

THE STANDARD

NO. 83

IV, NO. 5.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD
Subscriptions to THE STANDARD are now being made at the following rates:
Single subscription . . . 50c
Ten or more, each . . . 45c
One hundred or more, each . . . 40c

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.
Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

CONTENTS:

A Call for a Conference of Single Tax Supporters at Cleveland.
New York Free Trade Club.
Judge Reid and Tennessee Democrats.
William Lloyd Garrison and O. W. Lovejoy.
Awakening of Jeffersonian Democracy.
The Good Work of the Republican Press.
A Single Tax Campaign in Dakota.
The Press and Mayor Hewitt.
John Barrett versus John Barrett.
Among the Typos.
In a Type Foundry.
Again, Where Are Those Acres?
From Warren Worth Bailey.
A Hot Debate.
Harrison and the Workingmen.
Pen, Paste and Scissors.
Working of the Interstate Railway Law.
The Protective Idea Destroying American Manhood.
"Standard" Campaign Fund.
Physiology As Is.
Personal.
Men and Things.
Wire Rods.
The Bearing of the Drama.
Single Tax Petitions.
Quarrels and Answers.
A Visit to "La Condegerie," State Prison of Paris.
Straws Which Show the Wind.
Stupidity Incurable.
Current Thought.
Thomas Paine on Agrarian Justice.

Advocates of the single tax in New York and vicinity who propose in the coming election to support Cleveland and Thurman are requested to meet in the upper hall of Cooper union, on Monday evening, August 7, at 8 o'clock, for conference as to the best means of doing so.

This call is made at the request of a number of our friends and with the knowledge that it will meet the approval of many others. As to whether single tax men who are determined to support the democratic national ticket should take any concerted action or form any separate organization, and if so what that shall be, are questions that many of us have been thinking about and talking about, and that can best be settled by discussing the matter at an informal conference. As the call is only to those who have made up their minds to support Cleveland and Thurman, the matter for consultation will be only as to how this support can be most effectively rendered, and the end we have in view most effectively promoted.

It is time that we should take counsel together about these things. We have too much interest in Mr. Cleveland's election to leave undone anything that may enable us to make it more secure and more triumphant. He has taken a great step in our direction and has pulled his party, despite its machines, into a discussion that brings the great labor question into practical politics. He and Thurman—for the significance in the second place on the democratic ticket of a man whom the great railroad monopolists hate, and whose re-election to the senate the Standard oil company prevented, is very great—represents to us all that is good in the democratic party, and all that is hopeful in national politics; while the republican candidates, standing on the most ultra protection platform ever promulgated in the United States, represent for this campaign at least the ignorance, cupidity and prejudices that block our way. The election of Cleveland and Thurman means the revivification of the democratic party with something of democratic principle, the triumph in its ranks of the spirit of Jefferson over the spirit of Tweed; it means the carrying forward of the movement against protection into a fight for free trade; the winning of the first set battle on the road to freedom; the bringing up of other economic questions, and an attack on monopoly all along the line.

New York in this election, as it was in the last, will probably be the pivotal state. And it is in New York that cowardice and treachery are most apparent among Mr. Cleveland's party supporters and can do the most mischief. It ought to be our part to do all we can for his election independently of them, and, it may be to some extent, in spite of them.

This campaign, moreover, gives the greatest opportunity for the propagation of our principles that we have yet had. We ought to take advantage of it as far as our ability will permit. While democrats are apologizing for attacking protection and declaring that they are not free traders, we who are free traders, and who see in the removal of restrictions and the abolition of all the burdens now imposed on production, the emancipation of labor and the restoration of their birthright to the disinherited, ought to make our voices heard. We can rally the men who are not afraid of freedom,

and show how many of them there are; we can place upon our own platforms men who are too democratic to find place upon the regular democratic platforms; and we can arouse an enthusiasm and do a work of education that will not only tell in votes for Cleveland and Thurman in this election, but will tell most powerfully in the great educational campaign of which that ending in November is only a beginning.

This will not be a meeting for speaking, but a meeting for consultation, and I would urge all single tax men in sympathy with its purposes to be present.

The New York free trade club begins to show signs of life. A vigorous branch has been started in Harlem, and the general committee has issued a circular in which it announces a reduction in annual dues from \$5 to \$1, declares its intention of carrying forward the banner of the absolute freedom of trade, and says:

One of the most important matters of detail which we now have to undertake is the formation of congressional district organizations, through which those free traders who are not disposed to enter either of the regular democratic halls, can at the same time labor for the success of the democratic presidential ticket and insure the election of congressmen who stand right on the tariff question.

The ranks of the free trade club ought to be filled up. It can be made the agency of effective work in this campaign. Its office is 39 Nassau street. E. J. Shriver is chairman of the executive committee, and E. P. Doyle secretary.

The Philadelphia Record, though it is doing good work for free trade, is evidently afraid to let its readers know that there is a real free trader in the country. This is the way in which it speaks of Judge Reid:

Two years ago Judge Reid of Tennessee was the republican candidate for governor of that state, on a high tariff platform, and, by his popularity, he received the largest vote ever given to a republican in Tennessee, coming within a few thousand votes of an election. But Judge Reid has become convinced that the tariff should be reformed, and he is now an earnest advocate of the election of President Cleveland.

This is not the truth. Judge Reid has not become convinced that the tariff should be merely reformed. He is not that sort of a man. When he believed in protection he believed in the highest kind of protection. When he ceased to believe in protection he became an absolute free trader. He is to-day an outspoken and earnest advocate of the election of President Cleveland, not because he wants the tariff reformed, but because he wants the tariff and all other taxes on labor and the products of labor, abolished, and all public revenues raised by the taxation of land values—that is to say, by a tax on monopoly. Judge Reid does not suppose that President Cleveland stands for what he wants, or that the democratic party is committed to it. But in what Mr. Cleveland stands for, and in what the democratic party is committed to, Judge Reid sees a step toward what he wants. The Record would not endanger a single democratic vote by frankly stating this. On the contrary, protectionists are more likely to become out-and-out free traders like Judge Reid than they are to become tariff reducers. A vigorous, fearless free trade campaign in that state would have given Pennsylvania to the democrats this year, whereas the best that can be hoped for the policy that is being pursued is a reduction of the republican majority.

The Memphis Appeal is much more manly. Replying to the Dresden Enterprise, a democratic paper that likes Judge Reid's coming to the support of Cleveland and Thurman, but does not like his reasons, and thinks it necessary to protest that the democratic party does not sympathize with absolute free traders and single tax men, the Appeal says:

Our esteemed contemporary is wide of the mark in supposing that Judge Reid's support of the democratic party makes it in the least responsible for what it terms Henry George's wild theories of land tax. . . . Let Judge Reid hold fast to his single tax idea and Henry George and his followers promulgate it with all the good sense and logic they can command. This is a free country and they have a right to their views and opinions. We care nothing about any man's religious or philanthropic or economical views. If a man holds peculiar or extreme ideas in these departments of thought is willing to help us in victoriously re-electing Cleveland, we say welcome, thrice welcome. And we say to Judge Reid, you are a thousand times welcome to the democratic ranks, because you are a man of influence, a man of brains, a thinking man and a philanthropic man, who loves his kind and would find the shortest way to accomplish the greatest amount of good for his race. You may agree or disagree with George, Judge Reid, as much as you choose, you are pledged to support the democratic nominees and platform and we welcome you sincerely and heartily.

This is good sense and good politics. We single tax men are supporting Cleveland because he suits us. We are supporting him just as the wiser abolitionists supported Lincoln. We make no false pretenses. We do not assume that Cleveland is one of us, or that the democratic party is committed to our doctrines for

more than a little way. But that little way is enough for us now—it is a beginning. And though democrats themselves may not see, in the direction in which they have begun to move, anything of greater promise to the masses than a seven per cent reduction of the tariff, they will be unwise to reject the aid of men who do see in it the road to the emancipation of labor and the abolition of poverty.

A clear note comes from a Massachusetts democratic stump. William Lloyd Garrison addressed a large democratic meeting at Hyannis last week in a speech that had all the power of clear conviction and high moral purpose. If there are any milk-and-water tariff reducers among the Hyannis democrats, Mr. Garrison's declaration of his own position must have given them a cold chill. He said:

I am a thorough believer in absolute free trade. I look forward to the day when custom houses shall be regarded as the emblem of barbarism—an anomaly and an anachronism in a true republic.

And thus he continued:

I am aware that the democratic party makes no claim to being a free trade party. Shall I therefore decline to recognize its step in the direction of progress? On the contrary, I hail it with joy and hope. The question cannot be discussed without opening the eyes and minds of men. The republican party, from its inception till the day when Abraham Lincoln signed his immortal proclamation, steadily protested that it did not mean abolition. The path once entered on leads into liberty, and whether men mean it or not, one step necessitates the next. There are no returning footsteps. Therefore, in departing from the company that at present masquerades under an honored name, I show my fealty to the true republican party of Sumner and Giddings.

Another democrat of the same kind, Owen G. Lovejoy, has made his appearance in the democratic party of Illinois, and has been received with open arms, having been unanimously nominated for congress by the democratic convention of the Seventh district. Mr. Lovejoy, like Mr. Garrison, bears a name once bitterly hated by the "sham democracy." He is a son of the veteran abolitionist congressman, Owen Lovejoy, and the nephew of Elijah P. Lovejoy, who was murdered at Alton, Ill., before the war by a pro-slavery mob. Like Judge Reid of Tennessee, Mr. Lovejoy four years ago took the stump for Blaine, being then a protectionist. Like Judge Reid he has since, I am informed, become a believer in the single tax. At any rate his speech to the convention shows he has become a free trader. He denounced protection as nothing but robbery under form of law, and quoted as a statement of his position the words of Justice Miller of the supreme court of the United States in the Topeka land case: "No government has the right to put its hand in my pocket, take out my money and give it to some one else." "The democratic party is not for free trade!" so its "men-afraid-of-their-horses" declare. And we who are for free trade are quite willing to allow this claim. But, all the same, the democrats of the Seventh congressional district of Illinois howled with delight at the free trade sentiments of their free trade nominee for congress. And all over the country the democratic masses will welcome the same doctrine if it is fearlessly presented to them.

The address of Chauncey F. Black, late lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania, and president of the democratic society of Pennsylvania, which is being sent out with circulars looking to the formation of branches through the state has a most refreshing ring. Mr. Black says:

Mr. Jefferson believed that no man could be a protectionist, for the sake of protection, and be a democrat. President Cleveland agrees with Mr. Jefferson, and I believe I am safe in the statement that every enlightened democrat in the United States agrees with President Cleveland.

And a good many unenlightened ones, too. For no one knows better than Mr. Black that the enlightened democrats, i. e., democrats who understand and believe in the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, have, up to this time, and especially in Pennsylvania, been but a remnant. And what he seems to aim at in the formation of these democratic societies is not so much the securing of adjuncts to the machinery of carrying elections as the establishment of educational societies for the discussion and teaching of Jeffersonian principles. He says:

We are confronted to-day by the tariff question, and President Cleveland, like Mr. Jefferson, recognizing the paramount importance and vital character of the issue as involving nothing less than the power of government to lay the masses under tribute for the support of special interests and favored classes, has summoned the people to vote upon it, naked and alone, and thus to determine once for all whether the producers of this country are to be free or slave. Does any man suppose that if the democracy of the United States had any time since 1880 been organized into Jefferson associations or democratic societies acknowledging the name and authority of Jefferson, there could have been the smallest division of opinion among us on this grave question? It would have been impossible. Errors and misconceptions would have been winnowed away in the keen blast of popular discussion in the voluntary demo-

cratic assemblies. False doctrine would have been detected by the infallible touchstone of the Jeffersonian test, and the fallacies of the bourgeois protectionist, seeking to enslave labor to build up monopoly, would have been uniformly met by us as they were by our fathers. It would not have required the trumpet of our great leader—the fearless and invincible man of the people—who stands today where Jefferson and Jackson stood, to summon us to this critical contest for American liberty; we would have been there long before he called, and the battle would have been won before it was joined.

What could be more encouraging than such language as this from the president of the association of Pennsylvania democratic clubs. There are too many federalists and whigs in the lead of the democratic party to have the vote of Pennsylvania counted for Cleveland this year, as with a vigorous campaign on Jeffersonian principles might have been done. But the heaven is working.

In the meantime the republicans are doing their share of the good work. The Boston Globe says:

The extreme free traders like Henry George are delighted with the course of the republican press. And well they may be. Six months ago all the free traders in this country could hardly be reckoned by hundreds; now it is not too much to say that they are hundreds of thousands. It is doubtful if there is now any assembly of workmen in which there are not some who openly avow doctrines, not of reasonable reduction of the war tariff, as advocated by President Cleveland, but of genuine free trade.

The republican cry of "free trade" is responsible for this. But for that insane iteration there would be to-day no reference to free trade anywhere outside the ranks of Henry George's followers. Now, free trade is really being forced into public discussion by the madness of the republican press. Not in a dozen years of agitation could the handful of free trade theorists have so popularized their theory as the reckless republican managers have popularized it for them in the last six months. For when large bodies of men see free trade discussed and denounced every day in the republican press as if it were a live question, they are bound to take sides upon it.

There are and have been other influences at work to make free traders of workmen than the republican press. The Globe does not realize how fast and how far the doctrines advocated by THE STANDARD have been spreading. But the republican press is now doing its share, and this not from blindness, but from the necessity of the situation. When a great question like that of the tariff comes into popular discussion it must be discussed not as a question of percentages, but as a question of principle. This may be seen in the democratic press as in the republican. Despite their protests, what they are really discussing is, Whether we ought to have any protective tariff, or not? Let Cleveland be elected and it will not be long ere the question will be, Whether we ought to have any revenue tariff or not?

Something like a local single tax campaign has been going on in Lake county, Dakota. E. H. Evenson, the county superintendent of public schools, is a subscriber to THE STANDARD and a single tax man, and has been doing missionary work through the county by getting subscribers to THE STANDARD, distributing land and labor tracts, etc. This led to a fight against him at the recent school election, that, as the following extract from one of the local papers will show, would have delighted the heart of Vice Chancellor Bird of New Jersey:

The educational institutions of this country are the foundation on which depends the stability of our government, and that a man who, while in the performance of his official duties as the head of those institutions, devotes any portion of his attention, time or thought to the distribution of a class of literature of the seditious, treasonable nature of the Henry George circulars, which Professor Evenson has been handling and believes in, is as unfit to superintend the molding of the minds of our youth as would have been Spies, Fielden or Most.

This was the key note of the opposition to Professor Evenson. He was, however, elected by a considerable majority, and the people of Lake county, Dakota, know considerably more of the single tax than they did before.

The Press has been publishing certain comments as to the management by Mayor Hewitt of his great estate at Ringwood, New Jersey. According to the daily papers Mr. Hewitt has become very indignant at this and has placed the matter in the hands of Assistant District Attorney Fitzgerald, with a view of beginning a suit of criminal libel. He has also given an interview on the subject to the reporters, of which this is the Herald's version:

I am determined to resent this unjust and malevolent attack upon my character. If this publication be libelous, as I believe it to be, then Mr. Porter, the editor of the Press, must either give his authority for these false and malicious statements or he must go to jail. If he will give me the author, then the latter will have to suffer the consequences. Now this malicious slander must end. When I ran for mayor the same story was printed in the Leader, but Mr. Henry George, the editor, subsequently wrote a personal note of retraction. I could and did overlook the publication then, for it was made in the heat of a political campaign. But I will not overlook this statement, which is not only false, but deliberately malicious, and made at a time when there is no excuse for misrepresentation because of

political bias or excitement. I wish to say that I am not to be prevailed upon from prosecuting the author of this malicious attack upon myself.

I object to being thus made Mr. Hewitt's witness. I was never editor of the Leader, nor did I ever write such a note of retraction. I know nothing about these Ringwood stories further than that I heard them before I was a candidate for mayor, and that when I became a candidate they were brought to me with the offer of proof, if I would use them. I declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground that, whether true or false, the introduction of personal matters was derogatory to the dignity of our campaign, which was one of principle. A like abstinence from personal abuse I also declined to do so. Something of the sort was, however, without my knowledge, afterward published in the Leader. As that paper was supporting my candidacy, I wrote to the editor protesting against such publications on the ground

at last be found to rest on the grant made by an English king, some two centuries dead, to some English nobleman and gentry, dead pretty nearly as long. If the Press carries its inquiry thus far it may find itself coming dangerously near Thomas Jefferson's notions of men being born with unalienable rights; and of land belonging in usufruct to the living, in total disregard of what dead men now done with this world, have willed or granted.

Mr. Hewitt is quite right in his determination to compel Mr. Porter to prove or retract the statements made about him, though it would be a matter of great regret to free traders if Mr. Porter were sent to prison before election. And however false those statements about Mr. Hewitt may be, it is certain that the condition of affairs which the Press alleges to exist on the Ringwood tract do exist on the great estates of the protected coal and iron magnates of Pennsylvania.

Mr. John Jarrett in another column has something more to say about tin plates. There is no use of entering into the discussion of what he admitted or did not admit. Mr. Deverall's point is plain and indisputable. It is that the duty on canning material accrues to the benefit of the great combinations, by increasing the amount of capital required for the business, thus giving them an advantage over small concerns, and that the drawback works in the same way, since, to the great exporters, the amount involved is worth the cost and trouble of collecting, while to the small exporters it is not. Mr. Deverall's further point is not that the home production of tin plates would enable the Standard oil company to sell abroad cheaper than at home, but that the home production forced by a big enough duty would, as for the heavy duty on tin plates it is not protection to the tin plate industry, for we have no such industry, but it is protection of the manufacturers of sheet iron, its object being to compel Americans to use sheet iron when they would use tin plates. Like all such taxes, instead of resting on the consumer the bare amount of the duty, as Mr. Jarrett calculates, it rests on him the amount of the duty, plus the profit on the duty and the additional charges by reason of the concentration of the business. Instead of standing alone it is but one of various duties which put the American producer under the most serious disadvantages as compared with the foreign producer, and concentrate the control of business into trusts and combinations. As an instance of how the protective system works, one firm of canners in this city will require \$20,000 additional capital this year to put up their usual amount of goods because of the advance of sugar by the tariff protected sugar trust.

But the cold impudence of this employee of protected interests in contending that American citizens should be taxed for the private profit of anybody, whether he be laborer or capitalist, is sufficiently suggestive. There is nothing sacred about workmen in protected industries that other workmen should be taxed to give them higher wages. But no one knows better than Mr. Jarrett that the workmen do not get the benefit of those duties. In his testimony before the labor commission he was compelled to admit that wages were only kept up in these industries by the labor associations, and to say that—

With the majority of them [protected employees] where they have the workingmen in their power, the tariff or anything else will make but very little difference as to the wages they pay. They will pay but very little above the wages paid abroad.

Before Mr. John Jarrett undertakes to answer Mr. Deverall he had better answer Mr. John Jarrett.

HENRY GEORGE.

Judge Reid's Telling Work.

NASHVILLE, Tenn., July 30.—We have much opposition here to Judge Reid in the field. If the press does not help him, we will. We advertised a meeting for last evening. The democrats had one at the same hour, but we had it all our own way. Judge Reid captured the crowd when he told them how he proposed to bring about the social change. His speech was very strong.

An assembly of the Knights of Labor which I visited five weeks ago has taken up the single tax and is now in the van.

P. H. CARROLL,

Secretary American Land League.

How They Divide the Profits.

"Yes," said old Sea Dog, "this division of the tariff profits between the employers and the men reminds me of the way they used to divide the prize money between the officers and men in the English navy. They used to rest the ends of a ladder on the backs of two chairs, so that it lay horizontally, and then the officers would take the prize money and throw it at the ladder. Whatever stuck to the rounds of the ladder went to the men and whatever fell through went to the officers."

Fleets of Work.

The flock. Woman (to tramp)—"Can't ye get any work to do?"

Tramp—(Yes, ma'am; I was offered a steady job by the old agricultural expert who lives just beyond the forks of the road."

Woman—(That's Mr. Hayseed. What did he want you to do?"

Tramp—(Ma'am, he wanted me to get up at four in the morning and milk seven cows, feed, water and rub down four horses, clean the stables, and then saw wood until it was time to begin the day's work."

Woman—(How much did he want to pay ye?"

Tramp—(I dunno; I didn't stop to ask."

AMONG THE TYPOS.

THE MAJORITY FIRM FOR CLEVELAND AND FREE TRADE.

Strength of the Single Tax Principle—All but Eleven Men in the "Herald" Office Converts—Brief Statements by Representative Printers—Strong Opposition to Hill.

Though the columns of the press have for some time been teeming with expressions of opinion of political managers, little has yet been heard from the people who are to do the voting. THE STANDARD here presents the views of a number of the representative men in one of the big trades in this city—the printing trade. The men of that industry contributed very largely to the work done for the united labor party last year and the year before. It is found that a large number of the union members are single tax men and that they will vote for the democratic candidate for president, because they believe he is going their way.

In the Herald office the champions of the single tax principle are John McCutcheon, Robert McKeechie, A. A. Mohr, Frank Fleming and Mr. Tuttle. They are single tax men. They are well supplied with facts and figures showing why Cleveland should be supported this fall. They proudly boast that they have made single tax men of all but eleven of the one hundred and forty-nine men in the Herald composing room. This one hundred and thirty-eight men will support Cleveland, but the eleven men who will vote against Hill if he is re-nominated, and will use all their efforts to defeat him, because of his veto of the electoral reform bill. Let them speak for themselves:

ROBERT MCKEECHIE, ex-president of the international union, and editor of the Boycotter during the campaign of 1884.—"I was a republican up to 1884, when I voted for Cleveland on account of the Tribune trouble. I have been a George man since 1883. I shall vote the democratic national ticket this year, not because I have any respect for the party, but because it will be the means of helping the single tax men to clear the way. It is a matter of duty with me; the interests and the future of my family are involved in the struggle just now commencing. I agree with Hugh O. Pentecost that I am about to take a ride in a nasty smelling boat; but I have to choose between two refuse carriers, and I have chosen the least objectionable. But I will work with all my might against Hill if he is nominated, on account of his veto of the electoral reform bill. I vote in New Jersey, or my ballot would count one against him. He won't get ten votes out of this chapel."

JOHN MCCUTCHEON, an old and esteemed member of the typographical union, who stood at his polling place and worked for the united labor ticket in 1884 and 1887. Mr. McCutcheon's pockets are filled with single tax and free trade clippings, and under his case are tracts and STANDARDS with which to make converts.—"I voted the democratic ticket up to 1886. This time I do not vote that ticket as a democrat, but as a George man. I find it easy to convince men of the righteousness of our doctrines, and no man who ever becomes inculcated with our ideas ever leaves us. I will vote and work against Hill if he is nominated."

