THE STANDARD

VOL. I.—NO. 2. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1887. PRICE, FIVE CENTS.

THE CASE OF DR. M'GLYNN.

In the comments of the press upon the article in the last number of THE STANDARD, entitled "The Case of Dr. McGlynn," the opinion is very generally expressed that in "attacking the Catholic church" Henry George has forever destroyed his political aspirations and THE STANDARD has committed suicide at birth.

As to this, it may be worth while to say that I have no political aspirations. If I had I would not have re-entered journalism. I long ago made up my mind never to seek office. If I ever hold one, it will be because the people want me, not that I want it myself. I say this without any implication upon the desire to hold office. It may be prompted by a legitimate wish to improve one's own condition, or by a laudable ambition to win honorable distinction. But for my part, I have chosen another path—a path in which political aspirations can only hamper and befog.

As for THE STANDARD, it may be said that its success thus far has exceeded the most sanguine expectations of those engaged in it, and that we have good reason to feel that it has been safely launched. But if the time ever comes when THE STANDARD cannot freely and frankly take a stand on any question of public interest, then it will be high time for it to give up the ghost.

This, however, is matter of mere personal concern. What is really noteworthy in the press comments on "The Case of Dr. McGlynn" is the evidence they supply that the voice of the press is often far from being the true voice of the people; and the timidity, ignorance, and intellectual dishonesty which they show. No one who talks with men can have any question that the sympathies of the vast majority of the American people are with Dr. McGlynn, and that they deeply resent the attempt of Archbishop Corrigan to drag religion into politics. Yet no one would know this from the American press. On the contrary, he would imagine that the American people with hardly an exception applauded the doctrine that an American priest is answerable for his politics to a foreign tribunal, and are rejoiced that a clergyman who had ventured to have an opinion of his own should be "brought to grief."

The course of journals like the *Tribune* and *Times* of this city, that represent a strongly Protestant constituency, is especially noteworthy. Only a few months ago the *Times* was warning its readers against the political aggressions of Catholic ecclesiastical power. It is now supporting that power in the attempt to destroy the political independence of an influential class of citizens in all the ways it can. And the *Times* is in this but a representative of many other journals of its class. The causes of this are not far to seek. It arises partly from the feeling of the partisan than "any stick is good enough" for the beating of his opponent; partly it is an evidence of the rapidly-growing disposition of rich Protestants to regard the Catholic church as the best policeman they can employ to repress discontent among the "lower classes," and partly it arises from misconceptions of fact and from ignorance of the Catholic faith, strongly spiced, perhaps, with a chuckling irony in placing the Catholic authorities, under the guise of praising them, in an attitude which will justify all that the worst enemies of the church have ever said of its inconsistency with free institutions.

However this may be, it is certain that the most violent demonstrations of the most rabid Know Nothing could not be to the thoughtful Catholic half so insulting as the quiet, laudatory assumptions that the Catholic can neither engage in nor tolerate any criticism of ecclesiastics, and that Catholic priests and Catholic laymen are *in all things* the bond slaves of ecclesiastical authority.

The communications that are to be found in another column, and that are but samples of many of like tenor that have been received, show the real feeling among thoughtful Catholics. Catholics, and certainly Irish Catholics, are not the "priest-ridden" people that anti-Catholic bigotry paints them. There is no Catholic with an intelligent understanding of his faith who is not able to distinguish between the church itself and the individuals who may happen to hold its dignities; between what he believes to be the divine element and what he knows to be the human element. Catholic teaching is not the "religion of ignorance" that the prejudices of many Protestants lead them to suppose. That form of Christianity which for centuries held undisputed sway in western Christendom, and which, taking Christianity as a whole, is to other forms of it what the river is to the rivulets, has embraced among its adherents men of the widest learning, the most acute intellect, the highest virtue, and the truest patriotism—men who could not possibly have rested in a faith which gave no scope to individual liberty and which made its votaries in all things the mere puppets of those who pulled the ecclesiastical strings. Catholic statesmen have resisted ecclesiastical interference, Catholic soldiers have fought against their temporal domination, and Catholic painters and poets have not hesitated to picture the highest dignitaries of the church as finding their just deserts in hell. The pope himself is in Catholic theology only a man like other men, with the same weaknesses, the same infirmities and the same liability to err and sin which attach to all mankind. It is only in his official character, when speaking *ex cathedra*, as head of the universal church, and *to the universal church* (not to a part of it) that any particular sanctity attaches to him and to his utterances. In all other relations and capacities the pope may be criticised as freely by the Catholic, as though he were not a pope.

And what is true of the pope is, of course, true of any lesser dignitary. However much individual ecclesiastics may presume to stretch their authority, or however much attachment to their church may prompt Catholics to resent criticism which they believe to be founded on malice, no Catholic theologian can rightfully teach that the authority Catholic pastors derive from the church can extend further than to things spiritual, or that these pastors themselves are exempt from criticism and resistance the moment they overstep the line which separates matters of faith and doctrine from matters which belong to reason and are of secular concern. A man may be an ardent Catholic and yet criticise in these respects the action of priest, bishop, cardinal or pope just as freely as an ardent republican may criticise a republican administration. Of course in one case the cry that he is a bad Catholic and is against the church is quite as likely to go up, as is in the other case the cry that he is a bad republican and against the party. But as a matter of fact, every one who has mixed with intelligent Catholics knows that they do criticise the actions of priests, bishops, cardinals, and even the pope himself, with the utmost freedom. And this freedom which Catholics claim for themselves they cannot fairly deny to others.

With religious beliefs a secular paper has nothing to do, and for my part I shall not enter into discussion about them; but the veil of religion cannot properly be thrown over political intrigues and political actions; and when it is, it ought to be torn aside. In all I have written or shall write on this subject I have no quarrel with any religious belief or any animosity to any church. I have objected not to any form of religion, but to that abuse of religious forms which seeks to make religion a political factor and to use the name of Him, who was the greatest of reformers, as an agency to prevent reform.

Beyond this principle of Catholic faith there are one or two misconceptions in much that has been said in relation to Dr. McGlynn, which it is worth while to correct.

In the first place it is not true, as the press generally assumes, that Dr. McGlynn, in the position he has taken on the land question, has said anything antagonistic to Catholic doctrine. Archbishop Corrigan, it is true, insinuates this, but has never yet ventured to say it.

In the disquisition upon the rights of property which he inflicted upon the faithful of his diocese in his recent pastoral letter, he is very careful not to say that the church or the pope has placed the seal of condemnation upon those who deny the rightfulness of *property in land;* and even where the logic of his argument and the necessities of the contest require the phrase "*property in land*" he has had to limit himself to the term "*property.*" So in his telegram from New Haven to the *Tribune* he says, "The pope expressly teaches the right of property and ownership." This is a pretty piece of information to send by telegraph. Of course, the pope teaches the right of property and ownership! So does Dr. McGlynn! And so far from ever saying one word in denial of the right of property and ownership, Dr. McGlynn has always expressly and emphatically asserted it. What is in question is not the right of property and ownership, but the right of property and ownership *in land,* which is an entirely different matter; for while the right of property can and does justly attach to all things which man produces, it cannot guilty attach to that which the Creator has made.

And the proof that the Catholic church does not uphold private ownership in land as a matter of faith and doctrine, is furnished by the attitude of other Catholic prelates on the same question.

Every Catholic holds that the Catholic church is one and universal. In matters of discipline and in the language and form of her rites there may be differences in various localities, as, for instance, the difference between the Latin rite and the Coptic or Armenian rite. But Catholic *doctrine* must be the same all over the world, and no doctrine is binding upon a Catholic in one locality that is not binding upon Catholics in every locality. Yet, in Ireland, Catholic bishops proclaim the very same opinions with regard to the ownership of land which Archbishop Corrigan declares, or rather insinuates, are condemned by the Catholic church. Dr. McGlynn never has declared and never could declare more forcibly that the land of every country is the common property of the whole people than has one of the most eminent of Irish prelates, Dr. Thomas Nulty, bishop of Meath. In a letter addressed to the clergy and laity of the diocese of Meath, in the year 1880, Dr. Nulty uses the following language:

I infer, therefore, that no individual, or class of individuals, can hold a right of private property in the land of a country; that the people of that country, in their public corporate capacity, *are*, and always *must be*, the real owners of the land of their country—holding an indisputable title to it, in the fact that they received it as a free gift from its Creator, and as a necessary means for preserving and enjoying the life he has bestowed upon them.

The land, therefore, of every country is the common property of the people of that country, because its real owner, the Creator who made it, has transferred it as a voluntary gift to them. "*Terram autem dedit filiis hominum.*" Now, as every individual in that country is a creature and child of God, and as all his creatures are equal in his sight, any settlement of the land of a country that would exclude the humblest man in that country from his share of the common inheritance would be not only an injustice and a wrong to that man, but, moreover, would be an impious resistance to the benevolent intentions of his Creator.

In this letter Dr. Nulty is equally explicit as to the means by which the unquestioned right of the individual to the benefit of his improvements may be reconciled with the unquestionable right of all to the land itself. He declares that the value of land—that value which is sometimes known as the "unearned increment"—constitutes a national fund which seems to him to have been designed by Providence itself to be drawn upon for all social needs, and points out the way in which the appropriation of this fund for social purposes would free labor and relieve poverty.

Now, these are precisely the doctrines which Archbishop Corrigan insinuates are condemned by his church, and on which it is given out to the public that the suspension of Dr. McGlynn has been based. If Archbishop Corrigan is right, what becomes of the universality of Catholic doctrine? Either Catholic doctrine is one thing in Ireland and another thing in New York, or Archbishop Corrigan (to say nothing of "My Lord" Preston) is abusing his position and assuming to himself the functions of the pope speaking *ex cathedra* to the universal church.

And how gross from a Catholic standpoint this assumption is, may be seen from the preface to Dr. Nulty's letter, which begins in this way:

To the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Meath:

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN: I venture to take the liberty of dedicating the following essay to you as a mark of my respect and affection. In this essay I do not, of course, address myself to you as your bishop, *for I have no divine commission to to enlighten you on your civil rights or to instruct you in the principles of land tenure or political economy.* I feel, however, a deep concern even in your temporal interests, deeper, indeed, than in my own, for what temporal interest can I have save that I must always feel in your welfare? It is, then, because the land question is one not merely of vital importance, but one of life and death to you, as well as to a majority of my countrymen, that I have ventured to write on it at all.

If Dr. Nulty has no divine commission to enlighten his flock in the principles of political economy, where does Dr. Corrigan get his? There are evidently bishops and bishops, and some bishops rush in where others fear to tread. Dr. Nulty *is* a student of political economy. Dr. Corrigan is evidently unacquainted even with its rudiments. Yet the one feels constrained to address his flock on the land question only in an unofficial letter, while the other boldly puts his crude opinions in a pastoral which the priests of his diocese must read from their altars.

The position of Archbishop Corrigan, is from a Catholic standpoint, simply ludicrous. The church never having condemned the principle that land values justly belong to the community and not to individuals, Dr. McGlynn or any other Catholic is at full liberty to accept it or reject it. For a bishop or vicar-general to do as Archbishop Corrigan and "My Lord" Preston have done, and define a Catholic dogma on this point, is for them to assume ecumenical powers. Even the pope himself, when four years ago he ordered Simeoni to order Cardinal McCloskey to suspend the priest McGlynn for, as Simeoni alleged, teaching doctrines contrary to the teachings of the Catholic church, so far from defining a dogma binding on the conscience of Catholics, was but abusing his power and (though doubtless ignorantly) calumniating the American priest, just as his predecessor in the time of Galileo, being *ex-officio*, prefect of the holy inquisition, calumniated, worried and condemned Galileo as a heretic for teaching that the earth revolves around the sun, and was guilty of compelling the aged philosopher to go on his knees and swear on the holy gospels that he repudiated the scientific truth which he read in God's book of the heavens.

Another point on which great misapprehension exists, is as to the Catholic view of the obedience due from the priest. Most Protestants seem to entertain the idea that the Catholic priest owes absolute obedience to his ecclesiastical superiors in all things, and can be ordered hither and thither with no legitimate alternative save to obey or resign. Much of the newspaper comment is founded on this idea, Dr. McGlynn's case being compared to that of a soldier who should refuse to march at his general's command. One paper, the Brooklyn *Citizen*, edited by a gentleman perfectly conversant with questions of Presbyterian faith and discipline, likens Dr. McGlynn to a missionary sent out to foreign parts by some board of missions and by it called home.

These misapprehensions probably arise from a confusion of the two great divisions of Catholic cleries—the regular and the secular. The regular priesthood—under which title are embraced those belonging to all religious orders, such as the Carmelites, Jesuits, Dominicans, etc.—take a vow of unqualified obedience, which in its nature is like that which is due from the child to the parent. In their comings and their goings, and in all the details of their personal as well as of their religious life, they are subject to the orders of their superiors. This obedience, however, is tempered and controlled by well-known laws and constitutions peculiar to each order, which cannot be capriciously changed, and in accordance with which the vow of obedience is taken.

Whether the promise of obedience made by regular priests extends to political action, and, whether if it does, the existence of such orders is consistent with free institutions, are questions it is not necessary to discuss, since Dr. McGlynn, like most of the parish priests in this country, is not a regular, but a secular priest. The vow of the secular priest is simply that of obedience to the ordinary of his diocese—which obedience must, of course, be interpreted with reference to its subject matter—the exercise of ecclesiastical functions. The Catholic bishop has merely the right to demand obedience in reference to matters which concern the religious functions of the priest, just as an Episcopal or Methodist bishop has.

Nor does any special obligation arise from the fact that Dr. McGlynn was educated at the college of the Propaganda. Dr. McGlynn is not, as the editor of the Brooklyn *Citizen* seems to think, a missionary sent to this country from Rome. He is a native born American, owing to this country the paramount allegiance of a citizen and entitled to all the rights and privileges of citizenship. He went to Rome just as students go to Troy or Baltimore. The Propaganda College (which should not be confounded with the Congregation of the Propaganda), is merely a school of divinity for students from the various parts of the world, and the obligation that is there taken at ordination is simply that the student, now made priest, will return to his own diocese and engage in priestly work. The obligation in Dr. McGlynn's case does not extend beyond New York. He cannot be ordered to Boston or to Philadelphia, and the cardinals of the propaganda have no more right to call him to Rome than the faculty of Yale or Amherst have to call there one of their graduates.

