

respecting American family. The impairment of family solidarity is one of the most serious consequences to be apprehended.'” And then he says: “There is a good, old-fashioned atavistic nobility of sentiment about this argument which will greatly please all good men and women except those who have to be supported by their children, and those who have to support their parents and also their own families on a wage-earner's budget. . . . It further seems to assume that we love our burdens and that when parents cease being burdens the children cease loving them. It assumes that the standing of a superannuated parent in a family is in an inverse proportion to the amount he is able to contribute to the family budget. It is an appeal to an ideal of a patriarchal family which has been dead for a century in every industrial country, and which really never had any strong hold upon American life. Of course, its inapplicability to the aged single man or the aged spinster aunt will be evident. For it certainly cannot be claimed that the support of all spinster aunts is also a fundamental principle of American solidarity. Then again, even married people may not have any children, or may have lost them. . . .” And he says much more of interest on this subject, not in praise of a pension system, but to prove that these particular arguments against pensions are not valid and to urge the need of some sort of social provision.

Another question is brought up in these articles—the difference between pensions given to civil employees and war veterans and to workingmen in general. In his article, “State Pensions and Annuities in Old Age,” in the American Statistical Association Publications for March, 1909, Frederick L. Hoffman says on pp. 368 and 369: “The argument is advanced that such pensions are really not fundamentally different from the pensions paid to soldiers and sailors for service rendered the nation in times of peace or war, or to civil service employees of all kinds, who are retired on attaining a given age; for it is said, if the state considers it just to pension our fighters, why should she not also pension workers? . . . The case is very different with men who have followed