A. A. MOHR.—"I shall ride in the democratic wagon (as George says) as long as it is going my way. If it turns out of the main road I shall jump out. There is only one thing worth fighting for in politics, and that is to bring about the levying of all taxes on land values. But I realize that the change can only be brought about gradually. This year the democrats are making a great move to that end; therefore I am with them. I can't see how a reasoning man can do otherwise. I shall vote against Hill for his petty action in vetoing the electoral reform bill. Friends of mine, men who work for a living, writing from Indiana, tell me that Harrison will be defeated in his own state. However, the national democratic ticket will not win if the democrats continue to pursue their present cowardly plan of campaign."

MR. TUTTLE.—"Because I love my family I am a single tax man; and because I love them I will this year vote for Cleveland. Since I became a single tax convert I have spent all my spare time circulating that kind of literature, and that quiet talks have had an effect which will be made manifest in my neighborhood. The democrats seem to be afraid to stand upon their own platform; and they deserve to be beaten. If Mr. Cleveland carries this state it will be through our efforts, and not his party's. I will not vote for Hill if he is nominated. Better the rank protectionist in the state than such a man as Hill. There are three votes in my family for Cleveland and against Hill; and there are a good many more in the neighborhood in which I live."

The remarks of the four gentlemen, quoted above, were repeated again and again. Suffice it to say that the Herald composing room will give a nearly unanimous single tax vote for Cleveland, and against Hill.

When the reporter walked into the World composing room he saw Joseph Rymer standing in one of the "alleys" reading Thomas G. Shearn's tract, "The Common Sense of the Single Tax Question" to a circle of listeners.

"Dan" Webster, up in the corner, had some type in one hand, which he was distributing, while in front of him was a clipping from a newspaper, which he was reading and discussing with his side partner. Tom Hancock was distributing and listening to what Joe was saying, while a slight smile was spreading over his face. He greeted THE STANDARD reporter pleasantly.

"What's the matter with Joe?" asked the reporter.

"He's trying to convert those fellows. Joe's got it worse than ever this year. He's here all the afternoon and don't get in over a handful of type. How does the office stand? Well, this alley of mine is solid. We're single tax men, and we're going to vote for Cleveland."

JOSEPH RYMER.—"We have a large majority of single tax men. All the old hands are that way, but the new men have yet to be converted. They are nearly all from Washington, where they had been in the government office under the republicans. But we will get them later on. They feel a little hot now because they were bounced after the democrats went into power. THE STANDARD and the tracts are doing good work here; and we have a number of friends working among the heathens who have the single tax argument at their tongue-tips, and they are making a good impression. The way to make Cleveland votes in this office is to talk democratic party very little and the single tax a great deal. The office stands just now about two single tax Cleveland men to one republican. We will gain friends all the time; we can't lose any when we get them on our grip—they hold themselves there. Hill will be cut badly by my friends."

"DAN" WEBSTER.—"I've been trying for two hours to get in this handful and at the same time argue with this chap beside me. He's a hard citizen, but I'll catch him. You see, he has a 'susap' for so many years in the gov-

ernment office that he is 'pizen' on the party that bounced him. I've got to get my type in for to-night or there'll be trouble."

DON L. SWETT.—"If the democrats don't come out and stand squarely on their own issue I'll vote against them. Their vacillation will lose them this state. Blaine will be here in a few days, and he will open the campaign for the republicans of the state by giving fair and square protection talk. How will the democrats meet what he says—by saying they are also in favor of protection to a certain extent? Why, the voters will laugh at him. If the democrats will say they are not free traders, but partial protectionists, and the republicans declare for high protection, the conclusion of the unbiased voter will naturally be that it will be best to vote the high protection ticket, for if the democrats are agreed with their opponents that a little protection is a good thing, the voter will argue that a good deal must be a better thing. I won't vote for Hill."

SHERMAN CUMMINS.—"I used to vote the democratic ticket, but I won't do so this year. I don't like the democrats because more outspoken—unless they stop their shuffling. They are not fooling anybody but themselves. The average voter can see through their cowardly game. They only believe in a slight tariff reform, eh? Well, if a little tariff reform is good, why is not a great deal of tariff reform better? Why don't they come out man fashion and say that lifting tariffs from industry will stimulate industry and raise wages, and that they want to demonstrate that proposition by a slight reduction in the tariff? Why don't Speaker Carlisle and Congressman Mills and the others come out boldly and pronounce what their ultimate aim is, and ask the people to allow them to try the experiment on wool and lumber and salt? Their constituents have confidence in them, as is shown by the fact that they have sent them again and again to congress. The people of the country would be perfectly willing to give them a chance if they only asked for it. Their experiment would be successful. Lifting all tariffs from production would be the greatest blessing that could come to producers, for it would immediately increase the demand for workers, and would consequently raise wages. The democrats will have to talk honestly to the people or they will lose the fight in November. I will not vote for Hill, and will do what I can to defeat him."

HENRY ROGOWSKI.—"I will support the national democratic ticket. I think the office stands just now about two to one that way; but later it may be better than that. The only subjects discussed here now are the land and tariff questions. The Washington men who have come in are republicans, and are hoping that with republican success they will be able to get back their old 'susap' in the government printing office. There will be an increase in Cleveland voters before the election. I don't know about Hill."

The World composing room runs over two hundred men. A canvass shows about one hundred and forty votes for the Cleveland ticket. Estimates from the Journal show seventy in favor of Cleveland to twenty against; the Times, about half and half; the Morning Star, about seventy in favor to ten against; the Evening Star, solid for Cleveland; the Press, half and half; the Star nearly solid for Cleveland.

MR. O'BREN, one of the proprietors of the Union Printer, said: "Immediately after the adoption of the platform by St. Louis, the chairman of chapters reported that a large majority of their members had taken fright at the tariff plank; but since then things had changed and now the estimates for the entire book and job trade could be put down at five for the democratic ticket to two for the republican. The democratic percentage could be improved; but so far the only visible work had been done by the republicans. Already the book and job offices had been flooded with republican literature, but nothing of a democratic nature had been seen, the only work so far in favor of electoral reform by the George men, who stand aloof from the democratic party while championing their national ticket. The most notable change is in Beadle & Adams'. In 1884 the vote was six for Blaine and seventeen for Cleveland; this year it promises to be reversed. The Washingtonians who were thrown out when Benedict took charge of the government office are actively working for the republican ticket in the trade; some of them even threaten to introduce resolutions at the next meeting of the union regarding political action. If they do they will be badly beaten."

THOMAS WILKINS, secretary of typographical union No. 6, said that he showed the book and job trade now stood five for Cleveland to two for Harrison. He couldn't speak authoritatively for the newspaper men, as he rarely saw any of them, except the chairman of the offices. But he was certain that his estimate would hold in the balance of the trade. He did not know how Hill stood with the men; the only talk he had heard around the rooms so far was about the national ticket.

A Meeting Has Been Called to Consider This Subject.

NEW YORK, July 24.—What action do you deem advisable for single tax men to take in the state, congressional, and municipal elections? I shall vote for Cleveland and that candidate for governor who shall be in favor of electoral reform. I think it would be a good idea for single tax advocates in this vicinity to hold a ratification meeting to ratify Grover Cleveland. By doing this we could most explicitly give to the public, through the press, our reasons for endorsing the national democratic ticket. There would be no doubt of a large attendance, and we all would be pleased to see our leaders on the public platform. The Academy of Music, the Metropolitan opera house or some other large hall could be obtained, and the expenses might be met by opening a subscription list in THE STANDARD. I would most cheerfully subscribe five dollars. Yours truly,

[On another page we print the announcement of a meeting to be held at Cooper union, on Monday evening, Aug. 7, to consider what action should be adopted by single tax men who favor the election of Cleveland.—Ed. STANDARD.]

In Jersey City.

A meeting to organize a tariff reform club in Jersey City, will meet on Monday evening August 6, at eight o'clock, at 409 Grove street. Those residents of Jersey City desiring to join such an organization, are respectfully invited to attend. J. D. MILLER, Sec'y.

Taking the Census.

In a New England protected factory: Census Reporter to Superintendent.—Now, I'll just go through the different departments and get some statements from your workmen. Superintendent.—Have you got an interpreter with you?

C. R.—An interpreter. You see, our division superintendents are all Germans, and the head dyer is a Frenchman, and most of the hands are French Canadians, except the women who clean the floors; they're Irish.

C. R.—Well, never mind; I'll take your statements. They'll do.

IN A TYPE FOUNDRY.

An Infant Industry of Pretty Lusty Growth.

TO TYPE FOUNDERS.

Dear Sirs: The Mills tariff bill has passed the house of representatives. It taxes our raw material as follows: Lead—1½ cents per pound, equal to 3½ per cent ad valorem. Copper—30 per cent. Tin—Not mentioned, unless under a general clause on page 9, at 40 per cent ad valorem. Antimony—Free, but freight expenses and brokerage probably 10 per cent. New Type Metal—15 per cent. Brass—Under general clause on page 9, at 35 per cent.

To all these discriminations against the American type founder must be added at least 40 per cent for the excess of wages in America.

To overbalance these crushing disabilities, the Mills bill allows only 15 per cent ad valorem! Write to your senators at once, and give facts in your letter. Up and do, or American type founding will be proscribed. THOMAS MCKELLAR, President T. F. A.

"Look at that!" said Stillman Walker, senior member of a large type making and printers' furnishing house. I had already a copy of the circular in my pocket, and had called on him to ask questions regarding it; but he forestalled me by showing his copy. It was intended ostensibly to be a secret circular from the president of the Type Founders' association of the United States to its members.

"Do you know what that means?" said he. "It means that if the Mills bill passes type foundry's wages will fall to the level of wages paid in Great Britain. That's what you free traders will bring our American workmen to if you are allowed to go on; and more than that, type will be brought into this country to compete with our American made type, and we will have to close up, and our workmen will be thrown out of employment."

I read the circular more carefully. I hadn't heard or read anywhere that the Mills bill had made any radical cuts in anything except wool, lumber and salt; but I judged from the importance which Mr. McKellar had attached to the matter, that perhaps the Mills bill had made radical cuts in the metals necessary to the making of type. I asked Mr. Walker if he had a tariff book. He hadn't. I thought that strange, but didn't say so. I asked him what the present tariffs on the ores were. He didn't know, nor did anybody in the office know. It appears there is a firm on Gold street that sells type metal to most of the foundries, all ready to melt and work up. So I couldn't argue the matter with him at all.

But I had my serious doubts about type foundry's paying forty per cent more to their workmen than was paid in Great Britain. I had heard that statement before in regard to other industries, which I had found to be untrue; but when I expressed my doubt he looked at me with pitying astonishment.

I couldn't argue the type matter with him, and I told him so; I had no facts, and I don't think he had, either; but I gave way to him because I presumed he ought to know more than I did about type manufacturing, because he was in the business and I wasn't. With a quiet smile of triumph he permitted the matter to drop. But I determined at the first opportunity to test myself on the type business, so that when next we met I could talk the matter over with him understandingly.

After smoking half a bad cigar he had given me, I casually remarked that I would like to take a look at his type foundry.

"You want to make some inquiries?" said he suspiciously.

"Perhaps. Do you object?"

"Oh, no," he answered with the air of a merciful conqueror. Then turning to one of his subordinates, he said:

"Danny, take Mr. McCabe up stairs and introduce him to the foreman and Mr. Milne and ask them to show him around."

I went up and was introduced. I got a lot of ammunition, which I at first intended to save until I fired it at Walker; but on second thought I have concluded that it will do more execution if I fire it at the readers of THE STANDARD; it will hit my friend just as hard as if I had saved it for him.

John Milne is a matrix maker. He is a Scotchman by birth, and has lived in the United States over twenty years, but goes back every year or so on a visit. He is reputed to be an exceptionally good workman, and receives much above the standard wages. His weekly pay is interesting:

"As to the weekly wages paid, they are, as the circular says, on the average about forty per cent higher here than in Great Britain—in dollars. But you must remember that is the weekly wage. Type foundry over there don't work as many hours as they do in this country. Nine hours a day and four hours on Saturday is the rule, making forty-nine hours. Here we work sixty—a difference of eleven hours. Then the English workman doesn't do as much work in an hour as is expected in this country, the ratio of work done being, say, eight in Great Britain to twelve here, or one-half more work. You see, the trade organizations there regulate the amount of work that shall be done in a day; but even if they did not, I think the climate would. An Englishman finds soon after coming here that, somehow or other, he can do more work."

"Weekly wages are forty per cent higher here than in England, as a rule, as Mr. McKellar claims, but they should be more than that, for the cost of living is at least fifty per cent higher here than in Great Britain. A man earning ten dollars a week over there would be foolish to come here for eighteen dollars, unless he was assured promotion within a reasonable time."

"As to piece work—there is very little of that class of work done over there—there is nothing like forty per cent difference. For instance, to make this matrix in England [picking up one] I would get one shilling and six pence (37½ cents); here I would get forty-five cents for it—seven and a half cents more than is paid in England. Now, that is not a difference of forty per cent, by a good deal, but a difference of only just twenty per cent."

"The trade here is in a fair condition; much better than for many years. Has the tariff had anything to do with it? Certainly not! The tariff can't regulate wages any more than it can regulate the moon in its course. The supply of labor is what regulates the demand. It would be a positive benefit if the metals necessary for type making came in free of duty. Why, the largest item of expense in making type is labor—not material—and labor comes here free. Here's the way to figure the thing out. Take, say, one hundred pounds of nonpareil. Its costs:

For casting.....\$1 61 12
For breaking.....1 30
For rubbing.....7 40
For dressing.....3 36
For sundry labor (estimated).....5 00
Labor cost.....\$12 33 12
For metal (10).....12 00
.....\$24 33 12
.....\$37 13 12
Manufacturers' profit (30 per cent).....11 13 12
.....\$48 26 24
.....\$1 50 12
Total eight dollars is nearer the mark.

The cost of labor, you see, is over twice as

much as the cost for materials. Now, if the duty of fifteen per cent on raw materials were taken off it would enable the manufacturer to sell nonpareil type for nearly two cents per pound cheaper.

I thanked Mr. Milne for his kindness and departed.

The following day I looked over the Mills bill as passed and found there were mistakes in some of the figures in Mr. McKellar's circular, the principal error being his statement that tin is taxed forty per cent under the Mills bill. Tin under the Mills bill is free, as at present. But such mistakes as these are common enough in protectionist arguments, and I will not take up the space of THE STANDARD to go over the whole circular.

I find on reading over my manuscript I have shot an animal that I was not gunning for. That hundred pounds of nonpareil, after liberal charges and profits upon it had been paid, could be sold for forty-four dollars and fifty-eight cents. But the price at which any of our foundries when I last bought nonpareil was fifty-eight dollars—thirteen dollars and fifty-three and a half cents over the total cost of production, with a profit of twenty per cent added. How much of that does the poor, in-danger-of-not-being-protected journeyman type founder get, I wonder? I heard some years ago that there was a type manufacturers' trust; now I see it. I do not wonder now at Mr. McKellar's fears; nor do I wonder at Mr. Walker's. I can see where the Mills bill would "prostrate" American type founding.

I had to go down town on an errand Monday, and happening to pass by Mr. Walker's business place, the thought struck me that possibly since I had last bought type a change might have taken place in the price which would account for the difference of thirteen dollars and forty-three cents I had found between the cost and profit of manufacture and the selling price. So I stepped into the office and asked what nonpareil was selling at now. The bookkeeper answered, "Sixty-four cents a pound." I caught my breath and staggered out. Had the Mills bill done this? thought I. Sixty-four cents—six cents more than it was a year ago—increasing the monopoly profit which I had found from thirteen dollars and forty-three cents to nineteen dollars and forty-three cents. Nineteen dollars and forty-three cents out of sixty-four dollars—over fifty-one and a half per cent—the cost of the type—taken from the pockets of the purchasers, for what? Not to protect the industry, surely! Not for the benefit of the laborers. Well, then, for whom? He who swipes your handkerchief goes to the island—if he is caught. But he who chokes nineteen dollars and forty-three cents out of you every time you buy a hundred pounds of nonpareil, through being a member of the type foundry's trust, wears much jewelry, eats juicy steaks, and is admired for his "enterprise."

WM. McCABE.

Chicago Mail.

A Tramp.

You turn from looking in my face,
Bleated, distorted, vile;
Yet once I had a boyish grace,
I had—ab, you may smile,
But I'd been years, features as fair
As any girl's, the stump
Which only the well bred may bear,
Was mine—now I'm a tramp!

What made me what you see me? Pshaw!
The reason is as old
As are the mountains: 'Tis the law
Of nature; we are told
Off by grim fate, some to be made
Falling, fading, faint and weak;
Some to stalk on in the parade,
Their feet on others' necks.

I was but of the former class;
I'd where others won.
I found men false. It came to pass
My faith in all was done.
Experience did not prove to me
The boasted guiding lamp;
I found—sadly, as you see—
And still I drift—a tramp!

'Twas but my weakness! Maybe so;
What made me weak I ask;
And I'll be hermit I own
To parents! Is the task
Of fighting fate but for the few,
With justice? Why revamp
Those same old platitudes? Adieu.
I'll drift on—I'm a tramp!

Notes from Correspondence.

L. Y. Booth, sending us a list of campaign subscribers to THE STANDARD from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, says that after several months watching he is convinced that the position of THE STANDARD in this campaign is the correct one; that the discussion of the tariff question is engrossing public attention, and that it is enabling single tax men to propagate their opinions.

The settlers on the great Maxwell grant, New Mexico, are calling for a report from the house private lands claim committee on the resolution offered by Representative Holman of Indiana last February. These settlers are in danger of eviction by the foreign land company that has bought up the Maxwell claim.

W. S. Brewer, Meriden, Conn., says that he gave up taking the New York World in order that he might take an extra copy of THE STANDARD. He and two of his friends are working hard to convert their shop mates to free trade. They have got several men to the point of doubting the benefit of protection.

A Public Debate.

A meeting of the Progress and Poverty class will be held Monday, August 6, at 8 p. m., at the Lyceum. Dr. J. P. Stacey will address the class in favor of protection. Discussion will follow the address. All are invited.

"Triumphant Democracy."

And still there is another strike. This time it is the boys employed in the chain factory of the American Iron works of Jones & Laughlin, who want an increase of wages. "It's a cold day" when Pittsburgh can't produce a strike in some branch of industry.—[Red Short, in Age of Steel.]

At Leith, near Uniontown, Pa., drivers and roadmen around the mines have had their wages reduced from \$1.50 to \$1.38 per day. Other employes have had an equal cut.—[Buffalo Evening News.]

Three hundred employes of a Cleveland (O.) nut and bolt foundry struck last week because the company decided to pay once a month instead of every two weeks. Recently wages were reduced 10 per cent.—[Buffalo Evening News.]

Hunt the Raphael Down!

The Home Journal, in discussing the tariff on works of art, tells the following anecdote: A year or so ago it was reported that an original Raphael, a great merit and value, was in the possession of a contractor, but as discovered that no work of the character had paid duty at the custom house, and it became necessary to investigate the charge. "302 the Raphael down!" was the cry; but when the criminal was run to earth, the picture proved to be a copy of no value, and the complaint against the offender was dismissed. As long as he was thought guilty of introducing a counterfeit Raphael into the country, he was in the position of a forger, but as soon as it was shown that he had only a worthless daub, or a deliberate forgery, he was acquitted of all blame.

A LETTER FROM JOHN JARRETT.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., July 5.—Will you kindly permit me a short space in your valuable columns to briefly reply to an article on "The duty on tin plates" appearing in THE STANDARD from the pen of Mr. Deverall.

This article, though evidently intended to be a criticism on my replies to certain questions propounded at the Palace hall debate, is in reality a perversion and misrepresentation of the facts at issue.

I admitted at the meeting that I was aware the Standard oil company received a drawback of ninety per cent of the duty for all its exports of oil in tin vessels. I also stated, as a matter of opinion, that, as a rule, the larger amount of capital required the greater the difficulty of starting up a business. But I positively stated that the protection tariff in this case fostered the monopoly of the Standard oil company.

Such a statement would be absurd and inconsistent. It was the revenue tariff, and the drawback system, that I said fostered the coal oil monopoly.

There is not now, nor was there ever, in this country a protective tariff in force on tin plates. No tin plates are now made in this country, nor has there been any for the last few years. All are now imported from Great Britain, which country possesses a monopoly of tin plate manufacture. This country takes over seventy per cent of Great Britain's total production of tin plates, and consumes more than all the rest of the world combined. Yet not one pound is made here, though attempts were made between 1873 and 1878 under the then existing high prices demanded by England, which all failed, thus giving us a beautiful illustration of the practical results of a tariff only for revenue.

Thus it is clear that in this case foreign production protected by a low revenue tariff, and not home production of tin plates, is in the interest of the consumer. In this case it has fostered the coal oil monopoly. I would also state that during the last year a foreign trust monopolized tin, and advanced the price from twenty to thirty-eight cents per pound. We have absolute free trade in tin. Can Mr. Deverall explain this?

Mr. Deverall's method of reasoning showing how that home production of tin plate would foster the "coal oil monopoly" is grotesque and visionary. It is "heads I win tails you lose." Now it is foreign production with the drawback that fosters monopoly, then it would be home production and tariff that would do it. Now it is combination with the British tin plate trust that fosters the coal oil monopoly, then it would be combination with the American tin plate trust. This is really bad, indeed.

Mr. Deverall evidently attempts to fortify the position of the canned goods men in favor of free importation of tin plates. But he places them in a bad light when he says "that with home production of tin plates the Standard oil monopoly would, by combination, do what we are now doing with canned goods." From this we may infer that canners are now a combination, or trust, who tax the American consumer, enable them "to sell in such pauper countries as England at less than they sell here, just to feed the poor things and intensify pauper labor."

Mr. Deverall, I presume, is aware that the coal oil monopoly and canners both get the same rebate on exports in tin vessels, viz., 90 per cent of the duty on tin plates, hence both are in the same box.

Again, he is in error when he says that I admitted canned goods were sold cheaper in England than in this country. What I said was that British workers can afford to sell canned goods, their wages being too low to permit them doing so. I do not believe the difference in price in each country is much, neither do I believe that canners are monopolists, or that their profits are very large, especially when we can buy a dozen cans of tomatoes for \$1.

As a mathematical problem the influence of the duty cannot be any more than the full duty on the tin plates used in making the can. Let us see, the duty is 1 cent per pound on tin plates. Quantity of tin plate in one can, about 5 ounces; duty on can about 8 mills, or about 3 cents on a dozen cans. The tariff cost, therefore, on a dozen cans is about 3 cents to the American consumer. Exporting a dozen cans of tomatoes, the exporter receives a drawback of

AGAIN, WHERE ARE THOSE ACRES?

An Answer from the Portland "Oregonian" That is Not an Answer.

New York.—The Portland, Ore., *Oregonian* has been slightly ruffled by my letter in THE STANDARD on June 23. It attacks and makes an appearance of refuting my statements, and after all fails to disprove any of them. The *Oregonian* said:

"You of the east who are bawling 'land monopoly,' just look this way. Here are millions of acres you can have just for the trouble of coming to get them. Come right along. No sense in squinting down in the eastern cities and yelling 'land monopoly.' Come out here and become 'monopolists' yourselves. (Henry George's paper please copy.)"