But where, then, it may be asked, *does* the archbishop get the power to compel priests to keep silent when their political opinions differ from his own, and *why* is it said that Dr. McGlynn *must* either go to Rome to answer for his political opinions or be suspended? The reply is—and it is this which makes the question raised in Dr. McGlynn's case so important—that these powers have the very same origin as the power which has led to such abuses in our politics by compelling minor government employes to make political contributions or do political work. The one is no more inherent in the constitution of the Catholic church than the other is inherent in the American constitution, and arises in the one case, as in the other, simply from the abuse of the power of appointment. Archbishop Corrigan has no right whatever to dictate in politics to a priest, but having the power of removal in his hands he is able to coerce the priest. What Dr. McGlynn would be making a stand against should he refuse to go to Rome, is this abuse of ecclesiastical power, which is to the church just what the "spoils system" is to the state. Instead of doing anything inconsistent with his order he would be making a stand for the rights of his order.

And whatever the theologians of the daily press may have to say, this to my personal knowledge is the view taken of the case by many Catholic priests, who, however they fear to speak publicly, really look upon Dr. McGlynn as their champion against an ecclesiastical tyranny which they feel belittles their position, and degrades their manhood.

I have discussed this matter from a Catholic standpoint, because that is the standpoint from which an attempt is being made to befog the issue and arouse prejudice against Dr. McGlynn. This Catholic view of the case, however, is one which in itself concerns only Catholics. There is a larger question which deeply concerns the whole public. Are we, or are we not, to have in this country a power which can coerce a most important and influential body of citizens into such political action as it may choose to dictate—a power responsible only to a foreign authority, and which sets up for itself the claim of being beyond even criticism or remonstrance?

The land question, important as it may be in itself, cuts no figure in this case. Archbishop Corrigan has, indeed, informed the *Tribune* that Dr. McGlynn has been summoned to Rome because of his views on the land question; but he might just as well be summoned for his views on the tariff question or the currency question. And this summons to Rome which Vicar-General "My Lord" Preston has informed the public is intended not for compliment but for punishment, evidently grows out of the action of the archbishop in suspending Dr. McGlynn. This suspension, we have learned, was due in the first place to Dr. McGlynn's presence at a political meeting which he had been specifically ordered not to attend—a meeting in favor of a certain candidate whom Archbishop Corrigan did not want to have elected. As to the cause of the second suspension, which occurred after Dr. McGlynn had been restored to the exercise of his priestly functions and some time *after the election*, the semi-official account given to the press has been very hazy. It might be well to suggest to the interviewers who have the confidence of the archbishop and his "monsignors," that they should do something to clear this matter up.

It may be news to the general public, but it is, nevertheless, a fact that Archbishop Corrigan in the last election, not only wanted to defeat a certain candidate, but also wanted to defeat the call for a constitutional convention; that letters from him were sent to priests telling them to work against the convention, and that at a gathering where one of these priests endeavored to carry out this instruction, a proposition was made to get hold of the bags containing the ballots in favor of the constitutional convention, and by making away with them, to lessen the vote in its favor. Supposing any priest to whom this archiepiscopal order had come had refused to obey it? Are the journals which contend that the archbishop is quite right in suspending Dr. McGlynn and having him ordered to Rome, prepared to make the claim that the archbishop would have been equally justified in similarly punishing such a priest who refused to oppose the calling of a constitutional convention?

There are two distinct things in this controversy which have got somewhat mixed in the newspapers, but which it is important to distinguish—that is to say, the authorities of the propaganda and the archbishop of New York. They have become somewhat confused, because the archbishop in his crusade against Dr. McGlynn has seen fit to fall back for excuse upon missives received from Rome by his predecessor. The congregation of the propaganda in Rome is, of course, the center of the ecclesiastical tyranny which now seeks to coerce American priests, as it has at various times sought to coerce the priests of Ireland. But in the case of Dr. McGlynn it is evident that in both instances Rome has simply been used—in 1882 by the British envoy Errington, and in 1886 by Archbishop Corrigan, evidently at the instance or under the influence of the Tammany ring.

It is notorious that in New York the Catholic church has for a long series of years been more or less allied with Tammany, and that this influence, for which a *quid pro quo* has been paid by grants of public property at nominal prices and lavish appropriations of public money, has been one of the many sources of the strength of the rings that in this city have degraded the name of democracy. The raising of hands, the rolling of eyes and the ejaculations of sacrilege when a reporter of the *Telegram* asked some of the sachems of Tammany whether they had passed a resolution prompting the archbishop to suspend Dr. McGlynn, are refreshing. Of course such things are not done by resolution, but there are other ways in which they can be done, all the same. And thus *is* significant, that Archbishop Corrigan had no objections to Dr. McGlynn making any number of speeches for a candidate indorsed by Tammany, and that his concern about Dr. McGlynn's opinions upon the land question did not manifest itself until a new party had arisen which threatened to prevent the certain victory that Tammany had thought within its grasp. With the alarm of Tammany the archbishop's concern about Dr. McGlynn's economic opinions began, just as the concern of the propaganda began when Dr. McGlynn, in 1882, raised in the United States, whence the material supplies of the Irish land league were coming, the standard which Irish landlordism most fears and which the English landlord government thought they had succeeded in lowering in Ireland.

But that the things are really independent of each other is shown by the fact that Dr. McGlynn was not the only priest who was prohibited from giving any countenance to the movement that threatened the New York municipal rings. Other priests who had never made any public utterances on the land question, and who, so far as I know, have no special opinions upon it, but who were disposed to take part with the workingmen simply from their disgust with the rottenness of our municipal administration, were likewise inhibited from doing so. If they had possessed the courage of Dr. McGlynn they, it is presumable, would also have been suspended, though it is hardly likely that they would have been summoned to Rome, since, not filling so large a place in the public eye as the pastor of St. Stephen's, they could have been disciplined here more quietly. On the other hand, not only was the vicar-general permitted to issue a pronunciamento against the workingmen's candidate, which was distributed on the Sunday before election at church doors, but without a word of remonstrance as far as the public knows, priests were permitted to speak against that party from their altars, and, in some cases, at least, the power of the confessional and the threat of the refusal of absolution was used against the party which opposed the Tammany ring.

The persecution of the one priest who at last ventured to claim the right of an American citizen has been characterized by a peculiar meanness and vindictiveness which it is doubtful if the general public understand. While Dr. McGlynn has maintained a dignified silence, the press has been filled with semi-official statements, emanating evidently from the archiepiscopal palace, or those in the archiepiscopal confidence, and artfully calculated to place Dr. McGlynn in a light which would wean away from him the moral support of his parishioners and the Catholic public. I think I can safely state that all such stories as that of Dr. McGlynn's neglecting to open the archiepiscopal letter, and going on performing his functions after he had been suspended, and all such stories as that of the "venerable priest" to whom he professed contrition and promised to go anywhere, which have been set forth in evidently inspired articles and telegraphed over the whole country, are absolute falsehoods.

And while no art was being left unemployed to humiliate, degrade and isolate the open-handed, warm-hearted "priest of the poor," Archbishop Corrigan went over into the diocese of Brooklyn to honor, by taking the principal part in his funeral, the deceased James A. McMaster, long the notorious editor of the New York *Freeman's Journal.* This man, noted for his venomous intolerance, was, during the war, a blatant enemy of the American Union, giving all the aid and comfort he could to its enemies, hoping for its disruption by the intervention of foreign arms, and sneering at our volunteers as "utterly unfit to cope with the trained athletes of the army of France." This honored of the same archbishop who had just insulted the memory and wounded the feelings of the family of a deceased public official, Judge Alker, because in his official capacity as the commissioner of a public institution he had failed to take such action as "His Grace" saw fit, was an open enemy of free government everywhere. At the time of the Carlist insurrection in Spain he collected dollars and offered prayers in aid of the reactionary rebellion against the choice of the great majority of the Spanish people. He was also a promotor in the attempt to raise a papal legion in the United States to fight against the unity of Italy, and it was largely at his urgency that the pope was prevailed upon to send a discredited American soldier, one McTavish, from Rome to this country to recruit for a foreign army. It would be a gross injustice to Catholic sentiment in the United States to assume that this outrageous attempt to infringe our neutrality laws was sanctioned by it. On the contrary, it was deemed so grave and dangerous a scandal to the Catholic church in America that a number of its highest dignitaries met at Mount St. Mary's college, Emmitsburg, and by the pen of Archbishop McCloskey issued a caustic denunciation of the scheme and its promotors, making cutting allusion both to the exploded general and the ultramontane journalist—one of the things that the bitter McMaster could never forgive in the gentle McCloskey.

Mr. McMaster, who, in his foolish egotism, fancied himself a sort of journalistic pope of American Catholics, made his boast that he was the man who had scolded and bullied the Catholic church in America into its present pernicious policy of opposing the public schools. But he had one quality which may just now have redeemed his character in the eyes of the archbishop. He was a bitter enemy of Dr. McGlynn, who in all things was his antipodes, and his last public utterance was a calumny against Dr. McGlynn, whom he was reported in one of the daily papers as charging with having always been insubordinate and with having quarreled with Archbishop Hughes, whereas everybody acquainted with the subject knows that the relations between Archbishop Hughes and Dr. McGlynn were always of the warmest character.

But again the question comes back to Rome. Archbishop Corrigan's interference in politics in New York is by virtue of authority derived from a foreign land. It is to a foreign tribunal that he has had an American citizen summoned for punishment, and it is only to this foreign power that he himself is responsible.

The great question which Dr. McGlynn's case ought to bring home to all American citizens, no matter what their views on the land question, no matter what their creed or no matter what their politics, is whether the American republic can afford to have in its midst a secret power, wielding a tremendous political influence, deriving its authority and impulse from a foreign kingdom and utterly irresponsible to the American people or any part of them, whether they be Protestant or Catholic.

The tremendous influence of this power is acknowledged by the press in the most significant way. The almost unanimous chorus that now goes up from the press that Henry George has ended his political career, and that THE STANDARD has committed suicide, shows, as nothing else could, the estimate that the men who of all others in the community are best informed as to the hidden springs of political action, put upon the silent but terrific influence of this power.

Is it not time that we should demand that American priests should be released from the abuse of ecclesiastical authority which makes them political slaves? Is it not time that we should see to it that the Catholic men and women whose money builds and maintains churches should have some influence in the control of church property? And is it not time that the American Catholics, for the sake of themselves, for the sake of the priests they love, and to avoid scandal to their religion, should plant themselves on the same ground taken by the great Irish liberator, "*As much religion from Rome as you please,* BUT NO POLITICS!"

The case would be bad enough if the Italian cardinals who wield such power over Catholic affairs in the United States and Ireland concerned themselves merely with spiritual matters, for uncontrolled power, wherever it may be lodged, is always liable to temptations and dangers; but this is not the case. The Roman ecclesiastical authorities are politicians, and politicians of the most reactionary type, constantly engaged in scheming for the restoration of the temporal power, and to whom the United States and Ireland are but pawns on the great chess board of continental intrigue.

Every Irish Catholic ought to know from the history of his own country how dangerous it is to leave in the hands of Rome an uncontrolled power over Catholic bishops and priests. Devoted as Irish Catholics have been to their faith, much as they have done for the holy see, it has only been by the most strenuous resistance—resistance of a kind which the American press now declare would in New York kill the man or the newspaper that engaged in it, that the Catholics of Ireland have, from time to time, been able to prevent themselves from being handed over, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of the English government.

It will be remembered by those who know the history of Ireland that, in the early part of this century, when Rome was scheming with the allied powers for the restoration and maintenance of the temporal throne of the pope, which had been overthrown in the wars and outbreaks that followed the French revolution, the Roman authorities tried to give the veto power over the appointment of Irish bishops to the English government, and that not only

did Monsignor Quarantotti, Cardinal Simeoni's predecessor in the propaganda, exert himself to the utmost to break down the opposition of the patriotic Irish bishops, but Pope Pius VII. used his personal influence to the same end.

And it may be well to recall the fact that the same Quarantotti, in one of his letters to the English cabinet, in which he endeavored to conciliate the good will of the power that was at that very time holding Irish Catholics under the most atrocious penal laws, went on to show, as he claimed, how the Catholic church always makes people loyal and subject to their sovereigns, illustrating this point by saying: "Witness the fact that in the recent rebellion of the American colonies against his gracious majesty King George III, it was the Protestant colonies that rebelled, while the Catholic colony of Canada remained faithful to his gracious majesty."

We have no sovereign in this country, but we *do* have rotten political rings and great corporations who pack the bench and till even our highest legislative body with paid attorneys, and there is impending a great revolt—peaceable, as we trust—on the part of honest citizens against the moneyed powers which are sapping the very foundations of the American republic with their corruptions. If the Roman diplomats could intrigue with the oppressors of Ireland, why may they not in the same way intrigue with scheming politicians and the moneyed rings of the United States. The papal diplomats are at this moment sighing to have an Italian archbishop as their accredited ambassador or nuncio at Washington. Their emissary to make the preliminary soundings in this business has been the western German Bishop Dwenger of Fort Wayne, Indiana, who is to be rewarded, it is said, by the archbishopric of St. Louis when the venerable Archbishop Kenrick, now eighty years old, shall be called to heaven.

No one will be better pleased than American-Irish Catholics to know that the efforts of Bishop Dwenger, in his repeated visits to Washington, have not been very successful, and that the Roman curia has been informed by him that at present nothing can be done. HENRY GEORGE.

CATHOLIC PROTESTS.

Letters from Catholic Laymen and Articles from Catholic Journals—Petitions for the Reinstatement of Dr. McGlynn—Resolutions in His Defence.

That the attempt of Archbishop Corrigan to punish Dr. McGlynn for his exercise of the political right of an American citizen, is arousing the just indignation of intelligent and faithful Catholics, appears in many ways.

At the dinner to the eminent Irish physician, Dr. James R. Kelly—a dinner largely attended by influential Catholics, the mention by the Rev. Dr. Ducey of the name of Father McGlynn was followed by round after round of the most rapturous applause.

A few nights later, at a Saturday half-holiday meeting in Cooper Union, largely made up of Catholics, Rabbi Brown spoke affectionately of Father McGlynn, and was rewarded with a perfect tempest of cheers, to which no dissent was heard. Throughout the city and over the country, while "society-saving" Protestants are defending Archbishop Corrigan, Catholics who understand the limitations of ecclesiastical authority, are denouncing the un-Catholic and un-American conduct of the archbishop. These are now beginning to publicly express their indignation. Some of their letters to this paper and extracts from letters and articles appear in other papers are given below:

An Indignant Catholic.

