



## REPORTING THE REPORTS

The New York Times quotes Mathew Woll, vice-president of what is left of the A. F. of L., as saying: "American capital was trying to take advantage of Mexico's backwardness."

Backwardness? How come?

Seems to me, Mexico is advanced farther in unionism—that is, they are organized to a greater "per cent of population" than is our own United States.

And now that the A. F. of L. has made such a sorry spectacle of itself as an "organizer" in the U. S. A., is it trying to form "a haven of shelter" for itself among our enlightened neighbors.

If there is any hokum in that move, only developments will prove whether or not it is successful.

\* \* \*

Says Prof. Salvemini: "Fascism is merely Bolshevism of the Right as Bolshevism is Fascism of the Left."

Now wouldn't that scale your cheeks! Here we thought that one was two-faced and the other all face—or no face at all.

Dear—Dear, what shall we do?

Let's see—Right face of the left and left face of the right.

No; that ain't right—I mean, left—the right face of what's left and left face of—Goodness Sakes! I believe they're a pair of twins born of separate mothers.

How was that again, professor?

One is the left of the right and the other is the right of the left, is that it?

By the eternal Jimminy! If those were a pair of shoes, a man would have one historical time getting into 'em.

Either I'm not right or they ain't right! That's all there's to it.

\* \* \*

"The poor man thinks that if only he can be rich he will be happy."

The poor man might just as well think he will be fat (instead of poor) when rich. It's the consciousness of not being robbed that makes the crown so light to carry. Poverty and riches are opposite—happiness is in no way related to either one.

Says Bishop of Durham: "Believe me, cottages have a better reputation for happiness than palaces."

So have saloons, for that matter.

Surely the Bishop doesn't advocate the doing away with palaces, on those grounds.

\* \* \*

"The liberal but economical use of forests will breed reforestation."

Could anything be truer!

Just like the liberal but economical use of snuff will breed re-Copenhagen.

\* \* \*

"Protestant bodies," (that's what they call Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians) are considering the "possibility" of "UNIFIED COMMAND." They claim "they've been split," and don't amount to full rating—because political leaders adopt the policy of Disraeli toward Protestants—conquer by dividing.

\* \* \*

The excommunicated Bulgarian Church wants to take part in the orthodox gathering planned at Mount Athos.

A rigid churchman interviewed at Sofia, said: "We are deeply moved at the Christian spirit of the Roumanian Synod . . . we are Keenly anxious to re-establish friendly relations with the Balkan orthodox churches and welcome the opportunity to become reunited." In "joint work to restore morals," etc. "Seven years ago," he said, "we faced our Roumanian brothers on the battlefields; today we stand shoulder to shoulder in an act of Christian forgiveness and cooperation."

That's what I like about Christians—they can "stand shoulder to shoulder" one minute, and fight like cats and dogs the next (at the mere word of a political leader) and then, again, toss each other an olive branch, embrace, kiss and smoke a pipe of peace—all, in an act of Christian forgiveness and cooperation. Hot Dog!

\* \* \*

"OUTLOOK FOR BUSINESS IN CANADA IS GOOD."

(Outlook for LABOR is HIS lookout).

"Farmers Generally Prosperous."

(Are the BUSINESS MEN going to stand, for that?)

"Fewer Failures."

Does that mean that farmers are generally prosperous when "fewer failures" report? One would naturally think that if the farmers had been able to hang onto prosperity there would have been MORE than "fewer failures"—or does it mean that farmers are classed "prosperous" every time they don't fail unanimously? Who fails? Or does "fewer failures" mean that farmers have been able to accommodate a majority of the applications for failure-relief and are prepared, prosperous, to handle additional prospective backsliders.

Dart those headlines, any way!

I can't make head or t'line of 'em.

\* \* \*

No two Christians are a like. There's as big a difference between Christians as there is between whiskeys—weak, mild, rotten, blend, good, fine, exquisite, grand, great, gorgeous, glorious—I can't go any farther; I've run short of Christians—even while yet mentioning only the moderately priced liquors.

Sturdy churchmen will say: "Evidently Slim has studied whiskies more closely than Christians."

I'll say I have! Studied them closer than even the most critical Christian that ever threw his eye over (or laid his tongue under) the Spirit of Food in perfunctory examination and painstaking appraisal.

I'm thankful for the confidence you place in me, bless you. I've studied 'em both (man and boy) until I'm lopsided just from conscientious scrutiny.