I pointed out that I had traveled all over Oregon and Washington territory nineteen years ago and again nine years ago, and specifically named the sections of country I had visited [see STANDARD of June 23] and had found that nearly all the accessible land had been taken up—a very small portion by settlers, the bulk by railroad corporations and land speculators; and that while there was room enough, as the *Oregonian* says, in Oregon and Washington territory for millions, yet "at all the entrances to this paradise stood the land grabber and monopolist" who demanded full before the seekers for homes could enter in. "Let any person," I said, "whose eyes are turned to that country put money in its purse, for he will need it if he wants to get a foothold there; and despite what the *Oregonian* has said, there is no more use for a moneyless man in Oregon or Washington territory than there is right here in New York."

To these assertions, after printing its own paragraph which brought out my letter, the *Oregonian* makes answer:

One William McCabe, taking this for a text, writes a letter to Henry George's paper under the title "Where are Those Acres?" He professes to have been in Oregon twice—the first time nineteen years ago, the second time ten years ago; yet he couldn't find any of those acres, and now he wants to know where they are.

"Are they," he asks, "anywhere near Portland? Anywhere near East Portland? Anywhere in the Columbia valley? Anywhere in the Willamette valley? Anywhere along the upper Columbia river, or in the Cascade mountains, in the Walla Walla country, or at Puget sound?" Mr. McCabe says he didn't find land for the settler in any of these localities, and renews the inquiry, "Where are those acres that he had just for the trouble of coming to get them?"

By some it may be regarded as amazing that anyone should make such inquiries; but the fact should excite no wonder at all. Mr. McCabe is one of those who look at a thing hoping never to find it. He traveled over a considerable part of Oregon and Washington nineteen years ago, or ten years ago, he ran over millions of acres that could be had for the taking. But no doubt he kept in the towns and cities, where the land was "taken up" some time before he came.

In Oregon and Washington, since he first came, nineteen years ago, three hundred thousand people have found homes, and there is land for them. Here, in a country of nearly two hundred thousand square miles, there are now less than half a million people, and there are vast areas remaining where there is not one settler within fifty miles of the nearest town. Here, in a country of nearly two hundred thousand square miles, there are now less than half a million people, and there are vast areas remaining where there is not one settler within fifty miles of the nearest town.

The least likely of all places to find lands for settlement is in the saloons and bar-rooms of the towns, even in a new country. It is only by sticking very close to them that men can find land in Oregon and Washington "millions of acres to be had for the taking."

It is evident that the editor of the *Oregonian* avoids answering my question. I asked "Where are those acres that can be had just for the trouble of coming to get them?" and I still pause for an answer. Mr. H. C. Crockett, of Weston, Kings county, Washington territory, who had a letter in THE STANDARD of July 7, while deprecating the statements in my letter, admitted that the land speculators and mill companies and loggers held a large part of the choicest lands along Puget sound, and what land there was still even to settlement was "difficult of access," and that there "was no use for moneyless men in this [Oregon and Washington territory] country, and people who wish to take government land should not attempt it with less than five hundred dollars, and they could find use for more."

In one portion of its "answer" the *Oregonian* speaks of cities that have grown on land that "Mr. McCabe couldn't find," which was "unthought nineteen years ago, and which 'might have been as easily as any one else'—meaning 'Spokane Falls and many other smaller cities.' I admit I know nothing about some of these places, but Tacoma I do know all about, and I also know about Kalama, Columbia City and 'some other smaller cities' and the assertion that I 'might have had' the land on which they were built 'as easily as any one else' is a falsehood."

The story of the building up of the town of Kalama, and its subsequent downfall, is probably known to more than one Oregonian, who have good reason to remember it. It was one of the large swindles of a larger swindling railroad company. The town, as the editor of the *Oregonian* probably remembers, was laid out in 1870 or 1871 by the Northern Pacific railroad company on the Washington territory bank of the Columbia river, about forty miles from Portland. It was given out by the company that Kalama was to be the western terminus of the Northern Pacific railway. Unscrupulous Oregonians sold their farms and other property and flocked to this "new metropolis," and put their life earnings into lots. Upon these lots they built houses and waited for the railroad to come there and "terminate." From five hundred to two thousand dollars was the price of a lot 25x100 feet, where erstwhile flew the birds of the air and roamed the wild beasts of the forest, and land could have been had for nothing. Two or three thousand people gathered there, and poured their treasures into the terminal office on the hill. Well, the railroad reached there, but did not stop. When the company had got the last possible dollar out of the gullied people, it moved its terminus to "some point on Puget sound." That was only seventeen or eighteen years ago. Kalama was abandoned; and the last time I was there it had a population of five or six persons, who lived off the occasional traveler who happened to pass that way. The houses built during the "boom" were being used by the five or six inhabitants for kindling wood. The people who bought the "lots" and built the houses had wandered sadly and sorrowfully off to begin life again elsewhere. That is the story of Kalama.

Now for Tacoma. It was expected, and the judgment of topographers was unani-

mous, that Seattle would be the terminus. But the Northern Pacific people had been so successful in their Kalama scheme that they determined to try it again. They secured the land on which Tacoma now stands, and as in the case of Kalama, they laid out the town and offered lots for sale. The public didn't bite, and the "boom" didn't come to Tacoma until the railway company had built their road to it and had their docks and warehouses ready for business. When everything indicated that that was where the Northern Pacific company would have to stop, then the public came in and bought lots—slowly at first, as if mistrusting the people with whom they were dealing. Now, I understand, there's quite a town there; but about the spot where once flourished Kalama still hover the spirits of the poor people who were swindled out of their last dollar—by the same corporation that built Tacoma.

The story of Columbia City is a much pleasanter one. The projectors of that enterprise lost every dollar they had. Reason: The public didn't bite.

WM. MCCABE.

Declares for Straightout Free Trade.

PARKERSBURG, W. Va., July 24.—Single tax men here are encouraged by the growing sentiment in favor of free trade. The seed has been sown and the fruit is yielding in abundance. When THE STANDARD first announced itself in favor of Cleveland a few of our members laid on their oars, suspending judgment as to the course they should pursue, but now every member of our club regardless of past party affiliations has joined in with THE STANDARD on the march for freedom.

Hon. J. M. Jackson in a speech delivered here on the democratic ticket and one of the most influential men of the state. Mr. W. I. Boreman, president of our local club, is an earnest and energetic worker in the cause, being a prominent business man, influential citizen and a former republican. He is a power for good. The tariff discussion is already hissing hot. What may we expect by November? One week-end democrat was heard to remark recently that were it not for that infernal Henry George gang there would be less talk and trouble about the tariff.

T. E. Q.

Acknowledges His Mistake About Congressman McKinney.

BOSTON.—THE STANDARD is so full of meat that it required the whole week to digest it. My progress through the issue of the 14th was so slow that I did not arrive at the letter of Mr. Browne of Washington, correcting my misstatement relating to Congressman McKinney's position on the tariff question, in time to acknowledge my mistake in the following issue.

I am pleased to find myself mistaken about Mr. McKinney. The basis of my statement that he was a "protectionist tariff reformer" was a clipping I had in my scrap book. It was a garbled report of a speech by Mr. McKinney in the house, and I cannot now trace it to its source, but I think it was from some country paper. I have scanned the files of a reputable newspaper since, however, and find Mr. McKinney's record to be entirely clear and highly praiseworthy as a tariff reformer. His arguments in support of the Mills bill are terse and powerful. The voters in his district should see to it that a legislator who so ably represents them, and whose patriotic efforts have been directed toward removing a portion of the burdensome taxes on workmen, is returned.

I know of no better instruments for propagating the grand doctrines of freedom of trade and the single tax than THE STANDARD and the tracts published by THE STANDARD. I am circulating them to the extent of my means, and shall send an order for tracts in a few days.

FRANK E. STACPOLE.

A Novel Way of "Spreading the Light."

TUCKAHOE, N. Y., July 25.—It is generally considered bad policy to mix business and politics; but what is the use of advocating a principle if you are not willing to make some sacrifices for it?

Acting upon this idea, we got out a business card with a time table of the local railway and placed upon one part a striking extract from Sherman's tariff speech showing the inequalities and injustice of the present system. As expected, we received some warm congratulations upon our course which were very welcome, some animadversions, and a great deal of cold silence. One ex-county judge, who, by the way, should have known better, told us that we were "d—d English free traders, and after indulging in considerable personal vituperation said that he did not like any man's opinions thrust at him!

The vast majority of men in this locality are stone cutters and quarry hands who have a dread of Italian pauper labor which no amount of demonstration seems able to prove to them unfounded.

We should be glad of any suggestions from those who have had experience as to the best method of dealing with these who prefer a demonstration which appeals to the pocket. In the meantime we must persevere, and take pleasure in doing so, knowing that the right must ultimately prevail.

ALBERT O. YOUNG.

Now's the Time for Work in Connecticut.

HARTFORD, Conn.—Inclosed find order for books and tracts. In traveling through this state I have found that the ground is ready for the seed. Men are willing to listen to our doctrine, although most of the factory villages who are sympathetic shrink from openly avowing their convictions through fear of losing their positions. There are a large number of democrats in the state who make a strong showing, but they are so poorly posted on the tariff question that they have scarcely anything to say when confronted with protectionist arguments, even of the most ridiculous character. I was in Manchester last week, where most of the inhabitants are virtually owned by Cheney Brothers, silk manufacturers. All the employees of this big concern are being supplied with a certain high protectionist daily paper free of charge. This town goes republican, thanks to our system of voting, which permits intimidation.

JOHN CADRIS.

The Pitch Defies.

LOS ANGELES, Cal., July 27.—One of the evil results of gambling with the earth is the utter demoralization of those engaged in it. Real estate circulars are nothing if not "poetic," and poetry with land sharks means falsehoods. Not a circular is published but what contains the statement that working-men can always secure steady work and high wages. There are thousands of idle men here in consequence. S. H. PALMER.

FROM WARREN WORTH BAILEY.

A Single Tax Prohibitionist: The Moral Side the Strong Side—Louis Lescallier's Idea.

CHICAGO, July 27.—I think single tax men will be pleased to know that, in the person of Major G. J. Lewett, the prohibitionists of the Second Indiana district have nominated one who earnestly believes in the doctrines of "Progress and Poverty." Major Lewett was one of our most earnest speakers at Vincennes, and I cannot doubt that while teaching the monstrous evils of the saloon, he will also teach the monstrous injustice of landlordism. He is a brave, true man, and he will do much during this campaign to destroy the fetishism which so long bound the people to the car of destruction.

Permit me in this connection to add my testimony against indirection in the advancement of our cause. If we win, we must win upon the ethical strength of our position. I would rather have the moral conviction of one man like Hugh C. Penrose, willing to sacrifice all that life holds most dear for the sake of a great truth, than ten thousand men whose cupidity has led them to seek what they have thought to be an advantage.

But, really, all things work together for the advancement of our cause. I am not willing to quarrel with any one's methods. I am, indeed, willing to bid goodspeed to any man who has taken up the cross of the new crusade, whatever his line of march, for I find the weakest of the brethren confusing the enemy and adding to the honor, the glory and the conquering power of our cause. Even our internal dissensions have been a spur to some of us, and in good time, I trust, we shall all be found rallying beneath the white banner of our faith.

But let us not hide our light. Let us set it rather on the mountain top, a beacon to wandering feet. Let us teach men the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The man who petitions for the single tax without knowing its scope and its beauty, may fly from us as from a pestilence if landlordism raises its alarm in behalf of "vested rights" but if you make that man know the truth, his feet are planted on a rock, and the winds may blow, the rains descend, yet he will stand firm—a bulwark as impregnable as Gibraltar.

I have caught an idea from the note of Louis Lescallier in this week's STANDARD, suggesting that a premium be offered for a pictorial diagram contrasting our present system of taxation with the proposed single tax system, and I have already brought the matter to the attention of a brilliant young Chicago artist. I fancy that a prize of say \$250, made up by popular small subscriptions, would induce many artists to compete for it. In order to catch the spirit of the subject they must read "Progress and Poverty." To do that is to become converts, and to become a convert is to become a retentive propagandist of the truth. You soon come to me that you can make a good investment in this direction, and you may count me in as a contributor to the fund.

WARREN WORTH BAILEY.

The Case of the Custom Shoemaker.

New York, July 29.—In 1871 I was making custom shoes for a Broadway shoe-maker, and at the same time, I was working, at and slept in the same house, fetching my work from the store and taking it back when finished. I was often compelled to remain in idleness by day and to work nights and on Sundays. My sleeping room was also the sleeping room of five others; my sitting room was the room in which I worked. Having been born and bred in the country, in a clean home, this life went hard with me. I would gladly have changed for the country had I any hopes of obtaining employment. I had seen something of the prairies and western towns. As well as the knights of St. Crispin were at their best, and I was glad when the grand lodge indorsed and recommended co-operation. We talked and thought about it; the outcome was that about thirty of us formed a society and started to make men's fine hand sewed shoes. We were beginning to get into working order when we were surprised and grieved to find that we were to receive the opposition of the lodge to which we all belonged. Some of us withdrew, others stood trial and appealed to the grand lodge, in spite of laws and recommendations, decided that they were working contrary to the welfare of our fellow knighs. The charge against us was that we were one of the team system by which you can make many more pairs of shoes than you can by working individually. You are better workmen than they are in other factories. You are making better shoes. Our bosses know this and they can get your shoes for less money than they can have them made by us. They will keep a stock of your work from which to select when a customer leaves an order, instead of giving us the order. This means ruin to the custom trade, and you ought not to wonder when we say, "We will down your co-operation if we can."

They made no attempt to deny that if we were successful we would improve our condition. That was not the question, and when we asked "Why do not the rest do likewise?" they replied "There is not work enough even now, but under your system there would be less. There are only so many shoes to be made, for which so much money is paid, and while your system will reduce the amount of money, it will not create a great demand for shoes, but will throw out of employment many men, thus creating a greater surplus of labor which will bring wages to the starvation point." Thus they said to "You must be content to lose your hard earned money, and give up all hope of bettering your condition by co-operation, because it will make employment more scarce."

Looking at these arguments from a protection standpoint and in the light of those days, it was not hard to see that they were right. Our co-operative concern dragged on for a while, and then like all other similar societies of this town, went the way of all flesh. But the competition of the poor shoemaker still continues. The factories of this city and Newark with their machinery are playing havoc with the trade. Men are being thrown out of employment to die, sometimes by their own hand. I am afraid that doctors and jurymen don't always give the true cause of death or they would more often render a verdict of "Tired of the fight and slow starvation." But this would not be a pleasant record, and besides it is easier to say, "God did it."

Some of my mates are saying: "If protection is so good a thing, why in humanity's name do they not protect the custom shoemaker from the factory hand and the factory hand from machinery? The past and present are not pleasant to think about, but there is a light in the east and men are beginning to see it, and some of us believe in our hearts that a simple, sufficient and bloodless remedy for our troubles has been found, and that the day is not far distant when men and women will have no need to wage war upon one another for the purpose of getting work to do. It will not come through protective unions nor the co-operative business we have had, nor through that will-o'-the-wisp, "protection," but through the return of our stolen birthright—the bounties of nature. When that is done man will live under his own fig tree at peace with his fellows. Then to introduce

improved methods of working or machinery will be considered a blessing instead of a calamity.

GEO. SEWARD,

203 West Thirty-fourth street.

A HOT DEBATE.

A Free Trader Starts the Vermont Quarrel—To Thinking—The Democrats Aroused to Activity.

RUTLAND, Vt., July 29.—Last Friday evening we had a debate on the tariff between Dr. M. R. Levenson of New York and John D. Spellman, a young lawyer of this town. Dr. Levenson presented the case of free trade in a clear and forcible manner.

After our town hall, which seats about 1,200 people, had been crowded to its utmost capacity, there were still many who were unable to get even a peep at the speakers.

Both parties were well represented, and each side expected its advocate to come out victorious. It seems to me that that meeting must demonstrate to the leaders of the democratic party, at least of this state, that the way to make converts to democracy is by open debate—by forcing the republican reactionists to the wall, for they are absolutely unable to cope with even the least informed of the single tax men. Mr. Spellman evaded the question entirely, and the several direct questions which Dr. Levenson requested him to answer were in no way alluded to. His address was made up of the shallowest kind of political humbug and the meekest kind of demagoguery.

He appealed to the lowest prejudices, even going so far out of his way as to declare free traders to be disbelievers in God. He attempted to excite Irish prejudice against the English people, and misquoted facts about tariff legislation.

You are probably aware that this is the marble producing center of the world. Dr. Levenson made use of the tariff on marble to set people here to thinking. He showed that the production of cheap stone don't mean cheap wages. He illustrated by taking a cubic foot of stone cut here, the average price of which was \$3. This price included a tariff of 65 cents and wages at a rate between \$1, the minimum, and \$2, the maximum, paid per day. He compared with this a cubic foot of marble taken from works near New York, sold at \$1. Marble cutters there receive \$5.50 to \$4 per day, and a day's labor consists of but eight hours work. Having thus shown that cheap marble did not mean low wages, and showing that the abolition of the tariff would result in a cheapening of marble, Dr. Levenson asked who got the 65 cents of protective tariff?

Spellman failed to inform his hearers who, though they repeatedly called for an answer, The cry had gone out through the shops, and the marble cutters are excited. "Who gets the sixty-five cents?" they are asking.

Yesterday the street presented a peculiar appearance. There were little knots of men here and there discussing the tariff question. The democrats are jubilant, but the republicans are daunted, and have resorted to calling free traders anarchists.

The democrats have issued a challenge to any man in the state to join debate with the president of the Jackson democratic club, with the ringing cry, "We bring down the gauntlet upon whoever dares pick it up." The president is Thomas H. Brown, a marble polisher by trade, a young man under thirty, and self-educated. We pit him against any man in the state or country, and agree to forfeit the expenses of any debate if he is beaten.

Two Points for Weak-Kneed Democrats.

MOXMOOTH, Oregon, July 18.—There are two points of history that I would like to prescribe as a nerve tonic to Messrs. Hill and Carlisle and any other leaders who protest overmuch against any imputation of free trade as a democratic doctrine. One point is that the most decisive victory ever gained by the democratic party was in the Jackson-Clay contest of 1829, when the issue was as plainly stated as words could frame ideas. There was no desire on either side to "conquer" a vote for Jackson meant free trade and a vote for Clay meant protection. Yet the final verdict was more than four to one in favor of free trade, notwithstanding the fact that the so-called "business men" of the country and part of the south were dead against Jackson. The other point is to be found in Jackson's message to congress of 1833. The passage reads: "Those who take an enlarged view of the condition of our country must be satisfied that the policy of protection must be ultimately limited to those articles of domestic manufacture which are indispensable to our safety in time of war. Within this scope, on a reasonable scale, it is recommended by every consideration of patriotism and duty, which will doubtless afford secure to a liberal and efficient support. But beyond this object we have already seen the operation of the system productive of discontent. In some sections of the republic its influence is deprecated as tending to concentrate wealth into a few hands and as creating those germs of dependence and vice which in other countries have characterized the existence of monopolies and proved so destructive of liberty and the general good. A large portion of the people in one section of the republic declares it is not only expedient on these grounds, but as disturbing the equal relations of property by legislation, and therefore unconstitutional and unjust." This prescription applied with a due regard to the changed relations we now bear with foreign powers as regards war, should in a very brief time so far "brace up" anyone whose backbone is not all gone that he will at least refrain from needless apology when charged that the democratic party is essentially a free trade party.

NATHAN YOCUM.

A policy which will transfer work from our mines and our factories to foreign mines and foreign factories inevitably tends to the repression of wages here.

What about a policy that transfers workmen from foreign mines and factories to ours; does that tend to raise wages here? shouted an American workman who stood back of the crowd watching the scene.

Mr. Harrison ignored the rude interruption, and thus concluded his address.

These are truths that do not require profound study.

The rude American moved off, but as he did so he replied, yet more rudely, "I'll be d—d if you don't seem to think so. You clearly have not given any profound study to them."

Mr. Harrison looked after the fellow who had said that, and then he looked at the only legal printer by the name of Col. New that the corruption and demagoguery that marked democratic ascendancy was causing the working classes to become more and more forgetful of that respect for their betters which they owe to the men who give them employment.

Herr Auswurf returned presently, apparently somewhat crestfallen; and after giving an order in German to the delegates to cheer for Harrison and Morton, he marched the miners back to the train.

I managed to muster up enough German to ask one of the silent miners how they passed it all. He said that they did not understand what the gentleman said, but they thought he was a nice looking man, and that if he should run for governor again, six years hence, after they had had time to get naturalized, they might vote for him. The principal saloon keeper over at the mines said that Harrison and his party were for free whisky, and he supposed that they were therefore not opposed to beer. Our correspondent assured the newcomer that after many years

HARRISON AND THE WORKINGMEN.

His Reception of the Clay County Miners—Debate with a German—A Rude American Scoffer.

INDIANAPOLIS, July 30.—A lot of Indiana coal miners were last week kindly taken by their bosses to call on General Harrison. The republican candidate for the presidency kindly talked to them and told them what he and his class proposed to do for the benefit of "our working classes," and the newspapers report all that he said, but they fail to record the responses made by one of the visitors, who after their bosses had made their formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf. His English was badly broken, but I have refrained from any attempt to imitate it. His responses were so frequent, however, that Mr. Harrison's speech, instead of flowing on smoothly as is indicated by the published reports, was really a dialogue of this sort:

Harrison.—You come here as representatives of the diversified interests of your country. You are fortunate in already possessing diversified industries. You have formal presentation, seemed to think his place to act as spokesman of the miners. His name I learned was Hans Auswurf

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
10 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS. POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class
matter.Communications and contributions are invited, and
will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found
desirable for publication will be returned if sufficient
stamp is sent for return postage. No notice will be
taken of anonymous communications.Contributions and letters on editorial matters should
be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD,
and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER
OF THE STANDARD.THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscrip-
tions at every postoffice in the United States, to whom
special terms will be given.The STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers through-
out the United States. Persons who are unable to
obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notify-
ing him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4, 1888.

**THE STANDARD is forwarded to sub-
scribers by the early morning mails each
Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive
the paper promptly will confer a favor
by communicating with the publisher.**

WORKINGS OF THE INTERSTATE
RAILWAY LAW.

Dispatches from all parts of the country
show a great turmoil among railway
managers because of appeals to the inter-
state and state railway commissioners to
forbid discriminations against shippers.
There is manifestly a disposition to closely
scrutinize charges and to hold the com-
panies to a strict account, and the inter-
state commission is kept busy in hearing
complaints and adjudicating cases. This
is at it should be, and demonstrates the
wisdom of the legislation providing for
the governmental control of those modern
highways. Even if no real relief is
brought about, a public sense of the
wrong to which our people have too
tamely submitted has been aroused and
the habit of looking in the right direction
for relief is becoming established.