The leading idea running through the press comments on "The Case of Dr. McGlynn" as presented in THE STANDARD is that Henry George has commited "political suicide" by what is called his "attack on the Catholic church." These comments must be regarded by all self-respecting Catholics as grossly insulting. I am a Catholic, born of Catholic parents, and brought up in the most Catholic part of Catholic Ireland, and I indignantly resent the suggestion that I am not able to distinguish between an attack on my church and a legitimate criticism of the political speeches or actions of Catholic ecclesiastics. Let me ask those New York editors (most of them, by the way, Protestants whose new-born zeal as champions of Catholic church authority is most edifying to behold) where in that magnificent statement in THE STANDARD, or where in any of his writings or speeches, does Henry George attack the church? Is it an attack on the church to challenge and show the absurdity of Archbishop Corrigan's views on the land question? Archbishop Corrigan is not the church. He has no more right than I have to make an article of faith and promulgate it as binding on Catholics. He can neither add to nor take from the faith and teachings of the church one jot of binding doctrine. His function is purely administrative. His commission is to preach and teach, but in his preaching and teaching he cannot with authoritative voice go beyond the limit of the body of doctrine already prescribed by an authority to which he is as much bound to obedience as the humblest Catholic in his diocese.

And it is well for the church that individual prelates have not the power to make articles of faith or promulgate binding doctrine through the medium of pastorals to their clergy. Had such power existed a few years ago the Catholic world would have been scandalized by the spectacle of Cardinal McCabe condemning the Irish ladies' land league and an eminent Catholic layman, A. M. Sullivan, energetically protesting against the condemnation and supported in his protest by a vigorous letter from Archbishop Croke, declaring that the Cardinal of Dublin should no longer be permitted to outrage the feelings of Irishmen by diatribes against the national movement and its leaders. No, sir; Catholics are *not* bound to accept as church doctrine everything that a bishop, an archbishop or a cardinal may choose to write down and publish in a pastoral. They are only bound to accept and believe articles of faith promulgated as such by the proper authority or decrees on faith or morals given *forth ex cathedra*, that is, by the infallible head of the church speaking as such and addressing the universal church. No pronouncement of the kind has been made with regard to the doctrine that the land belongs to the people. In the whole body of Catholic doctrine, binding on the faithful, there is not a syllable to the effect that it is sinful for Catholics to hold that land ought not to be private property, or that it is sinful to agitate and to work for such a change in the laws of their country as would make the rent values of land public property, to be used for the common benefit of all. If I am wrong I ask the editors of the New York daily papers to correct me. For weeks past they have been reiterating that the land theories of Dr. McGlynn and Henry George are "condemned by by the church." Let them tell us where and when, and in what words the church—not Archbishop Corrigan or some cardinal, but the church—has condemned those theories. If they cannot or will not tell us this, then let us have no more of the rot and rubbish about Henry George "opposing the church."

It is true that Henry George says some hard things about Roman cardinals and worldliness among church dignitaries; but the most orthodox Catholic might say the same. In fact, orthodox Catholics of high standing in the church have said of Roman cardinals and of popes very much stronger things. Dr. Lingard, an eminent Catholic priest, in his History of England, which is to be found in the libraries of most Catholic clergymen, writes with much severity of "pontiffs" (I quote from Lingard's book) "who seemed to have forgotten their spiritual character in their ardor to free Italy from the dominion of strangers, and to aggrandize at the same time their respective families." Again, Dr. Lingard writes as follows in referring to money claims made by the popes on the clergy in England in the reign of Henry III:

> At first these claims were brought forward with modesty and reserve, nor did the ecclesiastics refuse to relieve the wants or support the splendor of him whom they revered as their spiritual father. But gradually the necessities, and with the necessities the demands, of the pontiffs were multiplied, till they at length excited the remonstrances and opposition both of the clergy and laity. (This was "attacking the church.") By accepting the donations of Pepin and by subsequent acquisitions the bishops of Rome had joined the concerns of temporal princes with the duties of Christian prelates, and the wars in which they engaged, sometimes with their own subjects, sometimes with foreign states, entailed on them expenses far beyond the annual amount of their income.

This from a Catholic priest is surely more of an "attack on the church" than anything in THE STANDARD, and any one who looks through the pages of Lingard will find a great deal more of a much stronger quality about the wars carried on by popes and the "reactionary politics" of Roman cardinals.

But strong sayings about individual popes or cardinals do not touch the faith of the church. Dr. Doyle, the great bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, wrote in emphatic terms of the ambition and intriguing of popes. During the repeal agitation in Ireland fifty years ago, when England sought, as it is said she is now again doing, to get the pope to throw his influence on her side in Irish national affairs, Daniel O'Connell, the great Catholic leader, voiced the indignant protest of Catholic Ireland in the memorable words, *"As much religion as you like from Rome, but no politics."* Another great Catholic leader, Michael Davitt, sent a similar message to Rome, not many weeks ago, in an interview on the Dr. McGlynn case, in which he warned Cardinal Simeoni against again "burning his fingers" by interfering in Irish national politics, reminding the cardinal of his blunder in attempting to crush the Parnell testimonial movement, which the Irish Catholic clergy and people supported much more energetically after than before the appearance of the cardinal's prohibitory rescript.

I cannot close without expressing a hope that Catholics who believe in the great principle of the land for the people will feel it a duty to promptly put themselves on record in some way as emphatically protesting against the claim of Archbishop Corrigan to authoritatively prescribe for Catholics, whether priests or laymen, what their economic doctrines or their political action shall be. I also hope that the prophets who talk about the "suicide" of THE STANDARD will speedily have proof that in this their judgment is as worthless as their opinions regarding the attitude of the church on the land question. I am, sir, your obedient servant, M. CLARKE.

1996 *Fulton street, Brooklyn, Jan.* 10.

Protest From a Parishioner of St. Stephen's.

J. P. McMahon, 234 East Twenty-seventh street, and a member of St. Stephen's church, writes to the *Star* a feeling protest against what he terms the persecution of Dr. McGlynn by Archbishop Corrigan. He says:

St. Stephen's parishioners naturally ask, Must we allow one of the tenderest, most devoted and best exemplars of the Christian priesthood to quietly depart from the parish, which his good work and unbounded charity has consecrated, without inquiry as to the reasons, remonstration against his removal, or dissent from the tyranny which, while it is intended to humiliate Dr. McGlynn, insults the congregation of St. Stephen's by ignoring the sentiment which has crystalized into a unanimous desire for the retention of a beloved pastor? Why has Dr. McGlynn been suspended and why should he be removed? Has he been remiss in looking after his charge and ministering to their every welfare? Has he brought politics into the pulpit, or preached uncatholic doctrine? In his character as a priest has he ever given rumor a chance to breathe the breath of suspicion against his moral conduct? No; none of these! He simply differs from his archbishop upon a question coming within the domain of political economy. But right here, it is claimed, is where Dr. McGlynn's advocacy of Mr. George's theories conflicts with sound theology. May I be permitted to ask whether—in the absence of authoritative dictum by the church, about which the reverend doctors themselves differ—the theology of Dr. McGlynn may not be as sound upon this question as that of the archbishop?

What, then, is the cause of his removal? The archbishop of New York can, I suppose, remove Dr. McGlynn even for no other reason than to evidence that power and authority; but justice, or even prudence, would hardly sanction such a course, although Dr. McGlynn is undoubtedly too good a Catholic not to obey. But in a case of this nature ought there not to be at least some show of deference to the wishes of the parishioners? or have the people who build the churches anything to say in the premises?

During the twenty years of Dr. McGlynn's ministry with St. Stephen's it can be said truthfully that there is no greater instance in the diocese than he himself furnishes of the practice of every priestly virtue. Does this count for nothing? Shall not his past services in the cause of religion, and, indeed, in every good cause, outweigh what can at most be regarded if you will—if the right be denied him of taking part in politics—as a simple indiscretion?

Helpless to retain Dr. McGlynn any longer in the field where he has so long and faithfully labored, his former parishioners see him now driven from them with all the circumstances of humiliating unkindness, and they remain passive spectators of a scene wherein they believe their pastor to be the victim of persecution.

Will the parishioners of St. Stephen's, after all Dr. McGlynn has done for them, remain now unmoved; and this, too, with the knowledge of the fact that he leaves them perhaps with not enough of the world's goods to provide for even a night's shelter? Although we know him as a brave, strong man, is it not due to him, and would we not be honoring ourselves that *in a moment like this* we should manifest in some way those feelings of love and attachment and regrets which it were idle to try and repress any longer? That the parishioners have, up to this time, refrained from expressions of opinion is to be attributed to their desire not to prejudice his case; but the action that any one may now take can hardly be said to be detrimental to his interests if, as is supposed, he is already prejudged.

The feeling is unanimous in denunciation of Dr. McGlynn's treatment. If he must go elsewhere he carries the hearts of his late congregation with him. Does the archbishop realize the effect upon the members of St. Stephen's of his unwise act? Does he comprehend their profound attachment for Dr. McGlynn? If he does not I wish he could have seen the congregation of St. Stephen's church last Christmas waiting with anxious expectancy to see Dr. McGlynn address them, as was his custom on that day, offering them the salutation of the season with all the candor of his big, tender heart; and afterward witness them depart with throbbing heart and swelling eyes because he came not.

It may be, however, that wiser councils will prevail at Rome than have prevailed in New York, although it is too much to hope that our worst fears will be dispelled by seeing Dr. McGlynn reinstated as pastor of St. Stephens, where his piety, benignity and zeal has for these many years "allured to brighter worlds and led the way."

What a Pennsylvania Catholic Thinks.

Permit an Irish Catholic to say that I am in full accord with you on the land question. The clanization of my fathers was on the same line as that so ably set forth in "Progress and Poverty." I am an Irish Catholic, as above stated, and know my religion too well to permit "Cawtholics" or Italian cardinals to teach me political economy.

My advice to Dr. McGlynn is to stop at home and let the Bourbon cardinals come to him. The doctor is old, and if deprived of a living by no fault of his own, he will find over a million sons of toil able and willing to give him a dollar each.

I got out of a job myself for making speeches for James G. Blaine, so I can sympathize with Dr. McGlynn, whom I have loved and admired for years, although I never saw him personally. I would on to-morrow, if necessary, give up my life in defense of my religion, but would permit no bishop, cardinal or pope to teach me politics. I think some of them need teaching, and they will get it.

History informs us that all the calamities of the church have been largely brought about by the "big guns" of the church siding with the robbing villains. If the bishops of France before the revolution had sided with the people they would not have been driven out of France. The evil effects of their siding with the robbing and debauching aristocracy remain to this day.

So I see by your paper the organ players first "got down" on Dr. McGlynn because he spoke for Ireland. England, that has been guilty of every crime in Ireland—England, that put the same price on the head of a priest as on that of a fox, is now more powerful in Rome in teaching "political economy" than any Catholic nation. The English "Cawtholic" tories are strong at Rome, and they have long purses if they have not much brains.

There may be a little doubt as to Pope Adrian's bull, but there is no doubt but John Bull, before he left the Catholic church, was as mean a villain in Ireland as need be. Here is my proof:

By the statute of the 50th Edward IV. c. 2d (A. D. 1465), "That it shall be lawful to all manner of men that find any thieves robbing by day or by night, *or going to rob or steal in or out, or coming*, having no faithful man, of good name and fame in their company in English apperal, upon any of the liege people of the king, to take and kill those and cut off their heads without any impeachment of the sovereign lord and king, etc."

Macauley said the Reformation was "begun by Henry, who murdered his wives, continued by Somerset, who murdered his mother, and completed by Elizabeth, who murdered her guest."

Let no Italian—pope, cardinal or bishop—tell me if ages ago people lost what God intended for universal man, that the descendants of the robbed and murdered ancestors have no right to claim—reclaim—their God-given inheritance.

I am glad you are well posted in real Catholic doctrine. You are better posted than Bishop Corrigan. The Catholic religion is grand when understood. It teaches the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man. Your letter in reply to the bishop's pastoral is the best thing you ever wrote.

The bishop made a "show" of himself; but if he prays hard and keeps his mental powder dry and reads your works he may not be delayed long in purgatory. JAMES MCGILL.

Beaver Falls, Pa., Jan. 10.

The Case of Dr. McGlynn.

As a Roman Catholic, and a descendant of a long line of Roman Catholics, I am naturally averse to any harsh newspaper criticism of the dignitaries of my church; but when they choose to enter the political arena and lend the weight of their priestly offices to bolster up one party and to terrorize another, they become fit subjects of criticism. To me their political opinions have no more weight than those of a layman of equal intelligence. If I believe in the infallibility of the pope in matters of faith, I do not believe, nor am I bound to believe, that an archbishop's fiat in regard to secular matters is infallible, for he is human. I have carefully read your article entitled "The Case of Dr. McGlynn," and I indorse every word of it. It voices not only my own sentiments but those of every Catholic I have talked to on the subject. It is logical, temperate and just. It is the bare, unvarnished truth. Outside of his priestly sphere, Dr. McGlynn has as perfect a right to proclaim and uphold his political faith as any other American citizen, and this inalienable right was as valid in 1886 as it had been in 1884, though some of the enlightened journals don't think so. Some of these journals—notably the *democratic* ones—have maliciously hounded Dr. McGlynn.

You think, and you may be right, that it would be better that Dr. McGlynn should not go to Rome; but I think he should go, and carry with him the prayers of his flock and their firm protest against the unwarrantable action of Archbishop Corrigan. I suggest that petitions, addressed to the pope, expressing the sense of Catholic America, and demanding respectfully but forcibly Dr. McGlynn's reinstatement, be circulated for all "non-Castle Catholics" to sign. These petitions could be placed at the church doors on Sunday mornings; or, better still, a few men could be appointed in each parish who would see that the petitions were properly signed. In this way alone can the sense of the Catholic laity gain expression; and I think Pope Leo, who has already proved himself invulnerable to the machinations of the Errington cabal in regard to the appointment of Archbishop Walsh, would render a decision in Dr. McGlynn's case which would be creditable to himself and acceptable to American Catholics.

OWEN FITZSIMMONS.

No. 70 Hall street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The Press and Dr. McGlynn.

"Gath's" New York Letter in Cincinnati Enquirer.

The fiercest of Protestants who have been noted for their unreasoning hostility to Catholic traditions seem to be chuckling that Father McGlynn has had to walk the plank, and you see in the notorious infidel papers of this city, which have no God but the dollar, sardonic admonitions to Father McGlynn to obey authority and to remember that the church which talks to him has a great deal on its side and in its favor. The poor man, who loved his clerical duties, had spent his life to great profit in teaching and visiting his congregation and he who knew no other kind of work, has merely to drink the hemlock like Socrates and expire as an influence.

The only wonderful thing about this is that wealth has so changed the nature of the American people that they are rather glad to see Rome rising to full length and the popular priest lying on his back. One man, however, considered that he was not fettered by either Rome or wealth or anything, and that was Henry George. He has published a protest against the treatment of his fellow citizen. At the appearance of this protest the mugwump and other hypocritical papers exclaim with great glee:

"Now at last we have got McGlynn ruined. We have divided McGlynn and his church from the labor movement. We have raised up Rome against the trades' unions. Therefore, there will be no more trouble with labor in the future."

Land Thief Theology.

New York Catholic Herald.

When we were a boy in dear Dublin we learned our catechism in the parish church of SS. Michael and John. That we learned it well we know from the fact that our mark at examinations was always "excellent," and, furthermore, we always received first-class premiums. These were the days of good Canon Roche, a Wexford man, with the blood of '98 coursing riantly in his veins, when Father Meehan, who walked out of Conciliation hall with O'Brien and Meagher, was first curate, and when Father John O'Hanlon, the learned author of the "Lives of the Irish Saints," was a curate there also. It was in that same parish church that one young Walsh learned his catechism. He was the son of a watchmaker, became a priest, a professor in Maynooth, made a great reputation by denying the right of property in land, as understood by the Duke of Leinster, and is now, despite the devil, England and the Erringtonites, the worthy wearer of the mitre of St. Laurence O'Toole. We learned much of our lesson of patriotism from Father Meehan, feeling that if it was right for a priest to be a "rebel" in '48 it could not be wrong for us to be one in '65, and we were arrested, imprisoned and banished for life in the name of that Victoria, who is called the Good, by—those who don't know her.

But to the point. When we were learning our catechism the teacher asked us one Sunday, What are the marks of the true church? We answered, One, holy, Catholic and apostolic. We knew that that anwer was right then, and know that a like answer would be right now. But there are things going on now that would puzzle us in connection with that question were we not so well grounded in the Christian doctrine as to be able to distinguish between the rich, grand, sonorous voice of the church and the quaking, feeble, puny treble of some individuals in the church.

We are led to write thus from the perusal of an interview with Vicar-General Preston, reported in the *Sun*, dealing with the suspension of Dr. McGlynn. The gist of the interview is that the beloved pastor of St. Stephen's has been suspended "because he holds doctrines as to the ownership of land which are contrary to the teaching of the church;" that he can be restored to his pastorate only "by recanting his land theories;" and that the church will never permit the views of Dr. McGlynn "to be held within her borders."

Hold hard, right there, vicar-general? Somehow or other we have an idea that the Church of Ireland is within the borders of the Roman, Catholic and Apostolic church, within the borders of that church, of which we learned in our catechism that her primary distinguishing mark was that she is one.

Well, the Archbishop of Cashel has just written a letter—'tis printed elsewhere in these columns—in which he says the land of Ireland belongs to the people of Ireland. Now, if the land of Ireland belongs to the people of Ireland, it cannot be uncatholic to assert that the land of France belongs to the people of France, that the land of England belongs to the people of England, that the land of America belongs to the people of America. The principle which justifies the Archbishop of Cashel in asserting that the land of Ireland belongs to the people of that country is precisely the same justifying principle of those who assert that the land of America should belong to the people of this country.

We know a vicar-general is a somebody. That is, we know that because of his position he is a somebody. He may be a nobody intellectually, and yet be a somebody because of his title. He may be even a Roman doctor—that thing which is the laughing stock of intellectual Maynooth, where a doctor's cap means something—be a nobody otherwise, and yet be somebody out here in a new country, where the church is young, and where even vicar-generals do not represent all the brains of the priesthood. But though a man in New York, because he is a vicar-general, is a somebody, yet he is not, in our opinion, big enough to excommunicate the Church of Cashel, to put it outside "the border," nor can he manage to get a good son of Tipperary to believe that what is Catholic in Cashel is uncatholic in New York. Oh, no! That son of Cashel learned that the church is one, and if he is asked to believe that the archbishop who perhaps baptized him, and certainly confirmed him, has been teaching him over there in Ireland a doctrine that he must drop, like a hot potato, when he reaches New York, he will naturally wonder where the oneness comes in. Then he will conclude, using his common sense, that as his natural reason coincides with his Irish archbishop's doctrines, it must be that it is the New York vicar-general who is talking rather taller than his intellectual gifts or his ecclesiastical position justify, when he says the church will never, in his opinion, allow a doctrine to be held within her borders which that self-same individual knows is already taught by the distinguished occupants of the sees of Dublin, Cashel and Meath.

And now having said so much we finish here, for the time only, by saying that we are well aware there is a coon up the tree, and we know why there is all this kicking against truth and justice in New York. The coon is English influence striving to strike at Ireland through America. That coon must come down. The kicking is the last spasmodic effort of an infamous system, which would bind the church, if it could, to the support of slavery. Every man knows that he who owns the land owns those who occupy the land. And as Ireland is destroying land monopoly not only within her own borders, but also, leading in that direction in England, Scotland and Wales, so we see English syndicates rushing out here to seize the lands of America. The vicar-general should think twice before he plays the game for these land thieves. It is not nice for any man, much less a monsignor, to lose a game. It ruffles one's feathers when one is beaten, and beaten the land thieves will be, notwithstanding the advocacy of their bad cause by the gentleman who ought not to be indiscreet enough to cover their land thefts in the folds of his Roman purple.

Labor Party Resolutions.

At the regular meeting of the Thirteenth Assembly association of the united labor party on Jan. 8, resolutions approving the course maintained by Dr. McGlynn in his relations with Archbishop Corrigan and the propaganda at Rome were unanimously adopted. They commend Dr. McGlynn's "championship of the equal rights of all classes of the community, irrespective of social position, financial status or religious beliefs," and trust that he will receive similar encouragement from the public in general. Holding that the efforts made to right the wrongs of which the working classes complain are of a civic character, embodying no religious element save that of justice, they unite in protesting against the "intervention of the agents of the propaganda, or of any other religious or secular body whatever, in the affairs" of labor organizations in this country. Continuing, the resolutions say: "Our opposition is directed against the oppression and tyranny sought to be cemented by the baronage of the nineteenth century against our working classes, whom they seek to reduce to a condition of serfdom, little less than that prevalent in Europe centuries ago. We disclaim all affinity or sympathy with communism or any 'ism' subversive of law and order, and seek, legally, to redress the wrongs and correct abuses which have grown out of the centralization of power in the hands of monopolists, and we seek to improve our condition through the silent but potent medium of the ballot-box."

A Connecticut Opinion.

P. C. Lodge, writing to the New York *Tablet* from Nagatuck, Conn., declares himself to be a Catholic who rents a sitting in the church, and goes to mass every Sunday. He says:

Archbishop Corrigan has taken the side of the Graces, the Keilys, the millionaires and money changers of New York—the very kind of men that Christ whipped out of the temple. He has taken to his heart of hearts the robbers whom his divine master scourged with leathern thongs. The good priest who is summoned to Rome, "the man of splendid intellect and Christ-like heart," should be the archbishop of New York instead of a man who has turned away his face from the poor, and taken the part of the bankers, corporations and politicians.

A Priest's Testimony.

Rev. Father O'Reilly, writing from Rush City, Minn., says: Dr. McGlynn is an old and valued friend, and a purer priest and better man it has never been my lot to know. From my heart I pray that he may obtain a decided victory over his enemies.

THE WICKED BEND.

ONE OF THE WORST PORTIONS OF THE METROPOLIS.

People of All Nations United in Misery—The Stale Beer Dives of Mulberry Street—A Police Raid on the Dens.

A worse locality than that which lies on Mulberry street between Bayard and Worth streets, and which is known to nearly every resident of New York as "The Bend," would be hard to find in any city of the world. The houses are old tumble-down, rickety affairs, and there is hardly one of them that has not been condemned as unsafe by the building department. Dark, noisome and ill smelling alleys give entrance to the narrow court-yards between the front and rear tenements. Streets, alleys, courts and houses are reeking with the accumulated filth of years; for the Bend seems to have been completely forgotten by the street cleaning department. Occasionally the sanitary squad makes a visit to the place, and with a plentiful supply of disinfectant partially kills the stench which makes the neighborhood far more unhealthy in summer than the swamps of South Africa. The inhabitants of the Bend are in keeping with the place. The lowest class of lazzaroni, a scattering of Chinese, negroes, Polaks, all of the most degraded character and a class of beings of all nationalities—who have sunk so low as to be almost outside the pale of humanity, who are so degraded as not to be worthy of the name of criminal, but are simply vile and vicious. Of such people is formed the great majority of the population of the Bend. There are, it is true, some few honest hard-working toilers who are forced by a hard fate to dwell in this hell upon earth, but they are exceedingly scarce.

The Bend is the home of the "stale beer dive," an institution which is luckily found in no other locality in the city. The flat beer which has become so stale as to turn the stomachs of the hardened habitues of the low groggeries in the poorer parts of the city is bought up for little or nothing by the proprietors of these dives, and the nauseating stuff is sold to their customers for a penny a schooner. It takes but few of the schooners to send the most hardened tramp into a drunken stupor which is a nearer approach to death than even the coma produced by opium. The dives are generally in the cellars of the buildings. Their furniture is of the most primitive character—a few hard benches, a cheap stove and a few tin cans for the beer. In the summer time there is little trade, but with the first cold snap regular customers begin to flock in and the places fill up.

The Bend is situated in the sixth precinct; and when young Capt. McCullagh first took charge of that precinct he made up his mind the stale beer dives must go. Officer John J. Wimmer was assigned to the post in the Bend, with instructions to familiarize himself with the locality of the dives and their habitues. It did not take him long to do this, and then came the work of rooting them out. Hercules' work of cleaning out the Augean stables was but child's play to the task assumed by Capt. McCullagh; and though raid after raid has been made and thousands upon thousands of prisoners have been taken from these places, they still flourish and the nuisance shows little abatement. Capt. McCullagh does not tire of the work, however, and not long ago gave the writer an invitation to accompany him on a raid. The night was bitter cold, and when 11 o'clock, the time set for the beginning of the raid, came, the thermometer was near zero. As the captain sat by the cosy open grate fire in his private room, he remarked casually, "It's a good night for a raid. I guess we'll make a good haul." On being asked what constituted a good night for a raid, he replied, "The colder, the better. The cold weather drives 'em into the dives, where it is warmest." A little before 11 p.m. the captain spoke to the sergeant behind the desk; the big gong was sounded and the doorman was instructed to call the reserve section. Up to this time not a man except the captain and his guest knew that a raid was contemplated. "I don't take any chances of news of the raid reaching the dives," said the captain.

Sharp at 11 the big gong again sounded, and with a steady tramp thirty-six big policemen, with a stalwart sergeant at their head, marched out in front of the desk. Instructions were given, and at the word of command they marched out into the street, followed by the captain and the writer. Down Elizabeth street to Bayard and then to Mulberry street was the line of march, and it took but a few moments for the squad of policemen to disappear, as they took their places at the doors and windows of the various dives to which they had been assigned. It takes but little to attract a crowd in the Bend, and even before the arrival of the captain the streets were lined with a dirty, ill-smelling crowd of men, women and children. They took good care to keep out of the reach of the officers, for the average Sixth ward policeman, when he is aroused out of his narrow bunk to make a raid in the Bend, is not at all careful whether all his prisoners were in the dives or not. There was little noise as the captain drew up before the door of a nasty-looking cellar and said to the officers on guard, "I guess we'll begin here." A sharp rap with a club brought no response save a confused scuffling. "Open the door!" was the sharp command. A heavy kick and the rickety door was knocked off its hinges. A more disgusting sight than was revealed can not be imagined. The room was about eight feet by ten. In the center was a small stove heated to a red heat. Plain wooden benches, without backs, were ranged about the room, and twenty-three of the most miserable specimens of humanity that it is possible to find in a big city were huddled together. They were of both sexes, and in the lot were two young girls not over eighteen, whose faces bore traces of beauty, even through the dirt and bloat with which they were disfigured. They were all stupid from the heat and the vile stuff with which they were filled, and many of the women had divested themselves of nearly all their clothing. The room was thick with a stench that would have turned the stomach of anybody save a reporter, a policeman or a deep water sailor, and the precaution of the captain in bringing along a plentiful supply of cigars was understood.

The miserable creatures gazed stupidly at the squad of bluecoats, and not until the intruders began to stir them up roughly as they obeyed the sharp command, "Take them to the house," did they begin to show life. They were divided into batches of half a dozen, and, with a big policeman in charge of each batch, started for the Elizabeth street station in a ghastly procession.

The captain started in search of more victims. It was a good night for a raid, and he had no trouble in finding plenty of them. The next room visited was not so crowded, and the inmates had not had time to stupify themselves. When the heavy boot of a big policeman burst in the door there was a rush for the windows, which were guarded, however, and then came a burst of profanity and blasphemy that would have made a Texas cowboy weep for his neglected education. It was of no avail, and they were sent on their way to the station.

A dozen other places were visited, all of which furnished their quota of victims to the procession to Elizabeth street, and the captain announced that the raid was over.

The cold seemed to arouse the prisoners, and the march to the house was enlivened with snatches of ribald songs, blasphemous ravings against the police in general and Capt. McCullagh in particular, and even profanity which made even the policemen, who are no neophytes in the art of profane language, blush.

When the station house was reached it presented a scene which can be found in no other station house in the city. Behind the desk sat two sergeants, one with the regular blotter in front of him and the other with the blank returns for the superintendent. In front of the rail were at least 150 beings of all ages and sexes, dirty and unkempt and ragged, swearing, singing, laughing and crying. In the center of the floor lay the body of a man who was so absolutely drunk that only a convulsive clutching of the hands indicated that he was alive. In the crowd was a plentiful sprinkling of bluecoats. When the captain entered the station there was a momentary lull, but when he went behind the desk and gave orders that the prisoners should be divided into groups, those from each house by themselves, the confusion became worse confounded. The expert knowledge of Officer Wimmer came into good play here; he seemed to know every prisoner and soon had them arranged.

Then came the work of taking down the pedigrees—name, age, birthplace, residence and color. They were of all nationalities, various colors, ages from 18 to 80, but nearly all were put down as having no home. The work was done quickly and by experts, and as a prisoner's pedigree was taken he or she was quickly rushed off, sometimes quietly, sometimes struggling, to the cells or the lodging rooms for tramps.

When the turn for the man who lay on the floor was reached it looked as though he was dead. A policeman turned the body over with his foot, and a convulsive movement of the body, accompanied by a drunken oath, showed that there was plenty of life there. He was unceremoniously hauled into the back room until he had sufficiently recovered to give some account of himself. The doorman came in with his broom and some carbolic acid, and except for the sounds from below all traces of the raid were removed.

"All I can do," remarked Capt. McCullagh, as he went into his room and lighted a fresh cigar, "is to abate the nuisance by making constant raids. These places cannot be abolished until those old rookeries are torn down."

"Why are they not torn down?" was asked.

"They are too profitable to their owners. Some of those old buildings pay an annual income of thirty per cent. If they were torn down, and modern buildings were put up in their stead, to be occupied by respectable tenants, the income would certainly not be more than one-third of what it is now."