A curious case has been pending for
some time before the interstate commis-
sion in session at Dubuque, Iowa. It ap-
pears that the Chicago, Burlington and
Northern company has made an unusually
low through rate between Chicago and
St. Paul. The Chicago, St. Paul and
Kansas City and other competing roads
have attempted to meet this "cut" by
lowering their through rates, at the same
time maintaining their old rates for local
business. Local shippers insist that this
is a violation of the "long and short-haul"
clause of the interstate commerce law,
and appeal to the commission for a com-
pulsory reduction of the local charges to
make them correspond with the through
charges. The Chicago, St. Paul and Kan-
sas City company has gone before the
commission with the declaration that the
Northern road is carrying freight unreason-
ably low, its charges not covering its
operating expenses, and the St. Paul com-
pany insists that the commission shall
compel the Northern to increase its
through rates.

At Leavenworth, Kan., the Northwest-
ern road recently brought suit before
Judge Brewer in the United States circuit
court to restrain the Iowa state railway
commission from enforcing a schedule of
charges that it has arranged under author-
ity of state law. Judge Brewer has de-
cided that the state may delegate the
power to fix rates to a commission, but
that the rates thus fixed must be reason-
able—that is, high enough to maintain the
roads, pay fixed charges, and a return to
the stockholders, however small.

These two decisions taken together in-
dicate the far reaching effect of the recent
railway legislation. Judge Brewer's de-
cision appears to indicate that the minimum
charges to be fixed by law must be sufficient
to pay interest on bonds and at least some
dividend on stock, no matter how great the
over issue of bonds or the watering of the
stock. On this principle no reduction
adequate for public relief could be fixed by
a legislature, either directly or through a
railway commission. But the case against
the Chicago, Burlington and Northern
company before the interstate commission
goes much deeper and raises the whole
question as to what is the actual cost of
carrying freight. This once ascertained it
will not be difficult to say how much addi-
tional must be charged to earn a fair profit
on the actual value of an honestly organ-
ized road. Charges sufficient to accom-
plish this cannot be accounted unreason-
ably low, and public opinion would not in
the face of the facts long tolerate any
system that would force such roads to
make unreasonably high freight charges
for the benefit of competing companies
that desire to earn enough to pay interest
on an over issue of bonds and dividends on
stock that represents no value whatever.
The work may be slow, but the tendency of
governmental interference to bring down
charges to a rate that will cover operating
expenses and pay a reasonable profit on
just so much capital as would be requisite
to reproduce the road now, leaving out of
account the excess of nominal capital
representing fraud or bad management in
the past.

Long before this result shall have been
actually reached public opinion will have
been educated up to see that a short cut to
the end sought is government ownership
of national highways, while the steady
diminution of chances to exact exorbitant
profits on non-existent capital will have
greatly weakened the forces that would to-
day be fiercely arrayed against govern-
mental ownership and operation of rail-
ways. In this, as in other matters, de-

spite white conservatives of the Brother
Jasper type, "the world do move"

THE PROTECTIVE IDEA DESTROYING
AMERICAN MANHOOD.

The delusion that the opportunity to
work is a boon for which the workman
owes thanks to the employer is a natu-
ral outcome of the theory that a tariff sys-
tem that taxes everybody for the acknowl-
edged purpose of putting money into the
hands of a few manufacturers is in the
interest of labor. Workmen thus deluded
become consciously pensioners on the
favor of employers, and they naturally lose
some of the self respect that ought to
characterize freemen. So long as men
occupy such an attitude, and regard the
position of suppliants for the opportunity
to labor as the natural and inevitable one
for wage earners, it is not to be wondered
at that trade organizations suffer through
the indifference of most workmen and the
disloyalty of some, or that political union
in behalf of labor's rights is difficult to
maintain. The man who must look to
another for the opportunity to earn a
living, with starvation as the alternative,
becomes the slave of him who can give or
withhold the right to live, and courage and
loyalty are not the characteristics of will-
ing slaves.

One of the evidences of the loss of
proper self respect among workmen,
brought about by the dependent attitude
in which they are placed by the protec-
tionist theory, is to be found in their lack
of sensitiveness to what American work-
men would at one time have regarded as
insults. There was a time, within the mem-
ory of men yet in the prime of life, when
all Americans instantly and instinctively
resented the idea of caste or classes among
the people of this republic. That time
has gone by, and a candidate for public
office who bases his expectation of success
in part on the aristocratic claim of high
pedigree can, with impunity, indicate to
workmen that he considers them as a
class apart, for which he and the class to
which he belongs benevolently propose to
do something.

Mr. Harrison, republican candidate for
president, in a recent address to a dele-
gation of miners, said: "Having here a
land that throws about the workman
social and political conditions more favor-
able than are found elsewhere, if we
can preserve also more favorable indus-
trial conditions we shall secure the high-
est interest of OUR working classes." Was
this lovely talk met by the indignant
inquiry, "Who are you that imagine the
duty devolves on you of so arranging mat-
ters as to secure prosperity to us, whom
you designate as your working class?" On
what meat have you new Caesars fed
that, in this republic, you dare talk of
classes and assume that you, constituting
by implication a class that does not work,
are charged with the duty of paternally
caring for that vast majority of the peo-
ple who constitute what you call your
working classes?

Unhappily no such response was made
to Lord Harrison's contemptuously benev-
olent proffer of alms to a body of Ameri-
can freemen. On the contrary, the re-
ports say that the sentence we have quoted
was "received with cheers," just as a
similar profession of benevolent interest
in those he had robbed and pauperized,
uttered by a European nobleman, would
have been received by a gathering of
serfs and peasants who had never dreamed
of becoming freemen.

This protective system is altogether ac-
cursed, but in nothing is it a greater curse
than in its maintenance of a feeling of de-
pendence that is sapping the courage, the
self respect and the very manhood of the
American workmen.

Among the home industries which it is
prophesied free trade would destroy is that
of glass manufacture. But in this as in
every other industry, when all the facts
are brought to light it appears clearly
enough that it is staggering under a load
of protection. George A. Macbeth of the
Pittsburg lamp chimney firm of George A.
Macbeth & Co., a leading republican,
is out for Cleveland and Thurman, and
in publishing his reasons shows how
protection affects his business. Accord-
ing to his statement it increases the
cost of his goods, which by reducing de-
mand for them both at home and abroad
diminishes opportunities to work in pro-
ducing them. Mr. Macbeth declares him-
self a free trader out and out. He has
been one on principle for eighteen years,
and during that time has learned, what all
observant free traders do learn, that the
facts of experience support the theory.
Taking his own business for illustration he
says the clay which goes into the pots is
not found in this country, and he is com-
pelled to pay for it 35 per cent more than
it is worth, that being about the rate of
duty. He might well have added that if
the clay were found in this country he
would have to pay nearly as much, with
the simple difference that instead of going
into the government treasury the extra
price would go into the pockets of the
owner of the clay bed. In addition to his
35 per cent extra for clay, he pays 1 1/2
cents a pound extra for lead, for potash
20 per cent, and for soda ash, of which,
however, he uses very little, a quarter of a
cent a pound. If we had free trade these
items of cost, besides others which he does
not enumerate, would be eliminated from
the value of his product without reducing
the wages of his men or of anybody else's
men by a single penny.

Mr. Macbeth computes the extra cost to
his firm of these materials, due to the
tariff, at not less than \$550 a week, with-
out saying anything of the extra cost of

his other materials. Free trade, then,
would reduce the cost of running his busi-
ness with present output and present
wages by fully \$550 a week. How would
that tend to reduce wages either in the
lamp chimney trade or any other trade?
Would it not raise wages by enabling the
firm to extend their market through
cheaper prices and compelling them to
employ more men to meet the enlarged
demand for their goods.

To offset the tariff duties which this firm
is compelled to pay for materials, a duty
of forty-five per cent is imposed upon their
goods. The object is to enable them to
sell lamp chimneys for forty-five per cent
more than they could get if the foreign
article were admitted free; but protection-
ists assure us that domestic competition
will compel Mr. Macbeth to sell his chim-
neys as cheap under the tariff as they
could be bought if there were not a tariff.
If that is true, Mr. Macbeth collects from his
immediate customers not less than \$550 a
week for the public treasury, plus the usual
profit on that sum for himself, and each
middle man between the manufacturer and
the consumer collects for himself his
usual profit on the original sum, plus all
prior profits, until the people who ulti-
mately pay the tariff in this case must dis-
gorge a great deal more than the govern-
ment gets. To say the least, that is an
expensive way of collecting revenues.

But if Mr. Macbeth gets any part of his
protection of forty-five per cent (and as
he cannot sell abroad, but does at home,
he must get some part of it), then to get
less than \$550 a week from that firm the
government compels its citizens to pay
\$550 a week, plus Mr. Macbeth's profit on
that, plus such part of the forty-five per
cent as he can collect, and plus a profit
on the whole for every intermediate buyer
of his goods.

And at what point in this labyrinth of
public and private taxation does the
workman come in for an extra slice?
Nowhere. His lamp chimneys are dearer
and his opportunities for work are less.
And yet there are workmen who go
with the protectionists? Yes; and so there
are innocent countrymen who go with
bunco steerers.

The New York Times recently printed
conspicuously on its first page a dispatch
setting forth in glowing colors the rich-
ness of the gold mines recently opened in
Michigan. The dispatch contained a state-
ment that the operations were confined to
companies already in possession of the
ground, and had caused no such rush to
the diggings as that which followed the
discovery of gold in California. The
reason for this difference is thus succinctly
stated by the Times:

The reason why prospectors are not rushing
in here by the thousands is clear. There are
no placer mines here. Placer mines can be
worked by any one, quartz mines requiring
a number of miners, supplies, etc., and several
months' work before anything like a mine is
developed. Again, in far western mining ter-
ritory the government owns the land, and any
squatter can locate and hold a claim. Here
every acre of ground is owned by companies
and private holders. Were it possible for
gold seekers to locate claims it would be done,
but leases and options for leases must be
secured before work can be begun. This
takes time and money. The difference in the
condition of land ownership here and in the
west makes the difference in operations.

A better illustration of the way in which
private ownership in land shuts out the
people from natural opportunities could
not have been given, and the appearance
of such a paragraph in the Times can only
be accounted for on the theory that the
man who usually wields the blue pencil in
that establishment with a view to sup-
pressing all news that lends force to the
single tax agitation is taking his vacation.

Let the workmen understand that their
wages are not dependent on the tariff and
the great obstacle to revenue reform will be
removed.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

True. But the quickest way to show
workmen that their wages are not de-
pendent on the tariff is to show them what
they are dependent on. In his Fourth of
July address at Harlem, Colonel Watter-
son intimated that he would do this some-
what later in the campaign. The quicker
he does it, now, the better. The country
waits.

It is reported that the republican sen-
ators spent considerable time at their re-
cent caucus "feeling" one another as to
the sort of tariff reform bill that could be
agreed on by the majority in the upper
house. A cut of fifty per cent on rice was
quickly agreed to, there being no repre-
sentative of a rice growing state present.
But when a feeler was put out in the
shape of a proposition to make a similar
cut on sugar, Mr. Plumb of Kansas let it
be known that his toes were badly hurt.
He claimed that the Mills bill cut was too
great for the interest of the sorghum
growers of his state; that the sorghum in-
terest was as much entitled to protection
as any other, and that if the sugar duty
were cut down one-half Kansas duty
would have to have free lumber and free wire
rods for barbed fences by way of compen-
sation. The objection of Senator Plumb
to a reduction of the sugar duty unless
the farmer's lumber and wire fencing be
made free by way of "compensation," is
simply a recognition of the facts which
are now haunting both the great parties,
viz: that the tariff system was built up
by a process of log rolling, engineered by
a few manufacturing politicians who have
thought it expedient to allow every other
manufacturing interest to share in the
plunder according to its kicking power,
and that to now deprive any interest of
its share would inevitably make it a bitter

enemy to the whole system. Like Sena-
tor Plumb, it would cry for "compensa-
tion;" and the business of "compensa-
tion" once entered upon it could never
stop until there is no protection left. By
all means, let Senator Plumb stand firm
for compensation. It is in just that way
that we expect the Mills bill, if it passes,
to do its work.

In passing the census bill the house
struck out an item appropriating \$250,000
for the collection of statistics of indebted-
ness. It is to be hoped that the senate
will put it in again.

We commend William McCabe's article,
"In a Type Foundry," to the attention of
the Press and Tribune; and as those jour-
nals have of late been making a specialty
of tariff conundrums, we respectfully re-
quest answers to the following:

Is it, or is it not, a good thing for the
men employed in American type foundries
that the trade of Australia, New Zealand,
China, Japan and the West Indies, to say
nothing of Mexico and South America,
should go past our doors to England?

If the duty of twenty-five per cent on
type were removed, would not the competi-
tion of English type foundries compel the
American type foundries' trust to abate
their present inordinate exactions? And
would not that be a good thing for Ameri-
can printers, American publishers, Ameri-
can newspapers, as well as for the men
who work in American type foundries,
and the American people generally? And
if not, why not?

Another communication in the columns
of this issue relates the experience of a
STANDARD reporter among the typesetters
of the New York daily newspapers. It is
a pity that the editorial writers cannot be
polled as easily as the types. The result
would be somewhat confusing to our pro-
tectionist and tariff-reduction-only friends;
but it would be mightily interesting for all
that.

CAMPAIGN "STANDARD" FUND.

The fund grows; but it grows slowly—far
too slowly for the work it has to do. The out-
goings have caught up with the incomings,
and every dollar that comes in is made to do
duty the instant it arrives. Were the dollars
twenty times as many, they would still be too
few for the task to which they are devoted.
For the opportunity which has presented
itself to preach our doctrines to men ready to
listen must be taken advantage of at once,
or it will be lost. While the presidential
campaign is in progress and the fierce debate
between protection and free trade is going
on all over the country, men are glad to read
anything which bears upon the question; and
our single tax literature is especially welcome.
There are thousands upon thousands of men
and women who will read THE STANDARD and
the tracts attentively if we can place them
before them. To do this is the work of the
campaign STANDARD fund.

Here are a couple of letters which illustrate
the spirit in which readers of THE STANDARD
are forwarding their contributions:

STONEHAM, MASS.—I enclose a postal note to
help the campaign STANDARD fund.
Mr. Louis Frang's article has the true ring,
and will greatly help the good cause. I am
glad that you published it.

I have a long list of names in this neigh-
borhood; but prefer to leave work done in
doubtful states. We must re-elect President
Cleveland. Free trade (or a slice of it) is the
entering wedge for free land.
W. SYMINGTON BROWN.

LA PORTE, IND.—Pardon the delay attend-
ing the remittance of the enclosed \$5, being
my first installment of my subscription to the
campaign fund. Will follow it up with more
in due course.
It is no less cheering that surprising to note
the willingness with which people will now
listen to the single tax advocate. It looks as
though we are rapidly evolving from the
domain of "crankery" to which ignorance of
human nature has led us. Open discussion can
now be indulged in anywhere, and ready
listeners be found. I find a great many de-
mocrats through this section who are for free-
dom and do not care to equivocate about it.
They do not count their party to their own
ideas, but openly express regret that the
majority of democrats do not take the right
view of the tariff question, though on the
proper track.
HERMAN KUEHN.

The fund now stands:

Helen Weston, Stoneham, N. Y.	\$3.75
N. Z. New York	5.00
H. B. King, Asheville, N. C.	5.00
Herman Kuehn, La Porte, Indiana	5.00
Baltimore	1.00
W. Symington Brown, Stoneham, Mass.	2.00
	25.95
Previously acknowledged	1,676.77
Total to date	\$1,702.72

Here is another convert who has gone to
work in good earnest, beginning by sending
us a list of twenty-five new subscribers to
THE STANDARD for a year each, accompanied
by this cheering letter:

CHICAGO.—From a patient perusal of your
valuable journal, and "Progress and Poverty,"
which our esteemed citizen, Mr.
Martin F. Coyne, of 178 South Halstead street,
this city, induced me by argument and
persuasion to read in order to be convinced of
the beauties of the "Henry George theory."
I have come to the inevitable conclusion that
the amelioration of the working masses of
this country can and only will be accomplished
by the carrying out and fully educating the
masses up to the principles as enunciated in
your very valuable paper, and so fully elab-
orated in your "Progress and Poverty."

I was loth indeed to cut adrift from the old
and cherished party line, and held many a
heated argument with my friends before I
could convince him of what I imagined his egre-
gious folly, as I was radically opposed to
what I believed your advocacy was, viz: the
"confiscation of honestly acquired prop-
erty." Now I have read your article and your
speeches over and over, and have become
more and more thoroughly convinced that
what I imagined was a chimera—a visionary
conception—seems the only haven of refuge
from misery and base subjection to the ser-
vile lust of monopolistic power. This relief
is practically attainable by thoroughly dis-
seminating your theories and practical ideas
among the classes to be benefited thereby.
With this object in view, with a firm and
so heroically advocate in the face of monopo-
listic malice and misrepresentation, I have
undertaken the arduous duty of becoming a
missionary in the grand army of the "eman-
cipation." And as an earnest of the sincerity
of my purpose and the readiness with which
the masses become educated to your ideas of
humanity and the present and future improve-
ment, I have spoken to a few men, and they
in response have sent a list of twenty-five
subscribers to THE STANDARD for one year.
Inclosed please find a post office order for

\$50 for a yearly subscription of the following
disciples in the grand army of progression of
human liberty.

I shall soon communicate with you, and ex-
pect to have good progress to report.

Truly yours in the good cause,

W. H. M. HUGH,

133 West Van Buren street.

This letter illustrates the fact that so many
of us have found to be true, that the men
who are at first most bitterly opposed to us,
and are the hardest to get to see the truth,
once they do accept it, become its most
strenuous and most valuable advocates. The
reason is that such men are positive men,
who for the very same reason that they do
not lightly accept a new idea, do not lightly
hold it; and that in throwing themselves
against our reasoning they fully test its
strength, and when convinced become thor-
oughly convinced. The very men to whom
we should address ourselves are the men who
oppose us because they believe us to be
wrong. Even a word, a question, the send-
ing of a tract, or a paper, may, while it
at the time to produce no effect, set such a
man thinking in a way that after awhile will
bring him to our side. How much good may
be done, what far-reaching influences may be
set in motion by the making of one convert,
no one can tell. The persistent presentation
of the matter by Mr. Coyne to his friend
Mr. Hugh resulted finally in turning one
strong man from an opponent to an advocate
of the single tax. If the thing ended here,
something worth while would have been ac-
complished. But it does not end here—a new
impulse is generated. Already this one new
friend of the good cause has brought to our
side, or put in the way of being brought to
our side, twenty-five others. And so in ever-
widening circles the good work goes on.

PHYSIOLOGY AS IS.

What the Children in Our Schools are
Learning of Their Own Bodies.

The Popular Science Monthly for August
contains a good article by "a teacher" on
the manner in which physiology is crammed
into children in our schools. The writer com-
plains bitterly of the ignorance, carelessness
and pedantry of the text books in use, and
thus goes on to show the result:

We may judge somewhat of how a study is
in general taught by the oral or written an-
swers given by a number of pupils, in various
schools, in reply to questions upon the study.
About a year ago there appeared in the Lon-
don Architect the following:

If instruction in sanitary matters is to be
continued in schools it will be necessary to
supplement the lessons with visits to some
such place as the Parkes Museum of Hygiene,
unless the school boards are satisfied if the
children get hold of a lot of hard words, or
rather of sounds resembling them. At present
it is supposed that sanitary science may be
taught as easily as morality, by listening to
a teacher read from a book. The children
are expected to catch the words, or they attach
no meaning to them. Here, for example, are
verbatim copies of the exercises in one of the
Greenwich schools:

Infections are brought on by bad smells,
such as small pox, measles, scarlet fever,
glass pox, &c.; they are brought on by bad
drainages; they must be well vented.

Infection disease are caught by touching
such as charcoal, chloride of lime, etc.

Measles, fever are called dissectionous be-
cause they are catching.

Fainted. If a person has fainted, take her
out in the open air, lay her down with her
head. And do the clothing round the neck and
dashed cold water the face and hand and put
her under a blanket to her nose.

Digestion is pain in the head, pain in the
stomach, bad tempers.

From digestion comes consumption, infor-
mation, head-ache, neuralgia.

Sanitary science may be thought amusing,
but it should be borne in mind that every
word represents more or less pain to some
unhappy child, in endeavoring to recall pon-
derous words which were without meaning.

Education in sanitary matters is desirable,
but, as it is conducted at present in public
schools, it must injure children's minds by
habituating them to the use of words they
cannot understand.

In the English official reports we read that
"an examination of girls in board schools for
prizes offered by the national health society,
showed some curious items of information."

One reply to mention any occupation consid-
ered injurious to health" was "occupations
which are injurious are carbolic acid gas,
which is impure blood."

"A stenographer's work is injurious, because
when he is clipping he breathes in all the
chips, and then they are taken into the
lungs."

"A third says, 'A boot-maker's trade is
very injurious, because the boot-maker
presses the boots against the throat, and there-
fore causes the throat to be inflamed, and it
touches the heart, and if they do not die they are
cripples for life.' With a beautiful de-
cisiveness, one girl declares that "all
mechanical work is injurious to health."

A reply to a question about digestion runs,
"We should never eat fat because the food
does not digest." Another states that "when
food is swallowed it passes through the wind-
pipes" and that "the chyle flows up the middle
of the backbone and reaches the heart, where
it meets the oxygen and is purified." Another
says, "The work of the heart is to remove the
different organs in about half a minute."

One little physiologist replies, "We have an upper
and a lower skin; the lower skin moves at its
will, and the upper skin moves when we do."

One child enumerates the organs of digestion as
"stomach, uterus, liver and spleen."

In the clever little book compiled by Miss
Le Roy, entitled "English as She is Taught,"
appear the following genuine answers by
pupils in reply to questions upon physiology
and hygiene.

It is usually most of these an-
swers from American pupils in American
schools.

Physiology is to study about your bones,
stomach, and vertebrae.

When you have an illness it makes your
health bad as well as having a disease.

The body is mostly composed of water and
a little oil, and a very small amount of bone.

The body has an infinite number of bones
joined together by the joints.

The spinal column is made of bones running
all over the body.

Digestion belongs to the lower animals.

Digestion is the circulation of blood.

Digestion is reducing our food to pulp.

Digestion is when food is taken into the
stomach.

The gastric juice keeps the bones from
cracking.

The eyes are set in two sockets in a bone
which turns up at the end and then becomes
the nose.

The coverings of the brain are the diame-
ter, the perimeter and the trachea.

The growth of a tooth begins in the back of
the mouth and extends to the stomach.

As an additional contribution to answers,
we add the following, taken by the writer
from the note books of pupils of one of the
high schools of this country:

Anatomy is dissecting of bodies generally
lifeless.

Anatomy is study of parts of the body,
physiology of action of parts, hygiene is ap-
plication of these parts. Kinds of bathing,
adapted to the age, quantity, quality and
heat of the water.

Supernatural are the muscles about the back.
The hygiene of a muscle should have proper
rest and exercise.

Hygiene is the study of the time and man-

ner of the action of the muscles and large
blood vessels.

The mouth is the commencement of the
alimentary canal, and it extends through the
throat, oesophagus into the stomach. The ex-
tent of the mouth helps the digestion of food.