From the Marble Quarries.

RUTLAND, Vt., Jan. 1.—No place in this county can furnish a better illustration of the evil effects of private ownership of land than here in Rutland, the home of the marble monopoly. Here you will find men who a few years ago were poor now rolling in wealth, the reason being in their gaining possession of land containing large deposits of marble, which lay there for centuries utterly valueless until developed by labor. Are not the men, who by their labor developed this great wealth, entitled to a fair share of the wealth so created? Do they get it? Come here and see for yourself and watch the gaunt and hungry faces of the men who every morning go down into the quarries and work until dark for the pittance of one dollar or even one dollar and twenty-five cents per day, a large part of which they must pay for the hovels rented them by their employers, while the men who claim to own the land and do nothing roll in luxury. Did God intend that we should respect such right of property? No! and Bishop Corrigan to the contrary notwithstanding. Shall we pray to God to relieve the wants of these poor men? It would be blasphemy to attribute to a just God the suffering and want of these men. The remedy lies with ourselves, and while we have the right to the ballot we can remedy this great wrong. There is no need of Anarchists or dynamite while that right remains. We ourselves will be to blame if the great wrong goes on.

MORE ANON.

Pauperism in Nebraska.

ST. PAUL, Neb., Jan. 1.—In answer to inquiry concerning paupers and tramps I would say that during this year I have allowed relief to thirteen families and four or five single individuals in this precinct, which is only one of nine precincts in the county; besides, tramps don't figure here much. There are numbers of persons who have not got to that stage yet, but are hanging on the border of it—going in debt as long as they have any credit or chattels to mortgage. This is a county seat town, on a branch road of the Union Pacific, on the Loup river; population fifteen hundred—county, seven or eight thousand. The professional tramp has taken in this territory only occasionally—as a burglar or insurance agent.

We Nebraska folks have been trying to dodge pauperism by coming out west, but it is just like the rest of our country. A small fraction of us have got rich. But the condition of a large fraction of us has not been improved. The farms we got from the government are mortgaged. Heretofore the public lands have been the resort of people banished from society on account of poverty. But that resort will soon be a thing of the past. The public lands, and the means of getting them, are fast diminishing. JASON B. PACKARD,

Manager Almshouse.

In Honor of Michael Davitt.

Michael Davitt is to be honored on Sunday, January 23, with a monster demonstration at Madison Square garden, which is under the efficient management of Patrick Ford, and is certain to be a great ovation to the great Irishman. Mr. Davitt returns from his lecture tour loaded down with honors, and he should not only receive equal honors from the metropolis of the continent, but be assured that in this country, as well as in Ireland, the standard of the "Land for the People," with which his name is associated, has been raised, and that the great revolution for the abolition of landlordism in America has really begun.

The Archbishop and Tammany.

A distinguished cleric of this State not long ago expressed the conviction that in his course toward McGlynn Corrigan was the mere creature of Tammany hall, and this conviction is not without circumstance that render it at least plausible. The Catholic institutions of the archdiocese get hundreds of thousands of dollars every year from the state through the influence of Tammany, and it would be quite natural if Tammany had a pretty strong "pull" on the archbishop.—[Detroit News.

It Stands the Test.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—I hope THE STANDARD will have a good following from the start and soon attach to itself an imposing host of champions of social justice, genuine and undefiled. I have yet to meet the dissenter from the principle of land value taxation who can stand a cross-examination on the grounds of his dissent. CHAS. FRED. ADAMS.

Work for All.

Well to do people appear to think that no one need be in want, since so many new ways to make a living are discovered. As an example of the numerous avenues to profitable employment that open up to intelligence and energy Harper's *Bazar* tells of a young lady who, needing to help herself, secured several classes in whist playing, and soon had more eager learners at good prices than she could do justice to. This is truly encouraging to the army of the unemployed.

LICENSING MONOPOLY.

HOW ARMOUR AND CO. CONTROL TRADE IN OLEOMARGARINE.

Advancing License Fees to Get Custom—Laws Against the Product—A Dairyman's Boycott—Interviews with Prominent Food Merchants.

Oleomargarine is becoming a subject of monopoly through the usual and effective means of a license tax. This article of food was introduced into the United States about ten years ago. It was then manufactured in accordance with the Mege-Mouries process. Its sale spread rapidly, and other and cheaper processes were substituted. It is claimed on one hand that some of these processes make it possible to use questionable materials, and on the other that even a small proportion of bad material will make the entire product unsalable. Among eminent scientists cited in support of the healthfulness of the article are Prof. Chandler, of Columbia college, Prof. Atwater, of Wesleyan university, Prof. Averill, of Yale, and Prof. Cauldwell, of Cornell university. Oleomargarine manufacturers and dealers assert that it cannot compete with first-class butter because, although quite as healthful, it is impossible to give to it the flavor of such butter; but claim that it competes with lower grades of factory butter, and in a fair market would entirely supersede those grades.

Oleomargarine encountered violent opposition almost from its introduction; not, as is generally supposed, from dairy farmers, but from wholesale butter dealers and commission merchants. This opposition resulted in the State of New York in a prohibitory law, which was declared unconstitutional. A law requiring manufacturers to furnish oleomargarine to dealers without coloring it was then passed, the constitutionality of which is soon to be determined by the court of appeals; but meantime the dairy commissioner is actively prosecuting alleged delinquents. Laws were also passed in other states, some of which, as in New Hampshire, require oleomargarine to be distinguished by a pink color, and in others, as in Pennsylvania, absolutely prohibit the sale of the article. The Pennsylvania law has just been sustained by the highest court of that state. The dairy interests of Iowa, not satisfied with legal interference, have undertaken to boycott dealers in dairy products who take out licenses to sell oleomargarine. Their trade union, the Iowa Butter and Cheese association, pledges its members to patronize only those who deal in dairy goods and withhold their patronage "from all stores, groceries or other establishments that take out licenses for the sale of oleomargarine," and provides for a black list by requesting its secretary to obtain the names of dealers who have taken out licenses. Apparently there is no law in Iowa against conspiring to injure trade or commerce, since this boycott was begun a month ago and no one has been prosecuted for it.

The license referred to in the Iowa boycott is a United States special tax. The opponents of oleomargarine, finding that state laws were ineffectual so long as any state fostered or permitted the manufacture, sought aid from the federal government. Congress could not prohibit the manufacture or sale of the article, but it could lay an internal revenue tax, and in 1886 an act was passed imposing a license fee of $600 on manufacturers, $480 on wholesale dealers, and $48 on retailers; and a tax of two cents a pound on the product. This act of congress was passed for the "protection" of butter makers and through the influence of dairy product dealers; but it operates, as all such laws must, to the advantage of large manufacturers and dealers. Indeed, it is by no means certain that the license feature was not embodied in the law for the purpose of making monopoly possible. At any rate, it did not take men like Armour & Co. long to discover how to utilize that feature for the purpose of creating a monopoly in oleomargarine. By advancing license fees to wholesale and retail dealers, they managed to confine the trade in their own hands, because it was impossible for manufacturers with small capital to offer such inducements.

Last week a STANDARD reporter interviewed Mr. Walter Carr, of Walter Carr & Co., produce merchants, 180 Chambers street, upon the general subject. Mr. Carr is regarded by the oleomargarine dealers as a fair opponent. He was of opinion that the law against coloring oleomargarine yellow to imitate butter was just, but should be applied also to real butter, inasmuch as nine-tenths of that is colored by the dairymen. He would apply the law to all food products, but does not favor prohibiting any that are healthful, provided the consumer knows what he is buying. Asked if the making of dairy butter keeps pace with the increase in population, he said: "Since the introduction of oleomargarine it does not; in the absence of oleomargarine it would." The laws, he stated, were passed at the instance of politicians and wholesale dealers, not of the farmers. The dairymen did not take any notice of this industry until they had been worked upon by the dealers and politicians. Mr. Carr formerly dealt in oleomargarine but quit because he would not break the prohibitory and coloring laws.

Mr. James H. Seymour of James H. Seymour & Co., butter and cheese merchants, 159 Chambers street, who took a leading part in the movement to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, was also seen. He is regarded as an enemy to the oleomargarine trade. He said: "I sent out some five thousand petitions to dairymen, which were almost all signed and returned to me. A committee composed of Senators Low, Nelson and Thomas took the matter in charge, and at the instance of Senator Low reported the law prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine, which has since been declared unconstitutional. I did not want a prohibitory law, but, of course, as that was what was presented, I favored it. I am willing to have the product sold if it can be sold as oleomargarine and not as butter, and as far as that goes so are the dairymen. What we object to is that a low-priced counterfeit should be sold as butter. I am in favor of the internal revenue license tax, although any license tax is injurious to small men, because it is the only way in which the general government can interfere so as to show where oleomargarine is sold. If left to the separate states, we would be unable to accomplish anything. I favor the coloring law, applied to oleomargarine, but don't see any necessity for applying such a law to real butter. When a man colors real butter he doesn't change it into something which it is not."

A prominent produce merchant who did not wish to have his name mentioned, said: "My position has been harshly criticised by my associates on account of my position on this matter. I am strongly opposed to the license taxes. The tendency of all license taxes is to bear heavily on the small dealers, to wipe them out. A small man cannot set up in business if he has to pay for a license. Such a law as this is worse than the old corn laws in England, because here we have a tariff in addition to this tax, whilst the corn laws were only tariffs on foreign products. Making business expansion by taxation tends from the word go to concentration, as the smaller people are unable to engage in it. Another effect in this case is that a few of the great manufacturers often pay the license of a small dealer so as to get his trade, and thus cut out small manufacturers." This gentleman formerly handled oleomargarine, but stopped it when the prohibitory law was passed.

Mr. Nathaniel Waterbury of 115 Warren street is a wholesale dealer in butterine, etc., whose license for $480 is posted up in his office. He said: "I have three charges filed against me now and some of my friends have more against them. The men who are pushing the law proceed, however, mostly against small dealers; but the manufacture of cheap, wholesome food products cannot be cut off in this way."

Mr. Washington Winsor of Wright & Winsor, produce dealers, 190 Chambers, said: "I am opposed to the license tax on principle. The oleomargarine trade is injurious to my business, but I don't want to invoke the aid of the law to wipe out oleomargarine dealers any more than I would to ruin my competitors in dairy product business. If oleomargarine ought not to be colored then neither should the various grades of butter."

Mr. F. B. Thurber of Thurber, Whyland & Co. said: "I haven't bothered myself about this question for three years very much, as we quit selling oleomargarine when the laws were passed, because we did not want to supply anything to retailers who in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred sell it for what it is not, in defiance of the law. I favor the license tax because it will mark the men who sell oleomargarine and prevent their selling it as butter."

This special license tax of the federal government is another instance of resorting to taxation to build up special privileges. If oleomargarine is an unhealthy food product, its manufacture should be prohibited. If it may be either good or bad, the manufacture of bad oleomargarine should be prohibited. If coloring matter is used to foist upon the public an inferior for a superior article, that should be prohibited. But license taxes discriminate against small capitalists, destroy free competition and create monopolies. That Armour & Co., who, by means of the oleomargarine license law, are centralizing the trade in themselves, will by all the subtle methods known to them endeavor to prevent its repeal, may be expected; but dealers and manufacturers generally must be short-sighted indeed if they silently permit this new precedent for destroying freedom of trade to take root in federal law.

A HEALTH DEPARTMENT MURDER.

A Little Child Dies, Crying in Vain "Mamma, Mamma!"

There lived in East Tenth street, New York city, a laborer, with his wife and three or four children. One of these fell sick with fever, and an eruption appeared. In deep poverty, the father called in a dispensary physician, who said that the child had a light attack of measles and would be "all right" in a few days. A neighbor in the house became frightened about the sickness and told a police officer that there was a case of smallpox in the house. In a very little while an ambulance rolled up, and, without any warning, the sick child was torn from the mother's arms and taken through the cold to a steamboat, and then across the river to the Island hospital for contagious diseases.

The broken-hearted woman managed to get a pass on the next day to visit her child. She went to the island, but was not permitted to see him. The next day she went again, was told that the little patient was convalescing, but that it was not prudent to excite him by allowing the mother to come to his side. On her return home a messenger from the commissioners of charities and correction came to inform her that the boy was dead. She was afterward told by a nurse that at the time of day when she was at the hospital and informed that convalescence had begun, her child was dying and lisping "Mamma, mamma, mamma." That poor woman loved her child as strongly as the wealthiest and most cultured mother of the land can love.

This is not all of the story. The parents were devout Catholics, and could not bear the thought of having the body put into the pauper's burial ground, but wished to place it in consecrated ground. An undertaker appeared, who claimed to have a monopoly in the handling of bodies on the island, and for an exorbitant charge agreed to deliver the remains, sealed according to law, in a metallic case. The poor mother, to eke out a scanty living, added to the earnings of her husband by working as a charwoman every week in a family where her worth was known. She now visited this house, told her grief, and begged the loan of one-half the amount asked for the dead body, that portion which was demanded as cash. The loan was given. The remains were decently interred. A small part of this money lent to her the woman consented, when pressed to do so, to receive as a gift. Her priest, on learning the sorrowful facts, gave some money toward payment of the bill. The woman worked faithfully the one day in every week her services were required, refusing to accept any more as a gratuity, but leaving part of her wages always. In about six months she repaid the loan—the poor, hard-working woman, dwelling in a wretched tenement house, but so saintly that in her sorrow she prayed as did her Master: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

Is Not This Rank Communism?

In the course of his sermon Sunday morning, Rev. T. De Witt Talmage is reported to have said: "I believe that God will make this a perfect world, and then he will divide it up among the faithful. The reason he has not divided it before is because it was not finished. It is far from a perfect world now, or there would not be 2,000,000 people out of work. God is going to make a new apportionment. The vast estates will crack to pieces when they reach the children of the third generation. The grand buildings that are now given up to sin will be museums, gymnasiums and churches." Continuing, he said, God would divide the earth after it is made perfect among the people who remain upon it. But the persons in heaven need not fear loss, for the heavens are to be likewise divided. "But what surprises will be there" quoth the preacher. "A man who has occupied a big place in the church here, and who got into heaven by a tight squeeze—who had to be pulled through by the doorkeeper—will want half the place. He will want a residence in the suburbs, so as to profit by the growth of the place. He will probably be given a second-hand crown."

Sense at Last.

The supreme court of the United States has decided that a person extradited from a foreign country on one charge cannot be tried on a different charge until reasonable time and opportunity have been given for his return to the country from whose asylum he has been taken. This decision is in accordance with the doctrine insisted upon by Great Britain and denied by our government in the controversy over the cases of Winslow and Lawrence. The doctrine has been growing in favor here for some years and may now be regarded as settled.

Private Property in Babies.

A cablegram states that a baby, together with a cradle and a dog, were recently seized for rent by a sheriff's officer in Scotland. "That's nothing!" remarks the Chicago *Sentinel*. "Every baby in the United States is born with a mortgage or tax burden on its back, which it begins to work off as soon as it can toddle."

The Tax Reformer.

The *Tax Reformer*, published by M. Battle, 9 Spruce street, was the first periodical publication established in the interest of a tax upon land values exclusive of improvements. It is published at half a dollar a year. The thirteenth number has just appeared.

THE NEW PARTY.

Encouraging Reports from All Quarters—A Conference of Labor Leaders This Month.

At the headquarters of the labor party in Cooper Union the work of organization goes on satisfactorily, and land and labor clubs are organizing at the rate of about thirty a week. During the present month there will be a conference of labor leaders from all over the country. This conference will appoint state organizers, and systematic work at once will commence. In every state headquarters will be opened for the formation of land and labor clubs, and organization will be proceeded with more systematically than it can be from one central organization. The only duty of these state organizations will be to form clubs.

When a sufficient number of these clubs have been organized to allow a full representation in all sections of the country, a national convention will be called. It is not thought that the movement will be sufficiently developed to call this national convention before next fall. To this convention the clubs will send delegates direct. The convention will choose the name of the party, will make a platform, and will decide whether to nominate or not.

In New York the party shows that it has lost no vigor since the election. Its city convention, which met on Thursday of last week, was numerous and enthusiastic, and, the daily papers are careful to add, somewhat noisy.

One of the speakers who occupied the few minutes of recess said that some of the members present who had never been to a political convention before had marked what appeared to them to be a certain disorder. "These gentlemen," said the speaker, "can believe me when I say that never in my life have I seen a more orderly political convention. The one which nominated Grover Cleveland was a bear garden compared with this."

The number of delegates entitled to sit in the New York convention is 340, being one for every 200 votes cast for Henry George. As might have been expected, the men who appeared that night at Clarendon hall found a body that was good to look upon. They were from all ranks of life, idlers and do-nothings excepted, but mostly "poor men who have to work for a living," men who work to solve political questions as they work at their trades, with a view of accomplishing something. The hall was just about filled, the delegations from the different districts all occupying fixed places. As the different questions were brought up the vote was generally taken by districts, but a most satisfactory feature was that the vote of a single district would often be divided—some for, some against. The "unit rule," by which the opinion of a minority is crushed out by the majority, evidently does not find favor with the new party.

The convention was opened by Mr. McMackin, chairman of the executive committee, with a short address.

Thereupon the meeting went into the election of a temporary chairman, which resulted in the choice of John McMackin.

Frank J. Ferrall was elected vice-chairman, and presided for the remainder of the meeting as Mr. McMackin was engaged on other important business. James P. Archibald was elected temporary secretary.

A committee of one member from each district (each district nominating its own member) was formed to investigate the contests from two or three of the districts. A recess was taken, during which, strange as it may appear to the experienced political "workers," the meeting did not resolve itself into a collection of animated whisky bottles and beer kegs, but listened to several prominent speakers who talked on the Blair education bill, which was generally favored, and the pending militia bill, which was disapproved.

The report of the committee on credentials was adopted as reported to the convention.

The meeting closed with the appointment of a committee on platform, and one on permanent organization, and an adjournment was taken to Thursday of this week.

From among the numerous letters received by the national committee the following are selected as of general interest:

W. H. R., Louisville, Ky.—"I have been agitating the land question for a long time, and getting my friends and acquaintances to read up on the subject. I believe the country is ripe for a new party movement, especially if the party shall propose reforms that go to the root, for these are universal in their application. I shall endeavor to help you all I can, or, rather, to help myself and my fellow men. You have made a good beginning, and we must all put forth all our power and influence to bring about the reforms that must come sooner or later."

Thomas W. Taylor, Homestead, Pa.—"From sad experience of the past I may not be as hopeful as others are that laboring men will redeem themselves from bondage by their own sober, intelligent action. After thirty years of personal slavery to the cotton lords of old and New England, and fifty years of devotion to the cause of unrequited toil, I still retain much of the hopefulness of youth. It is but natural that the workingmen should be devoted to their various organizations, but in these, it seems to me, that they are battling with effects, leaving the causes to reproduce like effects indefinitely. For fifty years I have earnestly protested against the drones taking all the honey, and yet I have been compelled to accept a little bees'-wax for my share, because the other workers seemed content with the same."

W. W. B., Vincennes, Indiana.—"Here the cause is progressing. It is estimated that the following to be relied on exceeds 300, but besides these there are many sympathizers. A land and labor club will be organized here shortly, and it is proposed to enter the field of politics in May with a single candidate for one or other of the city offices."

Thomas M. Brady, Boston, Mass.: The workers everywhere are ready and anxious to strike for legislative power.

Owen McDonald, Sharon, Mercer Co., Pa.: We have a good many members already, both democrats and republicans, all taking an active part. We are going to work in earnest, and by 1888 shall have Western Pennsylvania well organized.

A. R. Wright, Rome, Georgia: The old land is not dead yet; yea, there is amazing vitality in it. The overthrow of land monopoly is certain in the near future; and the proposition that one generation may put its vices, corruptions, and follies on succeeding generations is simply monstrous. Awakening intelligence will throw off these shackles before the expiration of the nineteenth century.

N. S., Logan, Ohio: One man says: "I am in sympathy with the movement, and would like to join, but, to tell the truth, I am afraid." There could be only one answer to that: "You are a slave already." Others are more courageous, and we shall send you good news soon.

J. F. Busche, Jr., New Haven, Connecticut: The matter of land and labor clubs was regularly discussed at the New England meeting of the socialistic labor party at Meriden on Christmas day. Will have conversation with you about it when next I visit New York, which may be within a week."

J. C. P., Allentown, Pennsylvania: I will begin the agitation in the labor organizations where I am acquainted and start the ball in this locality. Labor here is so thoroughly intimidated by political and employing bosses that it will require hard work. Already I have been urging the members to educate themselves on this question, hoping that it will lead to a proper exercise of the elective franchise.

U. T., Cannon Falls, Minnesota: My friend, —— wants a copy of "Progress and Poverty." I will hand him your circulars and let him wiggle. Mr. —— is a defeated candidate for the legislature. He will now have time to investigate the principles of the new party. It is a waste of money to give away printed matter. The people pay for their information.

James S. Hook, Augusta, Georgia: I have been profoundly impressed by Mr. George's views touching the proper ownership of the soil. I am satisfied he is right, and that his scheme of appropriating economic rent to the support of government is entirely feasible, and, in the way proposed by him, made easily practicable without any unnecessary shock or strain. And so far from injuring capital, it would in the end benefit it, while emancipating labor from its many grievous burdens. But from long habit of accepting the established order, the people will be somewhat slow in taking in this new, and to their apprehension, thoroughly radical idea. Yet if this grand movement is conducted discreetly and without passion, but with dauntless purpose to succeed, a great social and political revolution will sweep over this entire country that will strike the chains from the limbs of honest toil, make glad the hearts of the people, and give a newer and grander lease of life to our free institutions.

Geo. W. Appel, Secretary National Metal Workers' Union, Baltimore, Maryland: I will have the Clarendon Hall platform published in our official organ, the *Hammer*, and will call on all locals to organize in this movement.

THE RAILWAY POWER.

SHALL CONGRESS REGULATE COMMERCE BETWEEN THE STATES.

The Present Theory of Railway Management—Monstrous Favoritism and Oppression—The Old Turnpike Idea in Early Railway Legislation.

The theory on which railroads are now managed is that they are the private property of those in possession, who are authorized to charge the public whatever they choose for the service rendered. In pursuance of this theory the policy of the companies is "to make the charge as high as the traffic will bear," while making from time to time such changes in the rates as may meet competition of rivals, reward friends or punish enemies. This enormous power has been concentrated in the hands of a few men, who exercise it not merely in disregard of public interest, but with equal disregard of the property rights of a large number of those who furnish the capital to build and equip the roads.

The result is that the entire internal commerce of this country is to-day directed and controlled by a few men who have formulated for themselves a complete system for the exercise of such control. These men not merely usurp sovereign power, but even some powers denied by most writers on jurisprudence to sovereigns. That a government may raise money by taxation to the extent of its necessities has never been denied; but no government has a right to levy taxes on one citizen for the benefit of another citizen.

Yet the railroad managers unhesitatingly exercise this tremendous power. The constitutional right of Congress to levy taxes for what is called "protection" has been denied by many wise and able men. The railway managers, however, boldly practice a similar system, and openly claim a right to do so. A railroad attorney addressing a congressional committee in opposition to the Reagan bill recited a request made by a cooperage firm for a special rate to New York, lower than that given to other shippers, in order that such firm might successfully compete with English and Norwegian coopers, and he complained that the pending bill would prevent railroads from exercising any discretion in such cases. It never appeared to occur, either to the attorney or the congressmen he addressed, that such an exercise of governmental power to encourage or forbid exports should not be intrusted to private hands. Neither did they seem to see that such a power so lodged would almost certainly be abused.

That it is abused most outrageously numerous instances prove. In 1877 the grain trade of New York amounted to over 100,000,000 bushels; yet two houses largely controlled it. The investigation of the Hepburn committee showed that the enormous advantage enjoyed by two firms over all smaller competitors was due to the fact that a freight rate from the West from three and a half to five cents per hundred less than other houses could get had been given to the favored firm. A similar favoritism has built up that great monopoly known as the Standard Oil company. The secret contract made between the four great trunk lines and that company in 1872 stipulated that "the railroads will at all times co-operate with the Standard Oil company to maintain its business against injury by competition, and the railroad will raise or lower the rates for such times and to such extent as may be necessary to overcome competition."

This illegal and secret contract, whereby the highways were suddenly closed against every rival enterprise, at once bankrupted every other producer and created probably the most lucrative monopoly the world has ever seen. In 1879 this company refined 95 per cent. of the 350,000,000 gallons of coal oil placed on the market, and the single item of reduced freights in the form of rebates yielded it a profit of $10,151,218 in eighteen months.

One result of this is that the sagacious merchant must always take into consideration the possibility that his competitor may secure privately a more favorable rate, and also the risk of a sudden and arbitrary change in even the published rates. If he complains he is punished by discrimination against him, and so he obsequiously frowns upon the representatives of a power over which his right as a citizen gives him no control.

But the exercise of this imperial power by railway managers does not stop at undermining the manhood and self-respect of the mercantile class. It boldly lays its hands on government: it forces or defeats legislation; candidates for office look to it for assistance in their election, and the public-spirited and ambitious young man who dares to defy this great power finds his way to places of trust and honor as effectively blocked as though he were an unfranchised alien. The press, also, sometimes through corruption, but more frequently, perhaps, because of alliance with or interest in measures and candidates subject to railway influence, fails to protest against the dangerous usurpation that is undermining our system of government and making popular freedom impotent against a power created by the people's representatives.

Nor does the evil stop here. The secrecy essential to such a management of our railway system offers opportunity to the inside managers to swindle or "freeze out" stock and bond holders, and tends to the constant concentration of these tremendous and dangerous powers over business and government into a steadily decreasing number of hands.

The remedy for this condition of affairs is government control of management and rates, accompanied by the fullest publicity.

To the proposal to apply this remedy, the railway managers oppose the declaration that such an attempt would violate the obligation of a contract, invade vested rights and confiscate private property. In order to consider this claim we must understand just what a railroad company is, how it comes into existence, whence and for what purpose it derives its powers, and what are its duties as well as its rights.

We must at the very beginning of this inquiry dismiss any idea that the railroad company has any special rights because it is a corporation. A corporation is simply an artificial person created by the sovereign power. There are two kinds, public and private. The first is an instrumentality of government exercising governmental powers delegated by the sovereign, such as a city or town. All other corporations are private, and are essentially associations or partnerships empowered to act by a corporate name, to have succession, a common seal, etc. In short, they are artificial persons created by the State, and having less instead of more rights than an individual or natural person. Manufacturing, library and railway companies are private corporations.

Any special rights conferred by the State on such an artificial person might have been conferred upon a natural person. The artificial person has such a right, not because it is a corporation, but because the State has specifically granted it certain powers and authorized it to do certain acts.

To a railroad company the government usually temporarily transfers, under limitations, the exercise of the sovereign's power of eminent domain, just as it has done in times past to corporations or individuals who desired to dig canals or build turnpikes. It likewise, as in such cases, gives to the company the right to take tolls. In respect to the eminent domain, it is sufficient to remark that a railroad company cannot possibly claim under this franchise any other power than the right to acquire, *for the use of the community*, against the will of the owner, such private property as is demanded by the public convenience. It is a fundamental principle of the law that the sovereign himself cannot take private property for private use.

Thus far a railroad differs in no important respect from a turnpike paved with iron and ties instead of stone. Some of the first acts authorizing railroads regarded them in this light, and even provided for toll gates every ten miles and named a maximum toll. The nature of the business, however, required that one company should own and operate the road, and hence the State granted to railroad companies another right rarely granted to canal and turnpike companies, that of common carriers. These are all the rights of a public character that a railroad company has; and it has these, not because it is a corporation, but because they have been specifically granted to it with the full understanding that the community will thereby be served.

Long before railways were invented the principles of law applicable to common carriers, to highways and to the franchise of charging toll, were firmly settled, well understood and frequently applied to canals, bridges, ferries and turnpikes. The common carrier is bound to furnish equal facilities to all of his customers, and his charges must be reasonable. He must name his price at his peril; and, if it is unreasonable, the customer is entitled to damages, precisely as if the carrier had captiously refused to carry his goods. A similar demand has also been legally made that tolls on canals and highways shall be reasonable; and in many cases a maximum rate has been named in the act granting the franchise. Whether tolls considered reasonable at one time shall be considered as reasonable forever, is a question about which courts have rendered conflicting decisions; but that the question was one for judicial decision has never been denied. The legislatures, however, are competent to furnish the courts rules of evidence, and to declare by statute the charges to be considered as reasonable.

It is therefore a mistake to suppose that a railroad may regulate its charges upon those business principles practised by citizens in the conduct of their personal affairs. The claim of a right "to make the charge as high as the traffic will bear" is untenable. The road must be conducted and the charges regulated in such a manner as will, in the judgment of the sovereign, best promote the object for which it was created—to a furnish a convenient and necessary means of transportation. The profits of the owners must not take precedence of this consideration. They are entitled to fair profits on actual and necessary investments, but they are not entitled to mulct the public to pay for waste, blunders or fraud, and the public is entitled to constant reductions as the traffic increases, thus enabling decreased charges to pay the full profit to which the investors can lay just claim.