Nervous system a decided part of the body.
A young person who goes to parties and has
great excitement has generally some
brain trouble, such as St. Vitus dance.

It is far more reliable to drive out the fire
of a room and put on extra clothing than it is
to put on no clothing and sit in front of a
burning fire.

Soap is important in carrying off the fat of
the body.

What is eaten by the body has sometimes
been taken as food.

The third cavity is the pelvis, which con-
tains the vital organs.

In a diet of twenty-four hours a man should
eat some of all the nutritious articles.

The first step in digestion is mastication and
insalivation; second, the muscles of the gul-
let.

A person is in fair health when he has the
affinity to accommodate himself to change of
climate and the ability to endure.

Respiration is the exchange of carbolic acid
for oxygen.

The times for bathing depend on the age of
location of and heat of the individual.

PERSONAL.

J. B. Packard of St. Paul, Nebraska, is an
untiring advocate. He is at present con-
tributing some articles to the St. Paul Press.

They are in the form of conversations be-
tween Smith and Brown, and deal with the
single tax, the tariff and other questions in a
light, attractive way.

C. M. writing from Scranton, Pa., says:
"If the democrats would food the state with
free trade tracts we could carry it for Cleve-
land. If they insist that protection is good
up to forty, or even ten per cent, they might
as well make no fight here. The republicans
whom we change are converted by pure free
trade ideas."

Mr. H. Plangman writes the South-West
of Fort Worth, Texas, an energetic article favor-
ing the single tax, in which he declares that
the remedy for the present unsatisfactory
state of society lies in taxing production to
cease firing men for their industry and to

MEN AND THINGS.

There was a look out in Bryant & May's London match factory early in the present month, which originated in rather a queer way. Mrs. Annie Besant and Mr. Herbert Burrows had written to the papers, telling of various abuses in the factory; among others, that the system of fines was so ingeniously arranged as to be equivalent to a serious reduction of wages. Messrs. Bryant & May at once published a card denying these assertions, and by way of still further setting themselves right with the public, prepared a statement to be signed by the girls in their employ, asserting, generally, that the match factory was a sort of heaven on earth, and specifically that no fines were ever imposed. This tribute to virtue was presented to each of the girls in succession with the alternative of either signing it spontaneously or losing her job; the result being that about 1,200 girls were discharged, or, as Bryant & May euphemistically expressed it, "went on strike." The wages nominally received by these young ladies varied from \$1.20 to \$2.50 per week, and the average stoppage under the fine system amounted, it is said, to about fifteen per cent.

Of course, the condition of these poor girls is an awful example of the evils of free trade. The wicked English government allows matches to be brought into England free of duty, and the pauper match makers of Sweden being thus permitted to compete on equal terms with the match makers of Britain, the degradation of the latter follows as a matter of course. If the rulers of England were wise, they would clap an import duty of 35 per cent on matches. This would insure Bryant & May against foreign competition and by increasing their profits enable them to pay living wages to their employees. Vide Ellis Thompson, Horace Greeley, J. G. Blaine, the *Tribune*, and other protectionist authorities, *passim*.

The only trouble is that the facts in this case fail to square with the theory. Bryant & May is a corporation whose capital stock is very largely representative, not of real capital in the shape of machinery, buildings, etc., but simply of the good will of the original firm; and on this capital stock it pays a dividend of never less than twenty per cent yearly. On the protectionist theory that large employers are the one thing needed to assure large wages to their employees, the girls in Bryant & May's factory ought to be the very aristocracy of female laborers. There must be something the matter.

"Something the matter?" say our protectionist friends: "Why, of course there's something the matter. The country is overcrowded. Great Britain has more people than she can support. There isn't work enough to go round, and the competition for employment keeps wages down. It's different in this country. Here the protective tariff has a chance to do its perfect work, and the consequence is a well paid, contented, independent laboring class. To abolish our protective duties would be equivalent to bringing all the poor working people of Europe over here in a body. And what would our laborers do then, poor things?"

Well, it's a pity; but here again there is an embarrassing discrepancy between fact and theory—or shall we say, fancy? Here comes the Chicago *Times* with its investigation into the earnings of Chicago working women. It tells us that the current rate of pay for making cottonade trousers and cheviot shirts (thirty-five per cent duty) is seventy-five cents a dozen, and the same price for jerseys (forty per cent duty). Here, too, are the factory inspectors of New York with their investigations. They tell us that right here in this city men are making overcoats (duty forty cents a pound and thirty-five per cent) at fourteen cents a piece, and working eighteen hours a day; that children eleven and twelve years old are working sixty hours a week, and that women are crowded into work rooms at the rate of one woman to each ten square feet of floor space. There must be something the matter here as well as in Great Britain.

Strange, isn't it, that, differing from each other in every other way, there should be just two respects in which Great Britain and this country are precisely alike. In both the wages of unskilled laborers are squeezed by competition down to the point of mere subsistence; and in both the laborer is dependent for the privilege of work upon the pleasure of a small class of men who control the all abounding natural opportunities for work. In one way, however, the working people of Great Britain are better off than those of the United States. They are allowed to spend the greater part of their wages where they please, and are not compelled, like the unfortunate in this country, to buy the goods of certain producers at extra prices. The landlord oppresses them as he does us. But they are spared the added misery of a protective tariff.

A correspondent of the *Sun*, writing from Havana, describes the pleasant life led by certain Cuban gentlemen who have learned to live without work. They simply establish an office in some wealthy part of the island and send word to the chief families of the neighborhood to bring each a certain sum of money to the office or take the consequences. The chief families wisely obey the command, bring the money as directed, and so are left unmolested in their homes. These gentlemen are not, as one might suppose, the landlords of Cuba collecting their rents, but simply banditti, who have reduced their calling to a science and squandered the police. Curiously enough, the *Sun* thinks their existence a disgrace to the Spanish government, and would like to see them exterminated.

Mrs. Cleveland's summer jaunts to Marion have made it difficult for poor people to visit that seaside resort; General Sheridan's purchase of a house at Nonquitt has raised the value of surrounding real estate; and now the shade of the Father of his country is invoked to add to the value of a piece of land in England. A London

auctioneer announces as follows in the columns of the *Herald*:

Sulgrave Manor, Northamptonshire, for many generations the home of the ancestors of George Washington, the American patriot; a manorial estate, eligibly situated, seven miles from Brackley, eight from Banbury and thirteen from Daventry, in one of the best hunting districts in England, and within two and a half miles from a station. The manor house is an ancient structure, built chiefly of stone, with a square porch at the principal entrance, in which are curious old carved shields containing the arms of the Washingtons, from which was adopted the American flag. There are also other interesting relics of the fifteenth century, and the accommodation is adaptable to a family of modern requirements. Adjoining are useful farm buildings, and the home meadows and gardens are well planted with some of the best grown timber. The land, of excellent quality and highly productive, is mostly well drained and divided into convenient inclosures, in one of which is another home, of which 141 are in grass, the whole being in a high state of cultivation, and possession of which will be given. In addition there are several cottages and detached inclosures of garden ground. The property is tithe free and the outgoings are nominal.

The *Tribune* gives currency to a dreadful report that one of the bureau-chiefs of the United States navy has said of the recent exhibitions by the North Atlantic squadron: "The sham battles and torpedo practice at Newport are an unequalled summer attraction for that charming summer resort; and, for show purposes may boom Bar Harbor or some other inlet, but are not useful nor economical."

William Penn is reaching out his dead hand over Pennsylvania, and if he doesn't succeed in grabbing anything, at least he will put the Quaker commonwealth to considerable expense. The suit for possession of the public park at Easton has been begun, and is to be vigorously defended. The claimant, William Stuart of London, says he is the direct descendant of William Penn, and that the park belongs to him. Like the ancient genealogies, his title reaches away back to heaven. God made the park land; the king of England gave it to William Penn; William Penn gave it to Northumberland county expressly to build a court house on; the county didn't build the court house, and therefore the land reverts to Penn, and Mr. Stuart is Penn by virtue of descent. There's a slight hiatus in this chain between God and the king of England; but doubtless adverse possession can be successfully pleaded against any claim of the Almighty.

But it is a little ridiculous to hear men praise our system of private land ownership for the security of tenure it affords.

Mr. Powderly, in the *Journal of United Labor*, offers this advice:

Call a town meeting and appoint a committee to go through your town to find out how many men are holding on to lots with a view to speculation, then go to the assessor's office and see if they are paying taxes according to the price they ask for their lots, and if they are not, insist upon their doing so. Make every man who owns a lot pay taxes on it for its full value. This is not Spencerism, Georgism, or Powderlyism. It is better than all of them put together. It is equity. It is equal and exact justice. Try it.

If Mr. Powderly will think a little, he will realize that what he proposes is by no means equal and exact justice. If the present system of private land ownership is wrong, justice demands that it be corrected by taxing all land values into the public treasury, so that no one may be able to profit by the mere idle ownership of land. On the other hand, if that system is right, justice requires that men be taxed on the value of their lands and not on the prices they may ask for them without hope of finding purchasers for years to come.

The story of the Philadelphia and Reading railroad, which the *Sun* has been telling its readers, is an instructive one.

Up to the time when Franklin B. Gowen assumed the presidency, in 1869, the road had confined itself to its legitimate business of a common carrier, transporting coal or whatever else was offered it, and earning, year by year, very comfortable dividends on its capital stock. Mr. Gowen inaugurated a new policy. He sought to control the coal production—not the transportation merely, but the mining and selling as well. He induced capitalists to back him, and bought coal lands right and left, until he had secured control of territory estimated to contain not less than five thousand millions of tons of anthracite coal. The capital stock of the company was increased from \$29,000,000 to \$34,000,000; its bonded debt from \$8,000,000 to nearly \$30,000,000; its rental from \$754,000 to over \$3,000,000. Nearly \$50,000,000 were paid out direct for coal lands.

The theory on which Mr. Gowen worked was a very simple one. At one end of his road were an immense number of people wanting coal; at the other end an immense quantity of coal from which to supply their wants. Apparently, nothing should be easier than for him to fix the equilibrium of supply and demand at just that point which should bring a sufficiently large profit to his company. If demand diminished, he could stimulate it with lower prices; if supply should be at any time excessive, he could check that. His control of the market was not absolute, it is true. There were other producers of anthracite. But the interest of those others was practically the same as his, and they were amply willing to work in harmony with him.

Yet the result was a thoroughly disastrous failure. The entire coal trade was demoralized; the Reading company became bankrupt; and the end of it all was that the road and coal mines passed into the hands of a receiver, to be administered in the interests of the company's creditors.

Then ensued years, first of stagnation and then of slowly advancing prosperity. Finally, under the administration of Austin Corbin, the property has been rescued from the receiver's hands, the indebtedness has been refunded, and the stockholders have a chance of once again receiving dividends. Only, the men who hold the bonds to-day are not, save in

a few rare individual cases, the original creditors of the road; nor are the stockholders the same. The original bond and stockholders have both been "shaken out" of their holdings, and the men to whom the coal consumers of the country will hereafter pay tribute are an entirely new set, who have paid for their securities far less than the face values.

Now, this story of the Reading company is an illustration, on a smaller scale, of a constantly recurring chapter in the industrial history of the entire country. Just as the building and operating of the road gave value to the coal lands, so does every other form of industrial activity inevitably enhance the value of those raw materials of nature upon which, in the last analysis, all industrial activity depends. Mr. Gowen's grab for the control of all the coal lands reached by his road is paralleled by the land speculation in which every period of industrial activity inevitably culminates. The disaster that followed was inevitable, and was brought on by the same causes that produce our recurring seasons of industrial depression. By his enormous speculative purchases Mr. Gowen inflated the nominal value of his coal lands far in excess of their actual value, and found it impossible to levy on the users of coal a tax sufficient to meet his interest obligations. In the same way precisely our periods of land speculation produce disaster by encouraging and compelling land holders to charge for the use of natural opportunities double, treble or quadruple what producers can afford to pay. And finally, the slow recovery of the Reading property is precisely analogous to the manner in which, after a period of stagnation, population and rent approach each other, the former advancing and the latter diminishing, until industrial activity becomes once more possible. The land owners of the country—meaning the controllers of natural opportunities—are constantly trying to do on a large scale what Franklin B. Gowen sought to do on a small one. They try by artificial means to maintain the equilibrium of supply and demand at an unnatural point, and to squeeze out of the community a tax to which they have no right, and for which they render no return. The attempt always has resulted, and always must result, in failure.

Suppose, though, that the state of Pennsylvania levied on her coal lands a tax equal to their annual rental value, and asserted her control over the Reading road, operating it for the benefit of all her citizens. How completely would any possibility of panic or disaster be averted. The law of supply and demand would be absolutely free to operate. If the price of coal fell, the rental value of the coal lands would follow it down. If more coal were needed, a slight advance in price would suffice to bring about the opening of fresh mines. As with a delicately adjusted balance, the slightest pressure at one end would be felt at the other, and men would go to mining coal, or quit mining for other occupations, just as now, an army at a time, but so quietly and by such gentle degrees that no disturbance of industry could possibly occur. And as, from the mine seam to the point of discharge at tidewater, no man could levy a tax upon the coal save only for efficient work done, the result would be, concomitantly with the cheapening of coal, an advance in wages that would raise miners and railroad men and captains of industry far above the subsistence line, and even far above the line of comfort. For them poverty would be effectually abolished. And again the analogy holds. Let the people of the United States destroy land speculation by taxing land values to their full extent, and commercial crises, industrial depression, low wages and all the horrors of poverty and the dread of it will vanish into the past.

Mr. Parnell has taken a step in advance, and from the head of a faction is developing into the leader of a party. In a letter written to a leading politician he takes distinct ground in favor of the federal idea—an imperial parliament, in which every part of the British empire shall be equally represented, and local legislative bodies for the different kingdoms and colonies. Thus advocating home rule, not for Ireland merely, but for England, Wales and Scotland as well, he bids fair to draw to his support an immense body of voters whose fear of Irish home rule was founded on a not unjustifiable dread that Irish home rule really meant imperial dismemberment. Perhaps—who knows?—he may be starting a movement that shall culminate in the fulfillment of the poet's dream—the parliament of man, the federation of the world. Events move fast in this wondrous age of ours.

The secretary of the London charity organization society has been reckoning up the amount annually expended in charitable relief in London by the government, societies and individuals. The total amounts to nearly £5,000,000. And the only result of the disbursement of this immense sum of money appears to be that from all the rural districts of England and from every part of continental Europe the poor are rushing to London in constantly increasing numbers, and the mass of London poverty is constantly growing greater and more foul.

But before we exclaim too loudly against almsgiving as a breeder of pauperism, it is well to remember that the poverty stricken are not the only class of London's people who are supported at the public expense. The landlords of London draw every year not less than £50,000,000 in ground rents, for which they render absolutely no return and which they squander with a recklessness to which the extravagance of the poor is as a molehill to a mountain. Perhaps they may have something to do with the breeding of pauperism.

The United States is fast losing her pre-eminence as a wheat producer. The English trade statistics show that for the first six months of 1888 the imports of wheat from this country were less than half those for the corresponding period of last year, while the wheat imports from

Russia have nearly quintupled. Besides pressing us thus closely with her wheat, Russia supplies England with one-half of all the barley she imports, with seven-eighths of the oats, and with one-fifth of the Indian corn.

From a protectionist point of view this is a state of things over which we should rejoice. For it is certain that the less England buys of our cereals the less of her manufactured products can she send us in exchange. There is no surer way of checking importations than by checking exports.

On the other hand it is worth remarking that the tremendous increase in the grain shipments from Russia to England is largely, if not entirely, due to the operation of our protective tariff. We are really stimulating Russian agriculture while discouraging our own. The English people, wanting to buy grain, are to a very considerable extent barred out of our markets, and forced to go elsewhere. We refuse to accept most of the things they offer us in exchange for wheat and oats and corn, and thus compel them to do their trading in some other and more liberal market. They offer us, for instance, tin plates, sheet iron, cutlery and linens—all things that they are expert in producing, and that we have plenty of use for. But by the operation of our tariff we so manage that in exchange for a dollar's worth of grain our farmers can get from them only 75 cents' worth of tin plates, or 70 cents' worth of sheet iron, or 50 cents' worth of cutlery, or 65 cents' worth of linen. Naturally, this makes farming less remunerative and so handicaps American agriculturists in their efforts to compete with Russians. And the worst of it is that this discouragement of agriculture reacts upon our manufacturers, and discourages them, too. Manufacturers, even with the aid of a protective tariff, can't live without customers any more than farmers; and farmers who can't sell their corn for more than 75 per cent of its value are in no condition to become extensive patrons of manufacturing establishments.

Of course, it is absurd that England should buy wheat from us, or Russia, either; and it is equally absurd that we should buy from her many kinds of manufactured goods that, in spite of our protective tariff, we import by every steamer. England could raise all her wheat on her own fields far more cheaply than in Dakota or on the plains of Russia. She has plenty of fertile land, a suitable climate and abundance of labor seeking employment. She actually pays the passages of laborers to America, and the freight back to England on the wheat they raise there, while her own wheat lands are lying idle all the time. In the same way we could without difficulty produce right here in our country many of the manufactured goods that we now purchase abroad. We have the raw material, the iron, the coal, the natural gas, etc.; and we have the labor standing idle in our streets, or tramping along the highways. But the trouble, both in England and here, is that we allow certain individuals to keep control of the natural sources of production and to levy toll for the privilege of using them. England buys her wheat here and in Russia, because her landlords won't let her raise it at home; and we send to Europe for a host of manufactured articles because our landlords forbid us to utilize the natural elements of production that lie in bountiful profusion all about us.

If the first duty of Americans is to encourage Russian agriculture, our protective tariff is an admirable thing; but as a developer of home industry it is a lamentable failure. What home industry needs is simply a chance to bring labor and raw material together; and our protective tariff is nothing but a cunning device for keeping them apart.

Democrats Must Stop Repudiating Free Trade.

AUBURN, Me., July 30.—There are lots of free traders here. But outside of the single tax men they repudiate the name of free traders. Although Auburn is a republican stronghold, there is such unusual interest in the democratic cause that the democrats think it possible to carry the state election in September next. And there certainly never was a time in my experience when the democrats had so much in their favor. Their great weakness is their repudiation of free trade. A single tax man told me that short time ago, he made free trade converts of five farmers who were strong protectionists, and he advised them to vote for Cleveland. Now, if the democrats tell them the party don't believe in free trade, do you think these farmers will vote that way? In my opinion the democrats will not lessen the number of protectionists if they pursue their present course; they have got to come out for free trade if they wish to elect Grover Cleveland president.

H. G. CASEY.

A System Which We Imported.

A recent speech of Mr. C. M. Percy before the geological society of Manchester, England, on mining royalties and mine rents contained some remarkable facts concerning the effects of the present exorbitant charges which the mine owners levy on those who work the mines. The *Standard* has already published one or two articles on this subject. This speech of Mr. Percy, however, was reported in *Iron* of London, and its appearance there brought forth the following comment from the *American Machinist*, one of the leading technical journals of this country:

There is much food for serious thought in the above. It is a question which is affecting, and will more and more affect, our industrial interests. The fact that mines are usually worked by the owners of this country and no rents or royalties are paid as such, by no means relieves us from these burdens. The owners of the mines, and the railroad companies which transport their products (in many cases one and the same company) see that all the burdens of that kind are laid upon industrial enterprises which can be borne, and we foolishly help them in their schemes of monopolization by assessing unworked coal lands, bought and held by the coal barons to prevent others from working them, as unimproved farm lands worth \$12 an acre—lands which could not be purchased for \$5,000 an acre. In addition to this we "protect" them from foreign competition, at the same time that we allow them freely to hire their labor in the cheapest market; in return for all of which they are building up a system which will some day, and in fact, is a great extent is now, throttling the industrial interests of this country—those industries such as our readers and friends are engaged in, and in which brains and energy are employed in perfecting and developing products and methods of manufacture, instead of in devising new schemes of plunder.

WIRE RODS.

An Iron Manufacturer Shows How the Tariff Works.

Here is a letter from an Iowa iron and steel manufacturer to a Chicago single tax man which bears very damaging testimony against that part of the tariff relating to wire rods. The letter has been reproduced in fac simile for distribution during the campaign.

BURLINGTON, Iowa, June 5, 1888.

C. H. Whiting, Esq., 137 Wabash avenue, Chicago, Ill.—
Dear Sir: Referring to our conversation regarding the excessive duty on imported wire rods, I think you will agree with me that the figures which I give you below will bear out the statement that it is an enormous and exorbitant tax upon a large portion of our population, the only persons receiving any benefit from it being some five or six manufacturers of wire rods in this country.

At the present time No. 5 wire rods can be bought for 10 c. b. Liverpool or Amsterdam for 45 lbs. sterling per ton, which in American currency amounts to \$10.00 per ton. On No. 5 wire rods under the present exorbitant tariff is six-tenths of a cent per pound. The ton referred to is the gross ton making 2,240 pounds, and the duty on it would amount to \$18.40, which you will see is something like over fifty per cent of the original value of the steel rods. No. 6 rods are imported under an ad valorem duty of forty-five per cent. Nos. 3 and 6 wire gauge rods form the bulk of the imports, and the duty on them is the largest.

Now taking the price of 10 c. b. Liverpool or foreign port of shipment and adding to that the duty, also ocean freight and insurance, these three items added together make the market price for the American rod manufacturer.

Owing to improved machinery very little manual labor is used in a modern rod mill, not over fifteen or twenty skilled workmen are required to manage all the machinery, and connected with it. Modern machinery has been brought to such a state of perfection that manual labor is almost entirely done away with, and it is simply a matter of machinery, so that the cost of manufacturing rods in this country does not exceed ten per cent, even though labor may be higher here than it is on the other side. This, you will observe, puts into the pockets of the manufacturers here all the profit that is made in the foreign market, and from forty to fifty per cent additional, so that those who have possession of a wire rod mill make a moderate fortune every year of their lives.

Another fact to be taken into consideration is that three-fourths of the wire rods used in this country, amounting to from two hundred to two hundred and fifty thousand pounds, are imported from abroad. Now, who pays the duty on these rods? The price of the material on the other side of the ocean and the market on this? Of course, this is added to price of the finished product and the consumer must pay the bill, or in other words, pays the tax on it; and it is too much to say that he nevertheless the money comes out of the pockets of all the consumers of wire, in whatever shape or form it may be, the farmers paying the largest proportion of this extraordinary duty because they are the largest consumers, the majority of the product going into the manufacture of barbed wire fence.

Now, when we come to consider its effect upon the workmen about which our high protective tariff friends, so much, so much, view is entirely fallacious and misleading. There are in all about five thousand workmen employed in rod mills, so that you will see the five thousand workmen are working at a disadvantage, on account of the tariff, to the benefit of the few who are producers of rods. This is entirely contrary to the spirit and genius of our American government, which is founded upon the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number. This is taxing the many for the benefit of the few.

The question of tariff as it relates to steel wire rods is no longer a local question. It affects every consumer north, south and west, but the great west and south are the principle sufferers because they are the largest consumers and are non-producers of this material. Now, a whole volume might be written upon the subject, but as I am not a writer of political economy and have not the time nor inclination to enter into all the details connected with the tariff, I trust that I have made the matter sufficiently clear and plain so that you will understand it well. The tariff is oppressive, and as before stated, it is not being a local question, it should not be a political one.

It cannot be explained by the other side why the few large producers in the state of Pennsylvania should require all the balance of this vast nation with its millions of consumers, to pay tribute to them. It is a very unjust thing and like all other wrongs and injustices it must eventually be corrected. With our republican friends may be able to make political clap-trap and buncombe out of it for the want of a real issue between the two parties at the present time in this great country, but truth and right will eventually prevail. This high protective tariff system will, when properly understood by the people of this country, be done away with, just as slavery and other great evils which have existed themselves upon the body politic, have been abolished. Very truly yours,

T. McCOSK.

The "American Machinist" on Taxation of Manufacturers.

The single tax idea is in the air. Here, for instance, the *American Machinist*, in commenting on the injustice done to established manufacturing enterprises by exempting new ones from taxation for a term of years, as is now frequently done by cities and towns, shows clearly its perception that the taxation of land values and the exemption of all improvements would be the best and fairest way of collecting revenue. It says:

It is not true in anything like a general sense that the increase in the value of real estate caused by the acquisition of new enterprises is a partial recompense to the old concerns, because high land values per se are not advantageous to manufacturers, but just to the contrary; a given piece of land purchased and used for manufacturing purposes at \$25 per acre is in no way improved for manufacturing purposes because its value after improvement is \$1,000 per acre, and such increase in value, if brought about by the growth of the town consequent upon industrial development, cannot be justly held to be any offset against the increased burdens laid upon its owners in the way of taxation. Besides, such a distinction between old and new enterprises often leads to strange

inconsistencies; for instance, towns are sometimes put into the position of saying to new enterprises, "Come to us, we will charge you nothing for the privilege of owning land, and building shops, and putting in machinery, and whatever extra expense may be caused to us by your coming, the way of increased water works capacity, fire protection, police, lighting, etc., we will assess upon those already here; you shall have none of it to pay," while on the other hand, it says to the old establishments, "If you, by your enterprise, build up your business so that it becomes necessary for you to enlarge your works, and to use twice as much machinery, and employ twice as many men, as you now employ, through your doing so may be fully as advantageous to the town as the establishment here of a new manufacturing concern, yet your taxes shall be promptly doubled; you shall pay a fine for your activity and enterprise."

Teaching Tenants a Lesson Exceedingly Dangerous to All Landlords.

The Chicago *Tribune* thinks that the so-called anti-landlord act of Illinois, which was introduced in the legislature by Mr. Scully's friends, and will fail of its purpose of compelling the great alien landlord to let go his holdings in that state. But, says the *Tribune*:

There is a law, enacted at the same time as the so-called anti-landlord act, which may be made effective in forcing Scully to let go his grip on his Illinois tenants. This is an act to prevent alien landlords from including the payment of taxes in the rent of farm lands as part of the rental thereof. The Scully leases provided that the taxes should be included in the rental. This was a bribe to his tenants to keep down taxes, and, therefore, to discourage local improvements, the making of roads, the construction of bridges and the maintenance of good schools. The effect of the new law preventing the inclusion of the taxes as part of the rental has been that the taxes have been increased, local improvements have been made, the schools have been improved and are maintained for seven or eight months in the year, and Scully finds that his Illinois farms are not so profitable as they were some years ago. Increased assessments will naturally follow the improvements, and Mr. Scully's profits may continue to decline until he is willing to sell out. The excellent little law of only a dozen lines may be utilized by the good people of Logan, Sangamon, McLean and Grundy counties to "clean out" Scully and rid the state of him before he gets his final papers.

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

The truth is that the Mills bill does not go far enough in the direction of a lower revenue or a freer trade. It is simply the best that could be passed.—[New York World.]

Six months ago all the free traders in this country could hardly be reckoned by hundreds. Now it is too much to say that they are hundreds of thousands.—[Cincinnati Enquirer.]

If the tariff on foreign products is levied for the "protected" laborers, why don't they get as much for making the article as the tariff on it amounts to?—[Buena Vista, Cal., Democrat.]

The object of a protective tariff is to increase prices of certain kinds of goods by insuring to the manufacturer a profit on his work. If this is not class legislation, what would you call it?—[Burlington, O., Workman.]

The passage of the Mills bill is the prelude of a great success. It is a victory. It proves that a principle as old as the pyramids has asserted itself, and has pushed from the minds of men long controlled by the necessities of the civil war the heresy of protection.—[Memphis Appeal.]

The republicans of the house, skulked from the issue because they could not harmonize their free trade policy with the protectionist monopoly protectionists; and the republicans of the senate finally accepted the responsibility of formulating a bill only when supreme political necessities demanded it.—[Philadelphia Times.]

They do say that Senator Allison, who was the head and front of the republican senatorial scheme to get up a "single tax" for the Mills bill, has heard from his state. He writes several farmers in Iowa who believe in this proposition of Mr. Mills: "It is time the poor people should be considered in the reduction of taxation."—[Cincinnati Enquirer.]

Whatever may be the fate of the Mills bill, there will be no step backward. The bill may be defeated in the senate, but it is more than probable—but just as surely as its enemies reject it in their partisan short-sightedness, so surely will another and more thorough measure be pressed to passage in the next congress.—[Philadelphia Record.]

Harrison will be defeated because he is the nominee of the party which favors high taxation. He leads the party of monopoly, of trusts, and of artificial prices. He represents the poor man must yield a portion of his earnings to be dumped into the coffers of the protected millionaire and into the national treasury to be used in extravagant expenditure.—[Omaha, Neb., Herald.]

It is a serious question whether we shall push further a policy of restriction which narrows our relations with the rest of the world by advancing the interest of favored industries at the expense of the masses of the people, or whether we shall stop where we are and gradually return to a fiscal system that would permit and promote a symmetrical and untruncated growth of the industries which our unrivaled natural resources invite us to establish.—[Philadelphia Record.]

The value of the final passage of the Mills bill, or any other tariff reduction measure is greater than the actual reform it accomplishes. It would increase the number of advocates for tariff reform. Take the wool growers, for instance. They are now completely placed on the free list and the industry has been brought to the natural level of the unprotected part of the country it is not likely that the wool growers will vote to keep others on a pedestal. Every reduction of the unjust tariff knocks the scales of self-interest from somebody's eyes.—[St. Louis Post-Dispatch.]

It is a well known fact that Germany takes a leading share in exports of woolen fabrics to the United States. The question then arises: What influence will the removal of the duties on wool in the United States have upon German woolen industries? It must be admitted that the effect can be no wise favorable, as the American woolen industries after the repeal of the wool duties will experience a great impulse and will make such progress that German exports of woolen goods to the United States must undergo a serious decline.—[Leipzig, Germany, Textile Industry.]

SINGLE TAX PETITION.

[The following form of petition has been adopted by the New York single tax league. We print it in such form that it can be cut out and pasted on a sheet of paper. Printed blanks, however, may be obtained from Benjamin Uner, 6 Harrison street, New York.]

To the senate and assembly of the state of New York:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the state of New York, deeply impressed by the injustice of the present system of taxation, which falls upon the poor more heavily than upon the rich, leads to corruption and evasion, discourages those who add to the wealth of the state and permits forestallers and speculators to withhold from the use the natural opportunities of labor, do hereby, without respect to political divisions, ask your honorable bodies to pass such acts as shall provide,

1.—That in all assessments for taxation the value of land shall be ascertained and returned separately from all improvements.

2.—That all taxes, state, county and municipal, shall be assessed and collected upon the value of the land alone, so that no one shall be taxed upon the improvements he may make, and the lot, farm, mine or other natural opportunity that has been improved and is being used, shall bear no higher tax than the lot, farm, mine or other natural opportunity of the same value which remains unimproved and unused.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Law and Politics.
NEW YORK.—(1) Can a person who is not a citizen of the United States sell real estate or leave it to his heirs in this country?
(2) Give me the views of the democratic and republican platforms in the ensuing campaign.
(3) If the republican and democratic nominees for president should die, would the republican and democratic nominees for vice-president take their place?
RAYMOND.
(1) At common law an alien could not take real estate by inheritance, nor could any one, either native or alien, inherit from or through him; but he could buy and sell real estate, subject to the right of the government to divest him of his title by a direct proceeding for that purpose. This is the law in this country, except as it has been altered by legislative enactments. In New York state the legislature has provided that a citizen may take from or through an alien; that a resident alien who has taken the preliminary steps of naturalization and intends to become a citizen may take real estate, but cannot lease it until he is naturalized, and that if a resident alien conveys or wills real estate and dies, the grantee or devisee, whether citizen or alien, may hold the real estate so conveyed or willed, provided that if he be an alien of full age he cannot hold against the state until he proves his intention to become a citizen. In New York, therefore, a person who is not a citizen of the United States may sell or will real estate to resident aliens who intend to become citizens, and if his heirs are citizens they may inherit from him.
(2) The republican platform declares in favor of a protective tariff levied nominally upon imports, but intended to restrict importation. The democratic platform declares against this policy; and though it does not pronounce in favor of free trade, points in that direction.
(3) Not necessarily. Should a candidate for president die before election, the national committee of his party would probably name a substitute, who might or might not be the present candidate for vice-president. Should he die after election, but before the electoral college performed its functions, the electors of his party would in their discretion name another person for president.

Tory Protectionists.
MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—Is it not a fact that Messrs. Gladstone, Parnell, Devitt and their co-workers are free traders? Is it not also a fact that Messrs. Salisbury, Balfour and their advisers are protectionists?
J. L. FROST.
Gladstone, Parnell and Devitt are free traders; and their party, so far as any party distinction exists in England on the issue of protection or free trade, is a free trade party. Whether or not Salisbury and Balfour are protectionists, I do not know; but the protection element in England belongs to the Tory party. It was the Tory party that fought for protection until it was compelled to succumb to the efforts of men like Cobden, who taught English democrats to see that protection is a weapon of landlordism.

Protection in France and Germany.
ALBANY, N. Y.—Gladstone is said to average 4.19 per cent. Please inform me through THE STANDARD what is the average in France and Germany. If I am correctly informed, their tariffs are as high as ours. Protectionists claim that the light tariff is what induces people to come to the United States. The blessed tariff does not seem to have the same effect in other countries.
PRESBURY A. PARKER.
I have never undertaken to compute the average tariff in France or Germany. I am informed that protection in France is much less than in the United States; though less than in England, and that in Germany it is about the same as in the United States, while in Russia and Italy it is higher.
What really induces people to come to the United States is the better opportunity it affords to make a living. This is not due to the tariff, but is in spite of it, and would be much greater if the tariff were abolished. That there is more emigration from the countries of higher protection goes to prove that it is not protection, but something else, that makes our opportunities to earn a living better than they are abroad. If it were protection German and Italian emigration ought to stop, and Englishmen should turn their faces toward Germany and Italy. Protection cannot cheapen land; on the contrary its tendency is to increase its value. Whatever does that is injurious to labor, for cheap land makes high wages and dear land makes low wages.

Money and Trade.
PHILADELPHIA.—A and B have an argument concerning the following points:
(1) B contends that money has no value in itself, excepting its material worth—in other words, that if a workman receives a ten dollar note as wages, he has not received the wealth due for his labor, but merely an evidence legally entitling him to that amount of wealth.
(2) B holds that a reduction of ten or fifteen per cent. of the average duties would not necessarily result in a reduction of the total income from tariff revenue.
(3) A claims that any balance of commerce between two countries (nations) is settled by money, which B denies, asserting that such balances are settled by bullion.
(4) A claims that "land" (meaning that term to embrace all the natural elements and forces) never produces wealth without the application of labor.
As we have no words of reference at hand, you will kindly state which is right and obligate.
W. F.
(1) B is right. Money as such is but a measure of values and medium of exchange. Let a workman receive for wages two silver half dollars, each stamped by the United States as money of that denomination; with these he can buy one dollar's worth of anything in the market, including one dollar's worth of silver bullion. But if he hammer out the stamp, thus changing his two pieces of money into a commodity, he cannot buy a dollar's worth of anything with them. They will then buy but about four-fifths of a dollar's worth of anything, including silver bullion. So money (excepting the material of which it is composed) is not wealth; and when a laborer receives money he is not receiving the wealth due him but only an

evidence of title to wealth of a certain value.
(2) B is right again. It would not necessarily reduce the total income from the tariff; it might increase it. If the average reduction were made by scaling down all duties, the tendency would be to increase the revenue; if it were made by enlarging the free list, the tendency would be to diminish the revenue; if it were made in part by reducing duties and in part by abolishing them, the tendency would be to increase or diminish revenue in accordance with the effect on the importation of dutiable goods. If the tariff on hardware were 35 per cent; on dry goods, 50 per cent; and on wooden ware, 15 per cent, the putting of wooden ware on the free list would make an average reduction of 5 per cent, but that would not encourage the importation of hardware and dry goods, on which the duty was unchanged, and revenues would fall off by the amount that had been received from duty on wooden ware. If the rate on hardware were reduced to 30, on dry goods to 45, and on wooden ware to 10, that, too, would make an average reduction of 5 per cent, and by encouraging importation might increase revenues. This will illustrate the principle, but no one can predict with exactness the effect on revenues of a reduction of duties. The framers of the Mills bill claim that the free list will more than offset any increase of revenues from more reductions.
(3) Balances between nations are not settled altogether by either money or bullion. Suppose the balance of trade at any time to be against England and in our favor, then the five pound draft which an Irish servant girl sends to her parents in Ireland to pay their rent, helps to settle the balance. The girl deposits the value of five pounds in one of our banks; the bank gives her a draft on a Dublin bank, and the Dublin bank pays five pounds to the girl's parents. The New York bank will then be indebted to the Dublin bank in the sum of five pounds, and in the adjustment of national balances England's debt to us will be reduced by the amount of that transaction, though neither money nor bullion will have crossed the Atlantic. The same thing occurs when charitable contributions, mining dividends and other payments without consideration are transferred from one country to another. But what A and B have in mind is the ultimate balance which is settled, according to the common notion, by a shipment of money. As to that B is right. Though the debtor nation may ship money, the creditor nation receives it, not as money, but as bullion. The material of which the money is composed is assayed and the bullion value, not the money value, is credited. So that in fact all ultimate balances of trade are settled with commodities.
(4) B is right again. Wealth is something which labor has produced from land. Land has some of the characteristics of wealth, as value and utility, and is therefore often mistaken for wealth; but to regard it as such leads to confusion of thought. It is not material by what terms different things are distinguished, but it is of the highest importance that the terms shall always be used so as to distinguish things that essentially differ. If the term "wealth" be applied to a natural element on which no labor has been expended, it is used as a synonym of the term "land." You can readily see what confusion must result from sometimes using these terms as interchangeable and at other times as distinct. If we use "wealth" to distinguish products of land and labor, we cannot use it to describe either land or labor.

The Tariff and Trusts.
CENTRAL FALLS, R. I.—Please explain the following: You say that with free trade it would be impossible for trusts to exist. Now, I understand, that there is no duty on coffee; still within the last month there has been a corner in it, and when we took the duty off coffee an export duty was put on it. Now, would be a necessary, why can't they (on the other side) put an export duty on that, providing we let it come in our ports free?
J. G.
THE STANDARD has not said that with free trade it would be impossible for trusts to exist. What we have said and say now is that it would be more difficult for trusts to exist. Trusts will not be impossible until production as well as exchange is free.
What you call a corner in coffee was not a corner; it was only a gambling transaction on the exchange. Such transactions cannot be prevented, and are not particularly injurious to any one but the gambler who loses. They are limited in extent by the confidence which one gambler has in the ability of the other to pay his losses.
The Brazilian export duty was not put on coffee because we took off its import duty. It was put on before, and it affected countries which made no change of import duty, as well as ours. That export duty was imposed solely for local or personal reasons, and could not have been collected off buying nations if coffee had not been a national monopoly. If we should put an export duty on wheat, who would pay it? Not the foreign buyer, but the domestic producer. But if we had a monopoly of what raising we could within certain limits compel the foreign buyer to pay export duties. And this principle answers your question about wool. A foreign country having a monopoly of a certain kind of wool which we could make us pay an export duty, which would relieve the land owners of that country at the expense of its wool producers, whose profits and wages would be lower in consequence of our smaller demand. But because a foreign country might by an export duty incidentally injure our producers and directly injure their own, is no reason why we should directly injure ours by an import duty.

Coal Miners.
NEWARK.—At a political stump harangue here in Newark the other evening, the protectionist speakers, after a long discourse on the benefits derived from the tariff of 1861, the magnificent history and principles of the republican party since 1861, the great achievement of gaining control of the government when its finances were in a deplorable condition, and leaving it in 1884 with a handsome surplus effected by the tariff, brought forth two illustrations of their principles, namely, that coal is brought from England merely as bait, and that the wages of the English pauper miner is so low that we cannot pay our miners the present standard of wages

and compete with this labor; next, that wool can be raised so cheaply in Great Britain that our stock raisers would be obliged to sell their sheep for mutton, as it would be impossible to compete with foreign wool growers.
May I ask you what the difference in wages between English and Pennsylvania miners really is? The fallacy of the latter is easily discernible.
R. JORALEXON.
The difference between the wages of coal miners in England and in the United States is not less than twelve cents a ton in favor of the English miner. The wages for mining coal here is from sixty-seven cents a ton down to forty cents, and in England it is from seventy-nine cents upward. Besides this difference in money wages, the English miner gets his own coal free while the Pennsylvania miner is charged for it at mine prices—between \$2 and \$3 a ton.
There is something sublime in the impudence which claims that the tariff on coal is maintained for the benefit of the miners, when the miners get sixty-seven cents a ton for mining and the tariff duty is seventy-five cents a ton. If there were no tariff the miners, according to protection logic, would have to work for nothing and pay eight cents a ton for the privilege.
American Patriotism.
CHICAGO.—I have been reading up your land theory and would like to ask a question or two in reference to it.
(1) Suppose we adopt the scheme of taxing land values, and as a result wages take an upward tendency, will the volume of immigration to this country become so great as to almost, if not at times entirely, check that advance, and thereby deprive us of the benefit (or full benefit) of the change? High wages are bound to attract the people of the entire globe to the spot where they are paid, and the higher they are the quicker they will get there, so it seems useless to me to raise the "standard of comfort" in this country unless something is done to shut off the tide of immigration.
(2) Assuming that your answer is that the opportunities will be such that we could accommodate any influx that might occur, there is another point to be considered. Would it not bring upon us people of other countries at such a rate as to practically extinguish our individuality as a nation? Already the foreign element is a deciding factor in politics, and we go about in constant fear of offending German or Irish voters, and simply because they are German or Irish. Most of these people cling to their own language, read their own newspapers, celebrate their old country holidays; in fact, try to make things in this country as near to the one they left as possible. In fact they have no sympathy with our institutions, and take no pride in the past history of our country. Love of country, the mainspring of patriotism, is wanting; they are here simply and solely for the almighty dollar.
These facts are impressed on me more today than ever before; it is my first Fourth of July in Chicago, and the lack of interest shown in the day is painful to one who was brought up in the east. Not a cent was appropriated by the city for public celebration; properly used, this money could have been in fact, we have no Fourth here—how can we when two-thirds of the people are foreign born and know nothing about it? In view of these facts would not the adoption of your plan overwhelm us with people who would swallow us instead of our swallowing them?
A. H. HAWKES.
(1) In your second question you have anticipated the answer to your first. Our opportunities are practically unlimited. We could put the population of the world in these states, if unused land were free, without checking the advance of wages. Indeed, the greater the number that came the higher would our wages rise. But the whole population of the world would not come. The depopulation of other countries by emigration to this would cause a decline of land values abroad until the condition of working people there would be raised so nearly to a level with the condition here that emigration would check itself. There is another and more important consideration, which is that the single tax once adopted in a country of the magnitude of the United States, and its benefits demonstrated, no other country could long avoid its adoption.
(2) The only kind of immigration that could extinguish our individuality would be that of a different race. Our national characteristic results from opportunities for the enjoyment of freedom which are greater than the opportunities of other freedom loving people. Any of these people coming to us and finding here such liberty as the single tax would secure to all, would immediately develop the one great American characteristic which is already latent among them. Witness the case of English, Irish, German and other immigrants who have been fortunate enough to better their condition here.
If foreigners put the almighty dollar above the love for their adopted country they are not worse than Americans who do the same. The lack of interest shown in the celebration of the Fourth of July is not an alien characteristic. Indeed, I am inclined to think that you will find the traditions of that day dearer to the immigrant than to most of our native born population.

English Revenues.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.—It would be very interesting to myself and perhaps to many of your readers if you would tell us how Great Britain raises her revenue for the support of the government?
E. F. BLAISDELL.
Partly by a tax on real estate of four shillings to the pound, based on valuations of the latter part of the seventeenth century; partly by stamp duties; partly by excise; partly by duties on imports. These are the principal sources of national revenue.

Panics and Free Trade.
NEW YORK.—In 1871 there was a panic in this country in 1871 on account of a reduction of the tariff?
(2) A high tariff advocate is trying to convince me that if we had free trade in this country it would shut up all our manufacturing establishments. Is that true?
A SINGLE TAX CONVERT.
(1) No. There was a short panic in 1857 due to wildcat banking and land speculation, and the tariff was reduced the same year; but the panic was not due to the reduction. The tariff was reduced from a protective to a revenue basis in 1846, and it is conceded by well informed protectionists that times were prosperous from that year down to 1861, with the exception of the six months' panic of '57. This alone is enough to show that the panic of '57

was not caused by the tariff reduction of that year. That two things happen at about the same time does not prove that one is the cause of the other. But protectionists constantly get tangled in the fallacy that it does. Your question is an example. The protectionist argues: The tariff was reduced in 1857; there was a panic in 1857; therefore the reduction of the tariff caused the panic. He might as well adopt this syllogism: The tariff was reduced in 1857; James Buchanan was inaugurated president in 1857; therefore the reduction of the tariff caused the inauguration. When the protectionist can show you that a panic has followed a reduction of tariff, and that there is no other cause for the panic than the tariff reduction, you may accept his conclusion.
(2) Don't let him fool you. This is the latest deluge of the protected monopolist who wants to continue in the enjoyment of his pleasure. Would cutlery factories close if the tariff were taken off steel? Would steel mills close if it were taken off iron? Would iron furnaces close if it were taken off coal? Not at all. What would happen would be this: The owners of iron and coal mines would get less royalty, the iron furnace would get its iron cheaper, the steel mills would get its iron cheaper, the cutlery factory would get its steel cheaper, and as the people would get their cutlery cheaper they would buy more, and the business of making cutlery, steel and iron would be greater than before. So with all kinds of manufacturing. The tariff simply increases the profits of monopolies at the expense of consumers.