The right of the government to intervene to secure these ends cannot justly be denied. As to the policy of such intervention, there can be no question, in view of the fact that a few individuals have become possessed of all our great highways; and thus these individuals, and these alone, have power to move freight or carry passengers by modern methods. These men have misused their power to defraud smaller owners, and they have, through their usurped control, gathered great fortunes. Vanderbilt accumulated over $100,000,000 in twenty years, Gould $75,000,000 in fifteen years, the Central Pacific syndicate, with an investment of $12,500, $186,000,000 in fourteen years. That is to say, the managers of these three systems secured in the course of a few years the enormous sum of $358,000,000 for their personal use. Thus we see that this enormous power is in the hands of men greedy for gain and reckless in their methods. These men claim and exercise the power not only to lay whatever tax they please on transportation, but to protect or break down industries at will.

Having thus established the legal and moral right of government to interfere in the management of our modern highways, it seems hardly necessary to argue in behalf of the expediency of such interference. The question now is, whether Congress shall retain its constitutional power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," or permit this power to be usurped by a few railway magnates. It is to meet the necessities of that vast and well nigh voiceless majority of the American people, who have but one answer to make to such questions, that state control is advocated. This government is the people's government, and no men, rich or poor, shall be permitted long to usurp its rights or defy its power.

J. M. MASON.

Charlestown, W. Va., Jan. 1.

A TYPICAL MILLIONAIRE.

The New President of the New York and New England Road.

The Buffalo *Express* says of Jabez A. Bostwick, recently elected president of the New York and New England railroad, that he is worth ten or fifteen millions, accumulated in a life time of less than fifty years. He was born in Ohio, and early in life went to Cleveland, where he engaged in the hardware business. His health failing him, he went to Lexington, Ky., where he met J. B. Tilford, a banker, who took him into his employ and eventually made him a cashier of his bank. From Lexington, having accumulated some capital, Bostwick went to Covington, opposite Cincinnati, and became a dealer in cotton and grain. Later on he removed to Cincinnati, and finally came to New York in January, 1866, where he embarked in the cotton business. After a time he engaged in the petroleum trade as a receiver of the refined oil which then came principally from Cleveland. It was a fierce struggle with other receivers for the control of the trade, and for a considerable time he was engaged in a sharp business battle with the Rockefellers, who then had small offices down in the gloomiest part of Pearl street. After a time the rivals came to an understanding; and other houses being persuaded or coerced into joining the enterprise, the result was one of the most powerful, one of the most defiant, and at the same time one of the meanest monopolies that ever laid unscrupulous hands on the trade of this country, the Standard Oil company.

Much of Mr. Bostwick's vast wealth is due to his prominence in a corporation which, beginning, it is alleged, in the days of Jim Fisk, with the Erie railroad, has secured rebates on freight rates against all opposition and new stands as the dominant power in a mighty interest, after having taught other monopolists how to subvert the commercial liberties of American citizens, and heaped up offenses against the natural code of ethics for which the whirligig of time will surely bring in his revenges.

Mr. Bostwick built the great cotton warehouses at Staten Island, where 100,000 bales can be stored. He is engaged in a project for conveying steam heat to dwellings in New York; he is a director in a growing monopoly in the cotton seed oil business; he is president of the New York and New England railroad, and though he has retired from any active participation in the business of the Standard Oil company, he is still one of its largest stockholders. He lives in fine style on Fifth avenue, and is a member of the Union league, which numbers not a few successful traders in oil and speculators in stocks and food.

Go West!

ST. PAUL, Neb., Jan. 10.—Nebraska folks have been trying to dodge pauperism by coming west, but it is like the rest of the country. A small fraction are rich and the rest poor. Our farms that we got of the government are mortgaged. Heretofore our public lands have been the resort of people banished from society on account of poverty, but even that resort is now nearly a thing of the past.

JASON B. PACKARD.

THE NEGRO IN THE SOUTH.

INDUSTRIOUS AND LIGHT-HEARTED, BUT POOR.

An Exodus to the West—The Cause of Dissatisfaction—The Land-owner and the Merchant Takes the Whole Proceeds of a Year's Labor—Shiftless Poor Whites.

JACKSONVILLE, Fla., Jan. 10.—The colored man of to-day who resides in the southern states is not the creature of twenty-five years ago. Neither is he in the lower depths of ignorance and degradation, as many philanthropic men and women in the north seem to think. For three months I have studied negro life in the south in various localities in all its phases. Once upon a time I pictured the southern negro of the present day as a lazy, shiftless creature. In reality I find him an honest, sober and hard-working citizen. During the past three months I have seen nine intoxicated men in the south, but there was not a negro among them. In Atlanta, Savannah, Jacksonville and other cities in the south I find that nine-tenths of the idle men and loafers are of the white race. The negroes are the workers. They are to-day the bone and sinew of the south. The southern white man of the poorer class seems to hold labor in disdain. In the city of Jacksonville I visited the river wharves and docks, and saw an occasional white man working along with the negroes. I talked with these white men, and to my surprise learned that none of them were from the south. They were northern men, who were not above working as day laborers along with the negroes. The best carpenters, painters and machinists in the south to-day are colored men. The native whites of the south who are not men of wealth or engaged in profitable business enterprises are engaged in liquor selling, running cheap eating houses and filling like occupations. Few of them are day laborers or mechanics. Idlers from the white race are seen upon every side, but the negro seems to be always at work, and happily at work, for he whistles and sings as he labors, and his work is a pleasure to him. He never grumbles or complains. The chronic faultfinder, the man who harps on the question of hard times, lack of work and scarcity of money, appears to be the southern white man. Why these things are so I have not been able to learn, but the facts remain, nevertheless.

There appears to be no discontent among the southern negroes. They have considerable "voice" in political affairs. There are negro policemen in Atlanta, and every mail carrier in Jacksonville is a colored man. In Fernandina, Fla., all the city officials are negroes, from mayor to constable, and the city is well governed, and peace and prosperity reigns. As to the matter of schools, the negroes have the best school-houses in some localities—so much the best that the white tax-payers are inclined to shake their heads and grumble. Their teachers are educated colored folk of their own choosing, and the young colored people are making good progress in education. Many of the colored business men are getting rich. In this city men like J. H. Thompson, Tony Smith and May Green are amassing fortunes in legitimate business owing to their shrewd heads and industry, to the discomfiture of many white merchants. The negro is needed here in the south. It would be a poor country without him. There would be no one to work if he was absent. They are owners of their own homes in many instances, and to all appearances are happy, prosperous and contented.

While these conditions of affairs exist as I have stated there is going on an exodus of negroes to the western states. Over 3,000 have already left North Carolina alone. It is not an organized movement, yet there is a manifest method in it. I can see but one valid reason for this exodus. The negro is not virtually a lazy, shiftless individual. He will work, and work hard, if paid for his labor. All about him here in the south is a lack of thriftiness and industry. He has little to inspire him to labor for a home when his white brother is an indolent creature, who prefers to wander idly about the streets rather than work. The negro wants an air of prosperity all about him. He seeks it in the west, and thus I can readily see a reason for the western exodus. The condition of white labor in the south is largely the cause of the depressing condition of all classes in the south. The negro is poorly paid for his labor as compared with the laborer in the north, and the white laborers and mechanics in the south are the ones to blame.

There are other reasons why the colored man should seek pastures new, notwithstanding the fact that he is more prosperous here than his shiftless white brother. In every southern state there are laws on the statute books which give the white landlord almost absolute control of the interest of the colored renter or laborer. The "crop mortgage" system is only a legalized form of confiscation. A colored man is compelled to pay an exorbitant price for the use of land, to begin with—often as much per acre as it could be bought for by a white man. In order to get provisions for his family while his cotton is being raised he must pledge his whole crop in advance, and pay for everything he buys at rates two or three times as large as those which are asked in the regular channels of trade. At the end of the year he is indeed fortunate if he can settle with his landlord and storekeeper by turning over to them all the proceeds of his labor, and more frequently he finds himself still in debt after such a transfer.

These land shylocks of the south say that the colored man is free, and he has nobody but himself to blame if his crop is insufficient to pay for what has been furnished him under conditions to which he has voluntarily agreed. They advise him to drive better bargains, do less buying on credit and practice economy to the very letter. There is more poetry than truth in such a proposition. The negro is not a free agent in the transaction. He is entirely at the mercy of those who fix the contract. His absolute necessities deprive him of all liberty of choice. He must have land to cultivate and must pay an exorbitant price for it. He must have food and clothing for his wife and children, and he must pay the merchant a double price for the same. This is the prevailing rule throughout the south. I do not speak of any special case. The law is on the side of the white man. The courts are with the white man, and so is public sentiment to a certain extent. The negro is a slave still in a certain sense. He is not treated as is the white man, and here lies the secret of success and prosperity in the great south. Her whole labor system is liable to pull to pieces for want of wise and timely action in the direction of assuring the colored people that the wrongs under which they are suffering shall be removed. This is the cause of the immigration to the west. The negro mechanics and laborers in the towns and cities are prosperous and contented, as I have stated. The agricultural class, those who raise cotton and till the soil, are the dissatisfied ones, and I have shown the reasons why they are inclined to leave the south in large numbers and settle in the west, southwest and northwest. The white men of the south will never, as long as the world stands, perform the field labor now performed by the negro. The colored man must do this work or it will not be done. It is to the interest of the south to retain her colored population, every man of it. Without the negro the south is doomed to failure. She will never be prosperous without his aid, and if the south were wise she would hasten to correct her laws and look upon the negro as her salvation.

WILL M. CLEMENS.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
25 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE:
One year, $2.50; Six months, $1.25.

Entered at the post office, New York, as second class matter.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1887.

LET THEM BE REMOVED.

The murder of Roundsman Robert A. Montgomery by Patrolman Rourke of the police force was not only a shocking and cowardly assassination, but it brings out in the strongest possible light the nature of the control exercised over the force by the board of police commissioners.

Rourke murdered Montgomery because the latter caught him half-drunk and away from his beat and told him he would report him. He had already reported Rourke several times, and the latter had threatened to kill him if he did so again.

It appears that during the four and a half years of Rourke's service as a patrolman he has had charges preferred against him twenty-six times, frequently for serious offenses. Again and again he has been brought before the board, and he has been invariably dismissed with little, if any, punishment. The testimony of the officers at his station is that he has been for a long time habitually under the influence of liquor.

How could such a man remain on the police force? The answer is very simple, and the fact that it surprises no one shows how deeply this community has sunk into the mire of criminally controlled politics. Rourke was retained on the police force because he had political influence. Having that, he could neglect his duties, desert his beat, frequent saloons, and perhaps club an innocent citizen now and then with impunity.

The people of this country are constantly told that we have a non-partisan police board. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have, instead, a thoroughly partisan board, in which both of the old parties are equally represented, and in which all of the abhorrent influences of either have full sway. Men are appointed guardians of the police through the influence of politicians who are closely associated with dive keepers, roughs, gamblers and others of the criminal class. Once appointed, they are frequently kept on the force despite the grossest breaches of discipline and the exhibition of the most ruffianly qualities.

Rourke is an example of this. He ought to have been dismissed years ago. No one knew this better than the police commissioners, who were responsible for licensing this drunken ruffian to go about the streets armed with club and revolver and wearing the uniform of a guardian of the peace. To them he owed his ability to commit the crime for which he must answer. On their guilty heads rests the responsibility for this shedding of innocent blood by the drunkard they knowingly commissioned to carry deadly weapons as an officer of the law. The police commissioners of New York are morally, though not legally, responsible for Officer Montgomery's death.

But they are legally responsible for continuing such a man as Rourke on the police force, and there should be no delay in bringing charges against them with a view to their removal by the governor. We hope that Mr. Hewitt will soon be well enough to begin the discharge of the duties of the office he sought. This case demands his immediate attention. He and Gov. Hill have both professed a desire to do some practical good for the working people. Here is their opportunity. The workingmen of New York will now see whether or not these two men will put into operation the existing machinery of law to relieve this community of a board that keeps drunken ruffians on the police force.

A POSER FOR MANNING.

Congressman Weaver of Iowa has secured the adoption by the house of a series of resolutions directing the secretary of the treasury to report whether any of the sundry civil appropriation of the act of Aug. 4, 1886, has been expended in issuing treasury notes of large denomination in lieu of smaller notes cancelled or retired; how many one and two dollar notes have been cancelled since the act, and by what authority; how many were mutilated, and whether notes of like denomination were issued in their stead. As it has become customary for secretaries of the treasury to cancel one and two dollar notes and issue larger ones in their place, Mr. Manning may find it inconvenient to respond, especially as the act of Aug. 4 prohibited the use of any of the appropriation for that purpose.

LAW AND ORDER.

The anarchist cases have proved that while organized workingmen are as a class in favor of due administration of law, the society saving class is at heart a lawless class. Spies and his associates were convicted by a jury chosen in a manner so shamelessly illegal that it would be charity to suspect the judge of incompetency.

The accusation was murder, by an explosive thrown by an unknown person between whom and the defendants no connection was shown. The meeting at which it was thrown was peaceable and lawful. The mayor so declared it; and although the chief of police agreed with him, hardly was the mayor out of sight when the chief, at the head of a squad of policemen, ordered it to disperse. Then the explosive was thrown.

The only evidence against the defendants in connection with this meeting was that they were present and that some of them spoke. Yet this jury, many of whom confessed to fixed opinions against the accused, found a verdict of murder.

Upon this the labor organizations, although opposed in opinion to the defendants, raised a fund to vindicate the law. How different the position of the "better classes." No well informed lawyer can defend the conviction upon legal grounds. Laymen may think the proceeding lawful because outward forms of law were observed, but the lawyers who defend it do so solely on the ground that "anarchy," and "communism," and "socialism" must be stamped out. They concede that it was a mere subterfuge to punish men for opinion's sake, but urge that the opinions are dangerous to society; and when a layman is confronted with the truth that this trial was a legal farce, he falls back upon the same plea. An opinion more dangerous to society than that men who teach unpopular doctrines may be silenced by illegal convictions of infamous crimes could hardly be conceived.

Which then is the law and order class?—the class that demands a lawful trial for victims of popular hate and fear, and out of its slender means contributes to that end, or the class that uses the machinery of the law to mangle the law itself in an endeavor to silence doctrinal adversaries?

THE COUNTY CONVENTION.

Last week the first convention for permanent organization of the land and labor party in the county of New York was held at Clarendon hall.

The body was an intelligent, orderly and earnest gathering. The delegates were elected at primaries in the assembly districts on the basis of one delegate for every 200 votes cast by the party at the last election. The business of the first night was confined to temporary organization, a fact that perplexes practical politicians accustomed, by means of the cut and dried process, to rapid preliminary proceedings.