How a Farmer Sees It.
AMY, Dunn County, Wis.—I am a farmer, over seventy years of age. I am in favor of taxes being mostly placed on land, and of all taxes being taken off improvements and the products of useful labor. If it could be done, I would like to have all bonds, mortgages and notes taxed, as I think they do not always represent honest labor. Bankers' notes, I think, ought to be taxed to death, as they are fictitious money, and represent only fraud. I am aware the land tax will greatly reduce the cash value of my land, but it will continue to give as good crops as before, and if I wish to sell and move to another place I shall find it as easy to sell as before. If I had my land also cheap, so I lose nothing if I have to move, I have no objection if they should buy my land not to have to pay the earnings of so many years for it as I did for mine. I find that the direct taxes I pay are trifling compared to the indirect ones I pay every time I buy store goods, machinery and other items necessary to the farmer. Tariff, transportation, commissions, interest on fictitious money and on watered stock and rents of dwellings and stores compel the merchants to buy cheap and sell dear. This tends to impoverish farmers and all the merchants and customers, and when the merchant's customers are poor it is not easy for them (the merchants) to get rich.
Protection against the causes of foreign and domestic pauperism and bankruptcy is the kind of protection I would like best.
HENRY BROWN.
The single tax will reach the bonds, mortgages and notes to which you object. So far as any of these are burdens upon industry they are the fruits of land monopoly. If land were free, as under the single tax it would be, there would be no bonds, mortgages or notes which did not truly represent labor products. Then the bond holder, the mortgage holder and the note holder, instead of being to a greater or lesser degree in partnership with the landlord (often being in individual cases the landlord's superior), would be in partnership with the producer, aiding as well as dividing with him, and no where reaping except as he had sown.
Bankers' notes are now taxed out of existence, but this is for the benefit of national banks, which are invested with the privilege of providing the community with money. It seems to me clear that all money of whatsoever material made should be coined exclusively by the general government.
The effect of the land value tax on you as a farmer and your sons as a farmer's sons you see clearly and correctly, and you are not too old to make the farmers of your neighborhood see this as clearly as you do. Can you not give some of your time to the work of impressing upon the minds of your friends the fact which you so simply and forcibly express in your letter?

JASON WALTERS, Sullin, Mass.—The uniform envelope system of voting does not, and could not be so modified as to secure that secrecy and purity of the ballot for which the Australian method is designed. So long as private parties are permitted to supply ballots an excuse for corrupt machinery exists, and bribery and intimidation can be carried on. Massachusetts has adopted the Australian method, and you will soon be ready to admit from experience that it is superior to any possible modification of the envelope system.
LOUIS F. POST.
Look Out for that Margin of Profits.
What effect a reduction of the tariff on fruits would have on the fruit growing industries of California, is the subject of a long article in the *San Francisco Morning Call*, and the answer is, a most profoundly disastrous effect. Germany, Hungary, France, Spain, Italy, Cuba and the West Indies would cover our docks and break down our (Italian) fruit stands with pauper grapes, oranges and lemons, not to speak of the almonds, walnuts, raisins and prunes which the big grocers will be able to sell for a song. One man interviewed talks about the "narrow margin of profits" which will be still further narrowed. Mr. Wormser says the Mills bill "cut down the profits of production materially." Another man says, "It would have a serious effect."
If the reader of the *Morning Call* will take the issue of July 19, which contains this article, and when he reaches the end of the article, will skip ahead to the right one column, his eye will light on the following little paragraph under the head of "Coast Items":
A wealthy orchardist at Vacaville, who has a large force at work cutting and drying his crop, states that for the \$75 daily outlay he can easily see a return of \$300 when his crop is disposed of.
For every \$75 outlay the orchardist takes in \$200. This is the "narrow margin of profits" which the Mills bill seeks to still further narrow.
How the Mills Bill Will Develop.
It is claimed that the Mills bill is not a free trade measure because it reduces protection to only 5 per cent. Do not fool yourself nor be fooled by others. Five per cent towards free trade is one-twentieth of the entire distance. The next step will be to remove 10 per cent of the tariff, and then the removal of the larger proportions will be easy, and within a few years it will be all gone.

A Sen 1411.
Allice Staple Carter.
Last night I saw the mermaids ride
On shore-bound waves with music wild,
And watched them where, against the cliffs,
Their bowers of suovy foam they piled.
All night they worked; but when the dawn
Came blushing rosy o'er the deep,
The sea, grown weary of the toil,
Recalled his waves, and sank to sleep.
The mermaids wept, and combed their hair,<
Melted were all their foam wreathed
bowers,
'Till one sweet mermaid sang, "Let's make
New arbors of the white sea flowers."
'Yes, yes," they cried; and hand in hand,
Sank through the blue depths joyously;
And now, I ween, they're gathering flowers
In the bright gardens of the sea.

A VISIT TO "LA CONCIERGE" STATE PRISON OF PARIS.
Chambers's Journal.
In the early part of June last year, a friend and myself wandering in that portion of old Paris famous for its historical associations, stayed our steps before the gilded portals of the newly restored palais de justice, one of the most imposing monuments in that fairest of cities. It is superfluous to attempt to narrate the many objects of interest which have been put since the period of its occupation by the kings of France up to the present time. The portion which more particularly demands our attention is the "Conciergerie," the prison of the old Paris, and one of the most famous in the annals of France. The name of this ancient prison of the royal palace is derived from the con- (keeper). Occupying the left wing of the palais de justice, running parallel with the Seine, it is one of the principal existing monuments of the great revolution. A permit bearing the signature of the prefect of police being necessary before admittance could be gained, our first step was to call at the prefecture, where, on presentation of our cards, the required authorization bearing our names was accorded us. Crossing the broad open courtyard of the police barracks, we reached the entrance of the prison, a building which runs parallel to the river Seine. On the northeast corner of the tour de l'Horloge, near the point at Change, is fixed the oldest public clock in France, having been constructed in 1370 by Henry de Vie, a German clock-maker, and restored in 1832. Two figures representing Justice and Piety. A short walk along the bank of the river brought us to a sentry of the Garde republicaine, who, after a brief inspection of our gate, the bell was rung; and presenting our authority to a gate keeper, we were duly admitted within the precincts. We traversed a rectangular court yard, and on turning to the right entered a passage way flanked by a heavily barred door, on the top of which in stone letters was the word, "Conciergerie." We then handed our permit to a warder, and were admitted into the ancient guard room, the prison, styled used as such by the guardians. On entering and scrutinizing our ticket, he opened another barred gate, and descending some steps, we found ourselves in the famous state prison of the French revolution, the prison of the Girondins on the 24th of September, 1793. The small doorway, through which victims walked out, one after the other, and were fouly murdered outside, still exists in the chapel. On the walls at either side may be seen the remains of the autographs, now almost entirely effaced, of the names of the brave and ill-fated victims when in here on the eve of their execution. Mass above to be said here; and at the far end, above the stone archways, may still be seen the traces of the altar, where the priest attended divine worship. A wonderfully realistic painting, by Muller, of this chapel with prisoners huddled together, used to hang in the museum of the Luxembourg, entitled "Last Days of the Reign." At the present time, prisoners are only kept at the Conciergerie who are awaiting trial.

Now Find Out What Limits Opportunities to Labor, and You've Got It.
West St. Paul, Minn., Times.
Every workman by this time ought to recognize the fact that capital will pay labor just what it can get and no more, and that when there is an excess of labor over the demand for it the wage rate falls, and that the amount of duty on imported commodities will alter that fact.

STRAW WHICH SHOW THE WIND.
Since the labor party of Connecticut has decided to put a state ticket in the field the *Naugatuck Age* suggests that—
The democrats and greenbackers of Wisconsin have again fused as they did in 1884 when they came within a narrow margin of victory. The prospects for success is much brighter now than it was then.
The Washington Post is authority for the statement that over thirty members of congress are advocates of the single tax on land values as proposed by Henry George.—[Albany Press and Knickerbocker.]
What workmen want, here as everywhere, is plenty of work. Plenty of work means good wages. It is only when work is slack that wages are low. When work abounds, and the employer has to get his men, the workman, wages rise.—[San Francisco Examiner.]
Give the wage worker all he earns and he will be able to eat better food, have better health and morals, live in more comfortable houses, educate his children better—in short, make the whole nation more prosperous, from the richest to the poorest.—[The Texas Tribune, San Antonio.]
The platform should be confined to a very few of the most urgent reforms, particularly to demand for an absolute secret ballot law. With a law of this kind most of the difficulties in running an independent campaign would be overcome. The whole of the campaign and the peddling tickets would be obviated and the new party with nothing but principle to stand upon could use its limited means in the propagation of its ideas.
The tramp is a result of our present social system, and a reproach to it. He is not much of a compliment to the effort of our civilization. He proves our boasted civilization a failure up to this point, at least. His existence is a protest against monopoly and injustice, and a warning to us that we must reform our social system if we would last as a nation. A tramp at the base of a social pyramid and a millionaire at the top is no good omen. With the foundation rotten the pyramid must fall or be rebuilt.—[Tropica, Kan., Post.]
Scarcely a day passes but the contributions of large sums for campaign purposes are noted. The expenses of every election in New York city is generally estimated at one million of dollars, while the lowest estimate made of the sums that will be expended in the country in this campaign is twenty millions of dollars, or, in other words, two dollars for each voter. Can all this be prevented? The most effective remedy so far suggested is the Australian system of voting.—[Albany Press and Knickerbocker.]
The law that taxes personal property, whether imported or domestic, compels the consumer to pay the tax. Personal property of all kinds is the product of labor, and to place a tax on it is to tax the laborer. It is a violation of man's natural right to the enjoyment of his liberty to use his hands industrially. If the state has a right to take a part of what the laborer produces, it may take all, and thus subject him to abject slavery. The revenue needed by the state or nation can be obtained by taxing land values, and that the people themselves have created, and that therefore properly and rightfully belong to the people.—[Pearsall, Tex., Sun.]
A man should see what he is about. Public business should be done in plain sight, and so that plain men can see it. Above all, every man should see and know exactly what he is paying to the government. It would be good if all taxes were paid in visible coin by the taxed citizen direct into the hand of the tax-gatherer; then every man would see what he paid, and would know what he paid, and would feel what he paid. Only think what an immense barrier that state of things would raise against government wastefulness. On a system of this kind, the tax-gatherer would be able to keep a useless army of seventy or a hundred million dollars locked up at Washington out of the hands of the people.—[Pearsall, Tex., Sun.]
Weekly Star.

behind which Louis Napoleon and his faithful friends, Moray and Anquetin, were put under lock and key. This court yard is deeply interesting when we hear the illustrious names of those who have paced its stone flags unwillingly, and find a most interesting portion of the prison, Marie-Antoinette's cell, remains to be visited. Proceeding along another dimly lighted passage, at the end of which is a large square opening, and a dead wall stands on either side two dirty yellow doors. One is condemned; the second closes with a ponderous lock. From his girde our guide takes the self-same key as that used at the time of the imprisonment of Marie-Antoinette, and we are ushered into the last earthly dwelling place of that unfortunate queen. The doorway is very low, and we are obliged to stoop in passing through. This was so arranged—we are told—in order to force the proud and royal heart to bend before her persecutors. Tradition states that as the queen left her cell on her way to the scaffold in her sweeping robes, she failed to stoop low enough, and so struck her forehead against the top of the doorway, as she passed out. The cell, after the restoration in 1816, was transformed into a small chapel. It is paved with dark red bricks of a corrugated pattern, the same as existed in 1793. A white marble altar stands on the left of the entrance, is surmounted by an urn with a Latin inscription, stating that in this cell Marie-Antoinette-Josephe-Jeanne d'Autriche, wife of Louis XVI, was confined for seventy-six days before her execution. On the left of the entrance, still occupies the position it did in the happiest queen's day, and no doubt many a time was fervently embraced by her in her hour of fearful terrors. A lamp is also suspended from the ceiling.
There are in this cell two paintings, one by Drolling, representing the queen partaking her last sacrament, the other representing her removal from the temple to the guillotine. The queen's furniture at that epoch consisted of a wooden table, a straw chair and a trundle bedstead placed against one of the walls. The last named has since been removed.
A second cell, supposed to have been Marie-Antoinette's oratory, contains a portrait of the unfortunate queen. In the recess of the window in this cell, out of reach of the vandals, is an old fashioned arm chair, the favorite seat of the queen. The small doorway, through which victims walked out, one after the other, and were fouly murdered outside, still exists in the chapel. On the walls at either side may be seen the remains of the autographs, now almost entirely effaced, of the names of the brave and ill-fated victims when in here on the eve of their execution. Mass above to be said here; and at the far end, above the stone archways, may still be seen the traces of the altar, where the priest attended divine worship. A wonderfully realistic painting, by Muller, of this chapel with prisoners huddled together, used to hang in the museum of the Luxembourg, entitled "Last Days of the Reign." At the present time, prisoners are only kept at the Conciergerie who are awaiting trial.

Combini.
Mamm
timbra,
necks,
ever an
extolled
mutton
terestin
sim ex
who stea
gates in
delight,
open at
through
down it
The bea
winkle
who rec
man jee
half a
plac to
find a c
of a de
tury of
years o
lashed
limbs s
observe
showing
what its
mud, a
melted.
Even if
preserv
needless
the heat
when he
"Fictio
enchant
fure a b
in length
and cur
trunk m
imagine
end, wh
coarse h
nourish
flower o
the bea
should
hanging
his body
and eoa
the bea
the color
of the c
phant, h
low red
much la
open ey
alive, a
mens an

Charles
What
Leav
For
To
Or
To
What
Fa
Dau
Wh
Veng
Prat
What
Self
An
Kin
Li
An
Tenn
Hous
Henr
Simp
corrup
fine o
George
to prov
mass
the
fore us
read th
the ass
pridne
the
April 6
was the
on the
additio
Orville
cost of
1887-8
moved
what p
it w
follows
and wh
Hous
vent of
sacred
commen
adds th
the
is value
the spe
blades,
fore, or
vandal
point of
subject
tractor
estate
great
passed
or with
the non
worker
permits
on the
Combini
Mamm
timbra,
necks,
ever an
extolled
mutton
terestin
sim ex
who stea
gates in
delight,
open at
through
down it
The bea
winkle
who rec
man jee
half a
plac to
find a c
of a de
tury of
years o
lashed
limbs s
observe
showing
what its
mud, a
melted.
Even if
preserv
needless
the heat
when he
"Fictio
enchant
fure a b
in length
and cur
trunk m
imagine
end, wh
coarse h
nourish
flower o
the bea
should
hanging
his body
and eoa
the bea
the color
of the c
phant, h
low red
much la
open ey
alive, a
mens an
American
We he
precision
days, an
degree o
can be fr
Playin
the sides
if a paid
wider at
become
excess in
the end
tion in a
cheating
capable,
this mal
and by p
the other
twent
ure by at
There;
dried ye
put the
tain am
them in
scales fo
the sea
made m
up, and
it on the
right am
Where
and a
known a
taking th
in each h
before a
through
the
exact co
the men
use the
hands w
of the sp
quickly,
not mere
those wh
their fee
Here a

CURRENT THOUGHT.

An Economic Brush Heap.

Mark Twain once wrote a piece of which he felt very proud, and to which he was wont to refer as an illustration of the ease with which the ordinary reader can be induced to believe the most utterly absurd story, if only the absurdities are so arranged and varnished over with irrelevant statements and verbiage that it requires a little mental effort to detect them. The sketch in question was a description of a harrowing tragedy of some sort, and turned upon the finding of a gashed and mutilated body. The condition of the body was nowhere described in full, but scattered through the entire sketch were little incidental statements of the horrible atrocities that had been perpetrated upon it. In one place the reader was told that the right leg had been cut off and the right arm bent as if in a paroxysm of pain, with the thumb pressed hard against the nose. Then came a lot of description of surrounding scenery, followed by a statement that the left arm was missing, and the fingers of the right hand spread out like a fan. And so on through the entire sketch, which was a pretty lengthy one. The left leg was gone, the head was missing; the body had been cut in two and the lower part carried off. The viscera had been taken out; the upper half of the body was gone; the right arm couldn't be found. Altogether the dead man was in a horrible condition. The story was widely quoted, and it was quite a long time before anybody found out that it was all a joke, and that Mark Twain had been describing the corpse of Mr. Nobody with his thumb to his nose.

What Mark Twain did intentionally and with much labor, a great many men do unintentionally and without effort of any kind, save that of dipping the pen in the ink at intervals and guiding it along the surface of the paper. These men have minds which Mr. Croasdale once aptly described as brush heaps—in which all sorts of facts and fancies are heaped together, higgledy-piggledy, without order or arrangement, ends sticking up in all directions, branches intertangling—a terrible mess altogether. When one of these men wants to write something he just goes to his brush heap and yanks; and out of the tangled mess that answers to his yanking he constructs—by the simple process of flinging it down—a smaller brush heap, which he rejoicingly calls an essay, and sends to the magazines. And the funny thing about it all is that if the brush heap man only has sufficient ignorance to thoroughly believe in himself he will find plenty of people who will read his essays as men take patent medicines, with a feeling that the stuff must be good, or it wouldn't be offered them.

The Rev. G. H. Hubbard is one of these brush heap men. He lives at North Cambridge, Mass.; and he has written for the *New Englander* and *Yale Review* an essay on "The Economics of Speculation," which is a very tangled mess indeed. The *STANDARD* reader who wants to look at Mr. Hubbard's brush heap as Mr. Hubbard things it down must invest thirty cents in the magazine containing it. The most we can do is to take here and there a stick or two, and lay them alongside each other.

Of course, Mr. Hubbard falls foul of "Progress and Poverty." In these economic brush heap minds, whatever projecting end you may happen to pull on, "Progress and Poverty" is pretty sure to come out with the rest of the tangle. Here is what the reverend Hubbard's first yank brings forth:

In his work on "Progress and Poverty" Mr. George says: "Production and consumption fail to meet and satisfy each other. How does this inability arise? It is evidently and by common consent the result of speculation. But of speculation in what? Certainly not of speculation in things which are the products of labor—in agricultural or mineral productions, or manufactured goods; for the effect of speculation in such things, as is well shown in current treatises which spare me the necessity of illustration, is simply to equalize supply and demand, and to steady the interplay of production and consumption by an action analogous to that of a fly wheel in a machine. Therefore, if speculation be the cause of these industrial depressions, it must be speculation in things not the production of labor, but not necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth—of things of fixed quantity; that is to say, it must be speculation in land."

This is the way in which the founder of the great anti-poverty society disposes of the question of speculation and makes it pay tribute to his pet theory. His conclusion is at once illogical in itself and wholly inconsistent with observed facts. Speculation is speculation, wherever it appears, and its nature and effects are everywhere the same. The most casual study shows that speculation in land is a mere peccadillo when compared with the other forms of speculation carried on in America.

Mr. Hubbard's brush is brittle. It must have lain rotting in his mind a long time. If he had managed to pull out a little more of "Progress and Poverty" he would have discovered that Henry George—who, by the way, didn't found the anti-poverty society—by no means "disposes of the question of speculation" in that curt fashion. The passage quoted is from the first chapter of book V, in which the author traces the cause of industrial depressions to the fact that industrial activity always and invariably increases the value of land, and in doing so narrows the field for its own employment; and fortifies his argument, not only with undisputed facts, but with prophecy which has been fulfilled to the letter.

However, when we lay hold of another piece of Mr. Hubbard's brush, we find that he is willing to admit at least a part of the argument of "Progress and Poverty." He doesn't believe that speculation in land has anything to do with industrial depression. But he is quite willing to admit that speculation in other things has nothing to do with it either.

Doubtless Mr. George, in the expression "current treatises," refers among others to the works of John Stuart Mill, who says: "The operations of speculative dealers are useful to the public when profitable to themselves; and though they are somewhat injurious to the public by heightening the fluctuations which their more usual office is to alleviate, yet whenever this happens the speculators are the greatest losers." Similar statements

may be found in the writings of other well known economists. With them I have no dispute; for their meaning is clear to one who reads their works, and the truthfulness of their conclusions is unquestioned.

All right. Speculation in land is harmless; and speculation in other things is a benefit to society. Surely, then, Mr. Hubbard is going to speak in praise of speculation. It must be so, for he tells us:

Saints speculate and sinners speculate. Not only bankers and brokers, merchants, mechanics, lawyers, doctors, legislators, ministers of the gospel, dry goods clerks, newsboys and bootblacks endeavor to multiply their legitimate earnings by some form of speculation. Even ladies who must earn their own livelihood are trying their skill in the way of speculation; and many a snug little fortune has been accumulated by the keen speculating instinct of women.

A thing that saints and ministers of the gospel do—a thing, moreover, that will multiply legitimate earnings—must be an essentially good thing to do—especially since the ungodly, as well as the saints and ministers, indulge in it. But wait a bit. Turn over a couple of leaves and see what you think of this:

In our great metropolis we see "grinding poverty and fabulous wealth walk side by side." In the tenements and attics are huddled together multitudes of poor workers of every sort struggling night and day against starvation, not a few of them driven to lives of sin or a suicide's death by the powers of despair. Close by them, on the grand avenues, we may meet men whose fortunes are almost incredible. The Vanderbilt property exceeds two hundred millions of dollars, and Jay Gould forgets whether he signed a check for five millions or fifty millions. What is the cause of this inequality? What has taken the money from the pockets of the many and swept it into the coffers of the few? I answer in a word—Speculation.

Whew! We've heard some pretty hard things said about saints and ministers of the gospel, but never before anything so hard as this. And by a "reverend," too! Now give another yank at the brush heap:

A. T. Stewart was not a speculator, yet at his death he was worth fifty million dollars. John Jacob Astor accumulated twenty millions, of which only a small portion was the fruit of speculation. The elder Vanderbilt amassed a fortune of from sixty to a hundred millions, much of it entirely independent of speculation. . . . When Mr. Vanderbilt obtained control of the Harlem railroad, and by his skillful management raised the price of the stock from about twenty per cent of the par value to over two hundred per cent, the profit derived was natural and legitimate. The increase in the price of stock indicated a corresponding rise in value brought about by the improved condition of the railroad.

Speculation in land at least not an evil. Speculation in other things a decided good. Speculation the chief cause of poverty. The elder Vanderbilt not a speculator. Honestly, now, did you ever see a heap of brush more tangled and confused? It's good—it's bad—it is—it isn't—what the mischief does the man mean? Take the rest of the heap to pieces, and see if we can find out. So! A pull altogether now, and here it comes. Now we shall learn something:

We must carefully distinguish between the two different senses in which the word speculation is used. When Mr. Mill and economists of his class use the word they apply it to transactions based upon the actual possession and exchange of the commodities involved. The man who buys up the surplus wheat crop this year that he may profit by the probable shortage next year is a speculator in this sense of the word. So also is the man who buys railroad or bank stocks and holds them till an increase in their value enables him to sell them at a good profit. Speculation in land belongs strictly to this same class, since it implies the actual buying and selling of land. I do not know that there is any form of speculation in land that does not imply a real transfer of ownership. The man who actually buys a number of shares in some good railway and receives his dividends from the earnings of the road, however large those dividends may be, is deriving profits for which the work of the railroad is an adequate return to society. The man who buys a whole railroad at once is not necessarily a speculator any more than is the grocer who buys a dozen of eggs in the expectation of selling them again at a profit.

This is the kind of speculation that the Rev. Hubbard believes in. It isn't speculation to speculate in things, provided you really speculate in other words, provided you really buy the things and expect to make a profit by their rise in value. If a man engineers a corner in wheat he isn't speculating, so long as he buys up all the wheat offered him. On the other hand, if he doesn't buy all the wheat offered him he is speculating; and since a wheat deal so managed would very soon peter out, his crime brings its own punishment. It isn't speculation to speculate successfully. A speculation only becomes a speculation when the speculator speculates in such a way as to make it certain that the speculation will fail. This is a crooked piece of brush indeed. And when we yanked it out of the pile we brought this twisted up with it:

The commercial history of America abounds with illustrations of the way in which the prices of the most necessary articles are artificially raised and lowered when there has been no real inequality of supply and demand. Corners in wheat, gold, iron and coal are of frequent occurrence. Thousands of poor people may be starving for want of bread while millions of bushels of wheat lie stored away in the elevators, held to compel a rise in prices. And when the rise comes a few men are made rich by means of the injury they have inflicted on society. All this is plainly evil.

This is funny. If a man "buys up the surplus wheat crop this year that he may profit by the probable shortage next year," he is conferring a benefit on mankind. But if he holds it in an elevator "to compel a rise in prices" he is doing something "plainly evil." The Rev. Hubbard is hard to please. Let us take another pull at his brush heap and see what else it yields:

The form of speculation which prevails most extensively in our country to-day is wholly different from this. It consists in the transfer of paper contracts merely and has little or no foundation in actual exchange of commodities. It is in reality a form of gambling upon the chances of a rise or fall in the price of any commodity and is carried on without reference to real possession. Thousands of young men speculate in stocks who never have money enough at any time to purchase whole shares of any stock. Having scraped together a few dollars they invest in "margins," that is, they deposit with a broker enough money to cover the change in value of a few shares of stock within a limited

range. If the stock falls to the limit within the time specified, the depositor loses his money. If it rises, he wins the amount of increase. In either case he has not owned a single share of stock, and perhaps his broker has sold it for him. Similar to this are the methods of speculation in the various exchanges. While a few men really buy and sell wheat, the majority of speculators buy and sell promises.

The paper contracts of the various exchanges already mentioned, involving billions of dollars, imply an actual loss on one side and gain on the other of hundreds of millions. This enormous sum of money does not represent any benefit conferred upon the community, but is absorbed by the fortunate speculators without any return whatever, leaving the country at large so much poorer. Worse than this, real prices everywhere are largely determined, not by the natural law of supply and demand, but by the fictitious prices of speculators. Men pay for bread, not what it costs to raise, but what the speculators carry it to them, but what can be extorted from them by the tricks and combinations of exchange gamblers. The variations in the prices of the different necessary commodities as reported in the exchanges are felt most keenly by the poor laborers of the world. Every transaction of a speculative nature increases the cost of the commodity handled by the amount of profit made.

This is a fresh line of thought with a vengeance. The men who buy and sell on margin are the wicked speculators who do all the mischief. The quotations on our exchanges are settled without the actual delivery of the things sold. Stranger than all, when A wins a bet from B about the price of stock, it is the public at large, and not B, who pays the loss. The reverend essayist evidently knows nothing about exchanges, or he would be ashamed to put his name to such utter bosh as that.

And yet the Rev. G. H. Hubbard is probably a well meaning man, who would think clearly if he knew how—nay, more, who could think clearly if he would only try. His trouble is, that like many another hasty writer, he uses his reasoning faculty, not in forming his opinions, but simply and altogether in defending them. The social tangle that perplexes him into making this extraordinary exhibition of himself is easily unraveled by anyone who will take the trouble to trace causes and effects, and resist the temptation to take things for granted. We advise the Rev. Mr. Hubbard to burn his brush heap, study facts, and do a little real thinking.

Moral Principle in Public Affairs.

Why should we not give over discussing questions of political expediency and sectional or class interests, and aim simply to do what is right? This is the question that W. L. Trencholin propounds in the July Forum:

Here is the core of the trouble that besets our times: here is the chief, but a hidden, source of the social unrest, the industrial disorders, that mar the symmetry of American prosperity. Economic truth has not acquired ethical force.

In the United States society is constructed altogether upon the industrial basis, and modern industry is a living organism framed upon a vast network of reciprocal relations and dependencies. The currents of its life circulate with the velocity to which steam impels; electricity is its nerve force; the sciences are its faculties, the arts constitute its members, its great heart throbs with all the productive energies of nature raised to incalculable power by the mechanical achievements of human invention. Each man, woman or child who works, each human being who contributes to the matter or to the force which together constitute the totality of our industry, sustains some relation to every other such contributor; every person is an industrial point where the capillaries of supply and of distribution coalesce; every one is incessantly emitting the products of his industry and absorbing the products of others' industries; the channels of general distribution and supply are forged with the superfluities of all on the way to supply the deficiencies of all.

Natural laws pervade this wonderful system and sustain it. Nothing but natural law could hold its myriad forces in balanced play, guide through its mazes such masses of material, adjust to every man's back his burden of labor, bring to every mouth its daily bread. Natural law would go further, apportioning to every man his due share of industrial opportunity and his proper dividend in the total product of wealth; but man, voter and legislator, doctrine and charlatan, man in his unaidedness has presumed to interfere. Statute laws usurping the functions of natural laws and invading their sphere, have projected disorder into the machinery; the rhythm of its movements is disturbed, abnormal conditions are created, so that our wondrous resources, energies and achievements are running abnormally to two products, millionaires and mendicants!

Natural laws, when obstructed or overborne, transfer their energy to sub-laws, and in our case such sub-laws have produced, on the one hand, corporations and trusts, on the other, hard labor organizations. The first are castles and strongholds of accumulated wealth, the second are the walled cities and entrenched camps of the "producers of wealth." Here is war where we should have peace, and where nature would have maintained peace but for man's meddling.

A rapidly expanding industry demands absolute freedom of environment; within and beyond the peripheries it successively transcends there must be room for both the old and the new activities, scope for constantly augmenting forces, no obstructions, no counteractions. These conditions do not exist among us; no wonder that the old frames and casings are strained and cracked by the energies pent within them, for no strength of material can resist the force exerted by cell multiplication in natural growth.

This great expansion of industry is not quite a hundred years old; but see how it has changed the physical face of the country, the occupations of the people, their social habits. What corresponding changes have we made in our laws, civil and criminal? How have we adjusted our conceptions of property to the accelerated movement in the transfer of ownership? What efforts have been made to modify the precedents and the practice of our courts in harmony with the new relations generated by the spirit of industry that impregates every source of individual or corporate activity? The material gains of the century cannot be computed, its intellectual progress has been bewildering, in literature and in art there has been a veritable efflorescence, science has attained a development beyond the scope of eighteenth century conjecture; but in economics we have stood still, nay, we have even drifted back from where our fathers were fifty years ago.

The one science of all others which can enable us to take proper account of our gain in wealth, in productive force, in commercial effectiveness; the one science that can teach us to make this wealth a national blessing

without its becoming a social curse; the one science that can enlighten us as to the duties arising out of industrial relations, and guide us in grafting a new morality upon the dead wood of the old systems, has been, and still is, neglected among us. We have passed under a new social dispensation, but the light of its gospel is denied to us. In our colleges and universities economic science has less vitality than the dead languages; in legislatures and in congress it has not passed beyond the stage of superstition. Statesmen account it foolishness; to the politician it is a stumbling block.

But there is a higher and nobler view of the situation. Let it be admitted, for the sake of argument, that economic truth has an ethical sanction; let it be admitted also that economic science can adjust equitably the relations of capital, labor and all other factors of wealth; must it not follow that both religion and morality will thus have their door opened to them to reoccupy their old seats of social authority? Will not religion be inspired to formulate a nineteenth century statement of one's duty to one's neighbor and stimulated to enforce the observance of the duties thus defined? Will not morality take jurisdiction of economic offenses and a conscience be evolved that is capable of comprehending the true inwardness of "the management of properties?"

He who believes that God governs the universe must also believe that the laws of nature are his ordinances; and he who feels it a duty to learn and to live up to the written word of God must feel the obligation to learn and to live up to those laws which he has wrought into the very nature of things, and which he has fitted the human mind to discern, define and classify, and which he compels it to recognize as belonging to the highest order of verities. The scientific man realizes that the laws of nature represent absolute truth, that their invariability is not only indispensable to existence but is the fundamental concept of all reasoning, and therefore the ultimate basis of every form and degree of belief; while the theologian must recognize in them the ordinances of that constitution with which God has endowed the universe, the conditions prescribed by infinite wisdom for the eternal exercise of infinite power.

The sanction of scientific truth being complete and the economic organization of society being obvious, can it be doubted that there is the very highest obligation resting upon every one to study this science, or at least to see that those who have mastered it are entrusted with the making or the administering of the laws which impinge upon industrial interests and adjustments? It is only through the medium of this science that we can fully realize how true it is that we are "members one of another"; it is only by its light that we can fully live up to the golden rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye unto them"; it is only by its teachings that we can allay the turmoil between capital and labor, adjust the economic rights of the community to the industrial freedom of the individual, and reconcile the security of property with the progress of society; it is only by its aid that we can detect and remove influences that are now disturbing the equitable distribution of wealth and threatening us with calamities of portentous magnitude.

All true. There is no more delightful study than economic science. There is none whose truths are more intimately connected and intertwined with religion. Political economy is the hidden side of God's garment—the science of God's kingdom upon earth. It teaches men how to live in accordance with the precepts of Christ, taking no thought for the morrow, laying up no treasure, giving to those that ask, and loving their neighbors as themselves. Mr. Trencholin's appeal for moral principle in public affairs is an illustration of the way in which men's minds are turning from darkness into light—from the cold and sordid selfishness of political empiricism to the radiant glory of scientific truth.

A Mixed Up Professor.

To the graduates of Smith college the name of John B. Clark, A. M., is no doubt familiar. For the information of others it may be stated that he is professor of history and political science at Smith college, Smith college is in Massachusetts.

Professor Clark possesses an excitable temper and a mental organism of great complexity, two qualities which he displays with effect in a recent publication of the American economic association (1). It having been proposed to tax land up to its full rental value, Professor Clark is excited to great wrath.

"Would it be robbery?" he exclaims. "No, it would be the quintessence of robbery. The act of the highwayman, who should demand your money, take it from your purse, and complacently present to you the purse itself as the sole thing to which you have a right, would be in comparison a mild offense."

But here it seems to occur to the professor that such an exhibition of temper is unbefitting the occupant of the chair of history and political science in Smith, and after retiring for a moment into the innermost recesses of his complex mental organism, he emerges with the remark that "the logic of the two cases would be identical."

As THE STANDARD reader is not quick to perceive the logical identity of a proposition to take from his purse the money which a man has earned with a proposition that the community shall annually take from a land owner the value which it annually gives to his land, it may interest them to note the processes by which Professor Clark arrives at his "logical" conclusion. If they have ever found pleasure in attempting to analyze an atom or to realize infinite space, they will enjoy following the professor word by word and thought by thought in his book; but if they have not had this mental discipline, they should at least take a preliminary course of "fifteen puzzles."

Professor Clark first sets about to define capital:

Ask a manufacturer, "What is your capital?" and he will probably express his answer in dollars. Ask him "What is your capital invested?" and he will specify the buildings, machines, land, materials, etc., in which his productive fund now chances to be embodied. These concrete things will figure in his thought as the containers of his capital; while the content itself will appear to him to be a value, an abstract quantum of wealth.

This colloquial distinction between what capital is and what it is invested in, or to put it more accurately than Professor Clark does, between what a man's capital amounts to and in what it consists, the professor adopts for purposes of scientific analysis, giving to the former the term

(1) "Capital and Its Earnings," May, 1888, American economic association, Baltimore, Md.

"pure capital" and to the latter "concrete capital."

Capital in the concrete consists of commodities that aid production. It is instrumental wealth—that which directly satisfies natural wants, but helps men to obtain the things that satisfy them.

Having now got a definition which includes land, since that is "a commodity that aids production," and twenty years ago would have included slaves, as they were "commodities that aided production," and would include the ocean, if it were parceled out to owners by metes and bounds, for its parcels would then be "commodities that aid production," the professor describes "pure capital" as—

An abstract fund, the destiny of which is to migrate through an endless series of outward forms. . . . It lives by transmigration. Pure capital stays longer in some forms than in others. It remains for an instant in steam, and for an hour in the fuel that generates it. It stays for weeks in unfinished products, for years in the machines that make them, for decades in the buildings that house them. How long may it remain in the land under the buildings? Here, indeed, is an exception to the rule of endless wandering. Pure capital that rests itself in land is at liberty to stay there indefinitely.

If the professor's mental organism had been less complex it might have occurred to him that the fact that "pure capital that vests itself in land"—his mode of describing land value—may stay there indefinitely, indicates a rule as to land instead of an exception to a rule of capital. But in that case he could not have shown the logical identity between highway robbery and a certain system of taxation; so let it pass.

We now have capital neatly bisected into the pure and the concrete, the latter including the earth, which isn't capital at all if labor products are. The process, it will be observed, is much the same as if we should so analyze Professor Clark as to describe his distinguishing title as the "pure professor," and the professor himself as the "concrete professor," with a definition for the latter comprehensive enough to include Smith college itself.

The next step is to distribute the earnings of capital. Here again the professor makes an exploration of the field of business colloquialisms. When a man receives an income from the value of a thing, is it not a percentage, and does he not call it interest? And when he receives an income for the use of the thing itself, does he not call it rent? Therefore, the professor calls the income of "pure" capital interest, and the income of "concrete" capital he calls rent.

The entire income resulting from the ownership of property is thus interest when regarded in one way, it is rent when regarded in another. Ascertain the total market value of all instruments of production, find what proportion of that amount these instruments annually earn for their owners, and you have the total income of the property holding class, as such, in the guise of interest. Make a list of the instruments themselves and place opposite to the name of each the sum that it annually earns, add these amounts and you have the total income of the property owning class, as such, in the guise of rent. In this connection practical thought makes no distinction between land and other material instruments that are let to hire, and neither should science do so.

But why science should regard the same thing as two different things is not explained. Recurring to our analysis of Professor Clark into the pure professor and the concrete professor, we might illustrate this division of the earnings of capital by a similar division of Professor Clark's salary. When regarded as the income of the "pure" professor we might call it interest; when regarded as the income of the "concrete" professor, we might call it rent. And pray, would that throw any light upon the nature of the professor's salary?

In political economy, as in any other science, when the same thing approaches in two guises, it is pretty safe to suspect that at least one guise is a disguise. And that is precisely what we find here. This division of capital into pure and concrete and this twofold name for the same income of one capital are not adopted merely because they lead to complexity, and therefore gratify a natural craving of the author, but because the complexity to which they lead confuses the natural and obvious distinction between land, the natural source of production, and capital, an artificial agent of production, and between the interest of capital, which is an increase of the capital, and rent of land, which is a mere toll or tax for its use.

Professor Clark in making this unique outline of political economy to meet the emergency which so excited his temper, appears to have taken a hint from the youthful artist who drew a cat with six legs and wrote under it: "I know that a real cat has only four legs, but I put six on this one so it could run away from the dog."

But the professor makes an admission which is fatal to his six-legged cat. He says:

Land is an aggregation of three kinds of utility. It has properties that man did not create and cannot destroy; it has others that mankind, by collective action, create; and still others that individuals impart by the direct employment of labor.

Now it is plain that the last of these utilities has a characteristic which the other two lack, namely, that it is a product of individual labor. This difference demands a distinct classification, which is usually made by classifying the latter utility with capital, the characteristics of which—utility, value, labor product—are common to both. But the professor "skips the difference" and proceeds:

Rent is paid for utilities of the second and third kinds. These qualities of the soil that are in the fullest sense original and indestructible, the qualities that would have existed if man had never been created, and that would continue in their present condition if the human race were to perish, have at present no direct influence on rent.

There is a good deal of cautious qualification here, but the statement is sufficiently positive to show that the author has never discovered, bought or leased, an iron, coal or paint mine, or an oil well. He recognizes what he calls the "place utility" of land, which is created by man through the advance of settlement, and the exclusion of railroads and other improvements that "annihilate distance." This place utility, however, can never be

a full monopoly, because "man is making the world accessible;" but we look in vain for any natural explanation of the right of the owners of the "place" to appropriate to their own use the "utility" which they do not create. But it is just at this point that the six-legged cat is expected to bring its extra legs into play. It is not food, clothing, shelter and the comforts and luxuries of civilization that are the prime subject of property right, but "wealth in the abstract, mainly in the form of pure capital;" which—

When invested in land has the same rights that elsewhere belong to it. Whether nature or society, or individual man made the earth as an economic entity, man makes by personal sacrifice the value that he pays for it. That value is the subject of his claim.

An argument equally applicable if applied to the value of a slave, and vicious in either case because it ignores the fundamental principle that no human power can confer upon any man a moral right, by way of investment or otherwise, to confiscate the earnings of other men.

Professor Clark is withal somewhat of a humorist. After tiring himself and his readers with a description of the complex process of constructing an artificial economic cat with legs enough to get away from a natural economic dog, he drops into such diverting trifles as that our nation is "a home-owning community," that it keeps "the door of land ownership open," and that the man who does not buy it either has no pure capital, or has what is to him a better use for it." The last joke seems to be an adaptation of an old one by an Irishman who said there was no real famine in Ireland because "every body was atin," savin' thim as wasn't hungry, and thim as had nothin' to ate!" The other jokes are probably original.

THOMAS PAINE ON AGRARIAN JUSTICE.

"It is the Value of the Improvement Only, and Not the Earth Itself, That Is Individual Property."

The extract printed below is from Thomas Paine's pamphlet, published in 1795, entitled "Agrarian Justice." This pamphlet was issued as a reply to a sermon of Watson, bishop of Landoff, entitled "The wisdom and goodness of God in having made both rich and poor."

Taking, then, the matter upon this ground, the first principle of civilization ought to have been, and ought still to be, that the condition of every person born into the world after a state of civilization commences ought not to have been worse than if he had been born before that state of civilization. It is that the condition of millions in every country in Europe is far worse than if they had been born before civilization began, or had been born among the Indians of North America of the present day. I will show how this fact happened.

It is a position not to be converted that the earth in its natural, uncultivated state was, and ever would have continued to be, the common property of all human beings. In that state every man would have been born to property. He would have been a joint proprietor with the rest in the property of the soil, and in all its natural productions, vegetable and animal.

But the earth in its natural state, as before said, is capable of supporting but a small number of inhabitants compared with what it is capable of doing in a cultivated state. And as it is impossible to separate the improvement made by cultivation from the land itself upon which that improvement is made, the idea of landed property arose from that inseparable connection; but it is nevertheless true that it is the value of the improvement only, and not the earth itself, that is individual property. Every proprietor, therefore, of cultivated land owes to the community a ground rent, for I know no better term to express the rent of the improvement which he holds; and it is from this ground rent that the fund proposed in this plan is to issue.

There could be no such thing as landed property originally; land did not right to occupy it, though he had a natural right to earth, he had no right to locate as his property in perpetuity any part of it; neither did the Creator of the earth open a land office from whence the first title deeds should issue. From whence then arose the idea of landed property? I answer as before that when cultivation began, the idea of landed property began with it; from the impossibility of separating the improvement made by cultivation from the earth itself upon which that improvement was made. The value of the improvement far exceeded the value of the natural earth, at that time, as to absorb it, till in the end the common right of all became concentrated into the cultivated right of the individual. But they are, nevertheless, distinct species of rights, and will continue to be so as long as the world endures.

It is only by tracing the origin of their origin that we can gain rightful ideas of them; and it is by gaining such ideas that we discover the boundary that divides right from wrong, and which teaches every man to know his own. I have entitled this tract, "Agrarian Justice," to designate it from "Agrarian Law." Nothing could be more unjust than an agrarian law in a country improved by cultivation, for though every man, as an inhabitant of the earth, is a joint proprietor in its natural state, it does not follow that he is a joint proprietor of cultivated earth. The additional value made by cultivation, after the system was admitted, became the property of those who did it, or who inherited it from them, or who purchased it. It had originally an owner; whilst, therefore, I advocate the right, and interest myself in the hard case of all those who have been thrown out of their natural inheritance by the introduction of the system of landed property, I equally defend the right of the possessor to the part which is his.

Cultivation is one of the greatest natural improvements made by human invention. It has given to created earth a tenfold value. But the land monopoly that began with it has produced the greatest evil. It has dispossessed more than half the inhabitants of every nation of their natural inheritance, without providing for them, as ought to have been done, an indemnification for that loss; and has thereby created a species of poverty and wretchedness that did not exist before.

In advocating the case of the persons thus dispossessed, it is a right and not a charity that I am pleading for. But it is that kind of right which, being neglected at first, could not be brought forward afterwards without having opened the way by a revolution in the system of government.

It's Very Clear.

Toronto Grip. "Don't you see," said the manufacturer to the workman, "that a duty on imports protects me, because it enables me to get higher prices from the home consumer than I could otherwise get."

"Yes," replied the workman, "and I am a home consumer." "True," responded the manufacturer, "but you can afford to pay the higher prices because the tariff gives me big profits and I am therefore able to pay you wages in proportion."

"Why don't you do so then?" asked the workman. "Because I am not in the philanthropy line of business, and I don't have to. Labor comes in free of duty, and the competition of laborers governs the rate of wages. If I don't keep up wages, but of course I see it now."

THE STA!
Subscribe
to the clea
at the follo
Single subs
Ten or mor
One hundre

"The Sta
number of
to have th
four week
induced to
it advoca
scribers."
without hav
that it has
will be sen
out charge
Terms of
the fourth

The Single Ta
Immigration.
Mr. Powderly
Natural High
Process in E
Texas Single
The Army is
"Free Trade"
The Beating o
Pennsylvania
Staves Which
Cleveland and
In and About
From Ring of
Personal.
Ten. Please an
To Single Tax
Mr. Shearn
Literary Prop
A Law Break
Workmen
Men and Thin
Notes from C
"Standard"
The Tariff Has
Society States
What Must I
Current Thins
New Ideas, M
The Single Tax

Despite
the fact th
the call p
last week
men in fav
and Thurr
Cooper un
meeting w
flying in
feeling as
of one min
should ma
tion, and s
support of
dates that
and for a
democrats
as yet to b

When t
attacking
up in beha
licans beg
for some
the propos
favor with
single tax
into the F
aid in form
congressio
country.
itself at t
and which
that the g
and that
be done in
ner of the
ner of wh
trade. V
was in
believers
as far
recommen
single tax
clubs was
feeling thi
bring in
and to giv
whose on
icipation o
poverty, a
all their m
the advoc
stition are
vote again
represents
freedom.

The pla
extremely
look to th
party, not
organizati
enrollmen
in this ele
Thurman,
committe
for the
distributi
of corrup
is necessa
action, an
son for th
are agree
The
disclaim
the dema
stitutes v
party, or
state or
York, ind
of no exce
veto of t