One feature of deep significance was the unanimous election of a colored man as temporary chairman. True democracy overrides every form of prejudice—that of race as well as that of religion. To people who have made themselves believe that the labor party is a class party, the spectacle of a convention composed of wage workers and self-employers in both business and professional life, presided over by one of a class that is relegated to back seats even in churches, must have been startling. In so far as this party is a class party it is, as was reiterated in the campaign, a party of the class that works, regardless of race, religion or social condition.

Permanent organization has now reached a point where a strong third party in this country is assured. With the principle that gave it birth and vigor in the campaign here, its influence will extend rapidly over the country, and ultimate success be near at hand.

VESTED RIGHTS IN PRIVILEGES.

When Judge Peckham held that the corporate charter of the Broadway railroad was constitutionally repealed, he went on, for the purpose of protecting bond holders, to decide that the right of way the company had acquired through Broadway was property, and as such subject to the lien of the mortgage.

It is clear enough that the property of a corporation cannot be legislated away. The repeal of the Broadway charter could not deprive the stockholders or creditors of tracks or rolling stock, nor perhaps of a right of way acquired by purchase or otherwise from private owners. But here is a right of way through a municipal thoroughfare, acquired under the law of eminent domain by a private corporation which is now constitutionally dead. Yet this right of way is to be treated as an asset on which bondholders have a lien, and which, logically, is to be divided among the stockholders of the dead corporation after the mortgage is satisfied.

According to this decision, if the legislature should decide to repeal the charters of the various city railroads which have received back their capital many times told, their right of way over Third avenue, Sixth avenue, Fourth avenue, and the other avenues and cross streets, would survive as an asset like the rails, rolling stock, buildings, and horses.

The fallacy of vested rights in public privileges has been carried to an absurd length already; but in view of the aggressiveness of transportation monopolies, this decision of Judge Peckham carries it to a point where it may well excite alarm. It is fortunate that the decision was made just before instead of just after the constitutional convention.

THE PLEA FOR WORK.

Eugene Lawrence, after saying in *Harper's Weekly* that a society which would provide work for all is something still to be sought for, asks how we shall see to it that no one suffers for want of work. The question is easily answered.

The most obvious method of providing work is to destroy every product as soon as it is completed. That would make plenty of work in rebuilding, to say nothing of the work required in destroying. An equally sensible, though more complex and somewhat less perfect plan, might be found in an extension of the protective principle. The existing tariff is wholly inadequate. What is needed is a blockade. By excluding both foreign goods and foreign laborers we might save all our work for ourselves. Then there is the drudge-or-drown plan, better known after the name of the inventor, as the "See" method, which it is proposed to introduce in Westchester county. It would be more popular with the better classes, for it is as simple as the destructive method, more effective than the protective, and cheaper than either. Moreover, it is penal in character—an important consideration, since, notwithstanding the fact that idleness among the masses is scarcely known when work is to be had, the social pharisee persistently regards it as a crime.

But, seriously, no society or ingenious plan for providing work is necessary. Opportunities for work are not scarce. They are said to be scarce because one part of the community levies toll upon the other part for the privilege of using natural materials—a toll that grows with the growth and wants of the community until it becomes, in many instances, prohibitory. Let every one have free access to idle land—that which is in and about the city of his birth, as well as that thousands of miles beyond—and the plea for work will be heard no more.

LONG AND SHORT HAULS.

The principal opposition to the pending inter-state commerce bill is based on the claim that its long and short haul clause will drive the through business to the Canadian Pacific. That road, these objectors say, is subjected to none of the restrictions of American legislation and will not be bound to publish its rates or be perplexed by any problem of long or short hauls, while it can make bargains with shippers it is its interest to attract.

This statement is no argument against the bill. The Canadian roads cannot carry freight at a lower actual cost than roads on this side of the line. Their owners are not likely to consent to any permanent policy that will deprive them of a fair profit on the present worth of their investment. If the owners of American roads are satisfied with such returns they need not fear Canadian competition. If, on the other hand, they seek to obtain dividends on inflated values or on capital long ago sunk through mismanagement or misfortune they demand what they are not entitled to; and if Canadian competition can force the railway kings to abandon the attempt to impose an unjust tax on our people, it will be a good thing.

The bitterness with which the railroads fight the clause preventing discrimination between the charges per mile for long hauls and short hauls is a confession of unfair dealing. They have either been carrying through freight at a loss and taxing local business to make good the deficiency, or else they have been making an extortionate profit on their short hauls. In either case the small shippers who furnish the freight for the short hauls have been unjustly treated and are entitled to legal protection against any further imposition. Yet the railway managers have the audacity to ask the congressional representatives of these very people to permit them to continue their present system.

The men who think about this question are not likely to be scared by this bugaboo of Canadian competition. It will not affect the votes of congressmen. If the pending bill is defeated it will be due to the selfish interests of the numerous railway owners and attorneys in congress, and to the "practical arguments" of the powerful railway lobby, furnished with an immense sum of money, that has gathered at Washington for the express purpose of preventing the passage of any measure designed to check the blackmailing power of the little clique of millionaires who now control the leading railroads of the country.

A PLAGUE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES.

The refusal of the republican United States senators to vote for the confirmation of James C. Matthews as recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia is an amusing proof of the hypocrisy of that party's pretence of unselfish devotion to the uplifting of the colored race. It so happens that Matthews is a colored democrat, and the republican politicians say plainly that they cannot afford to teach the colored people that there is any other avenue to political promotion than that of republican success. Of course, if the republicans really desired to benefit the colored race, instead of desiring that the race shall benefit them, they would rejoice at the prospect of a competition between the two parties for the votes of colored men. So far is this from being the case that the very thought of a colored democrat infuriates them, and they feel that a negro has no right to be anything else than a republican. And yet, though they set up this claim to an absolute ownership of the negro vote, they have rarely, when in power, given office of importance to colored men.

Among democratic leaders there is a great deal of this same feeling toward white workingmen. They have declared for so long that they are the only friends of the laboring people that they view any attempt of the latter to set up a party of their own, not only with alarm, but with genuine indignation. It is true that they have never done half so much for the white working people as the republicans did for the negro, in releasing him from slavery and giving him the ballot, but they have somehow come to feel that they have done wonders for labor, and that workingmen are base ingrates if they do not vote for the candidates named by the democratic bosses. The moment the workingmen attempted to elect a candidate of their own the democrats of this city showed precisely the same peculiar bitterness toward them that the republican senators have displayed toward Matthews.

Both incidents are revelations that workingmen of all colors ought to comprehend. Their proper sentiment toward the two old parties is "a plague on both your houses!"

THE NEW PARTY IN THE SOUTH.

A valued correspondent in Texas writes feelingly of the danger that the new party will encounter in the south through any attempt to include the negro voters within its ranks. He states with great force the prejudice prevailing there against any effort that threatens to restore negro rule. Our correspondent, who is thoroughly in sympathy with the movement for the restoration of the ownership of the land to the people, thinks that northern people have no conception of the strength of this feeling in the south.

Perhaps he is right, yet there is a very thorough appreciation in the north of the monstrous crime perpetrated by the republican managers when they commissioned conscienceless adventurers to go south, and in the name of liberty, teach the newly enfranchised blacks that thievery was the legitimate end and aim of political power. Such men can understand, even if they do not sympathize with the violent southern prejudice against white men who seek an alliance with the negroes for political purposes.

Yet, after all, the miseries of carpet bag government were not so much due to the ignorance of the blacks as to evil leadership. No similar consequences would necessarily follow an attempt by southern men to lead them in a movement guided by principle, and aiming at honest ends. In fact the hope of the south, as well as of the north, lies in the exercise of just such leadership. The present condition of affairs in the southern states cannot continue. Except in a few districts the new generation of colored voters, who never were slaves, are acquiring a sufficient education to enable them to understand something of their political rights. Their votes will some day not only be cast, but be counted. As soon as the present absurd division of the people into two parties representing dead issues ceases, there will come a division among southern whites that cannot fail to draw the blacks into politics, and once more make them an effective force.

The question with those who seek the overthrow of industrial slavery is not whether this force shall be exerted, but whether it shall be exerted for or against us. Let our friends in the South not delude themselves with the idea that when the final struggle comes the monopolists will not use the negro vote if they can. In this city, where those who pose as the saviors of society are given to talking scornfully about the proletariat and to denouncing the criminal classes as unworthy of the suffrage, the very poor and the criminals are bribed or coerced into voting for the candidate of the rich. That district of New York city which is most noted for dives and criminal haunts gave the largest proportionate vote to Mr. Hewitt. Every criminal under indictment, every suspected person under police surveillance and every purchasable man in this city voted last November against the candidate of the workingmen.

The question at the south is whether by the educational influence of an active propaganda the colored voters shall be lifted above such influences, or whether they shall be left a densely ignorant mass, to be used by employers to break down all attempts by organized labor to raise wages, and, in the struggle at the polls, to be voted by the landlord class like so many sheep, in opposition to the movement for the abolition of industrial slavery and the rescue of our people from monopoly rule.

Our correspondent will see that THE STANDARD understands the causes of the prejudice against the negro in politics, but we nevertheless must say that the time has come when that prejudice must be patriotically put aside, if the southern states are to participate in the great movement for the relief of the whole American people from a burden that already presses with intolerable and ever increasing force on north and south alike.

MANY questions are asked, especially by those in the business of what is called "practical politics," as to what relation the labor party and those who wish for far-reaching and beneficent reforms, as shown in the vote cast in New York at the late election, will bear toward the existing great parties.

BEFORE considering these inquiries, it would be well to make one or two of our own in regard to this business called "practical politics" and the men who follow the calling. In New York "practical politics" means a profession, which, under existing conditions, no respectable father would care to have his son pursue. It is one degree below the house of correction and another above the penitentiary. It means the rum shop, the gambling hell, the slugging den and the slum. It means lying, hypocrisy, servitude and shame. It means the sinking of manhood to the servitude of a boss. Is it any wonder that a proud, anxious father, seeking a career for his son, should shrink from the associations and temptations which "practical politics" implies?

BUT there are prizes! Yes, to be sure! A shrievalty, an office of record, a seat in the legislature, and, if you have money enough to pay the assessment, the bench. If you wish to administer justice, and hold the scales of eternal right between man and his creator, you may have a chance by paying twenty-five thousand dollars assessment and seeing the boys well supplied with tobacco and drink-money. But the prizes are few, and come stained and reeking with shame. What of the blanks? Is there any class of our fellow-citizens more worthy of sympathy—the sympathy, the pity we give to those who are compelled to live lives wanting self-respect—than the shoal of office-holders who drift from the custom-house to the City hall, and follow the commands of the "leaders?"

WE HAVE had corruscating examples of these "leaders" in Tweed, Sweeny, Connolly, McCu[illegible], Cardozo, Barnard and others. Some have left us, but their memory remains, and their example bears fruit in Jachne and McQuade. When it is necessary to make an appointment to an important place, the saints who are screaming reform in November and carrying Tammany banners in "the cause of good government," take a gambler and a pugilist like "Fatty" Walsh. And as practical politics go, and considering what appointments have been and might have been made, we are inclined to think that "Fatty" is much above the average. There is no reason why he should not buy a diamond pin and run for sheriff next time, as he probably will. In fact, it was only by making "Fatty" warden that he was prevented from going to congress. The wardenship goes to "Fatty" and the seat in congress to a blue-blooded relative of the Tammany leader. This is "practical politics!"

AND this is what we are to accept year after year, and with it diptheria, scarlet fever and small-pox for our children because of sanitary conditions arising from misgovernment. Of course there are redeeming features. We can have, as the election approaches, a speech from the mayor, or Mr. Depew, or Sunset Cox, on the "dignity of labor" and "the duty of recognizing labor." These speeches are sure to be eloquent. But when it comes down to business—to "practical politics"—these musical talkers would prefer a half hour's talk with "Fatty" Walsh or Mike Cregan to all the oratory of Demosthenes.

WHAT then, to return to our initial question, are we to do, we laboring men, concerning the great political parties, whose "organizations" heretofore have controlled New York and other cities? Shall we hold off and accept tenders from the democratic and republican leaders? These tenders will be sure to come. About the first of next September we shall have Judge Tappan, Edward Cooper, Surrogate Rollins, L. P. Morton, or some other of the leaders, full of love for the laboring man, and pregnant with plans, remedies, legislation, expressed in finely turned phrases. The laboring men have only to throw their votes for one side or the other, and all that party influence can do will be done to ameliorate labor. Has not Sunset Cox shown his sympathy with labor, really making a speech in November promising all kinds of legislation in its behalf? True, Sunset is not a serious person. No one thought him serious in November, and no one thinks so now. Sunset will have his joke. But what Sunset said then will be said again, and no sooner said than forgotten. We have heard a good deal about Sunset's humor, his right to two salaries, his stars from the Sultan, but not a word in regard to "legislative action in the interest of labor" since he was seeking labor votes for congress.

AS IT WAS, so it will be! Labor must hold its own, must organize, must expect discouragement, disappointment, treachery. It will only be felt in politics when it educates the influences without which "practical politics" would pass away. The remedy is in the hands of the voter. He can close the rum shop and the gambling hell when he pleases. He can clean the streets, give the city pure water, compel railway and other corporations to serve the people instead of striving to own them, and make Gouldism impossible; have judges on the bench whose election means something more than a large assessment. But it cannot be done by listening to the blandishments of professional politicians. Make it a disgrace to be a professional politician; an honor to be a politician of the Jefferson era, when office sought the man, not the man the office; when the hustings was a tribune, not the shambles. Then we can see what can be done in council with our brethren of all parties to advance the people's welfare.

JOHN W. MCGRATH of Michigan has been recommended to the president for the appointment of chief of the national bureau of labor statistics. Mr. McGrath did exceedingly well as chief of the Michigan bureau.

MR. C. P. HUNTINGTON resents the newspaper statement that the late Charles H. Sherrill was a lobbyist. He was, says Mr. Huntington, simply the adviser and agent of the Central Pacific railroad before congress and the departments. The Central Pacific had, of necessity, entered into business relations with the government. Out of these relations questions constantly arose between the company and the executive, judicial and legislative branches of the government, and it was Mr. Sherrill's duty to see that in the decision of such questions the Central Pacific should receive no damage. He represented, however, but that one interest, and did so openly and honorably. He never resorted to the use of money to influence votes. There is nothing disreputable in the open representation of a railroad company's interests in such fashion, provided the ends sought are just and honorable; but the prevailing opinion is that this cannot be said of the ends sought by the Central Pacific and other land grant railroads.

BOB BURDETTE injects a good deal of sound sense into his humor. "The bomb that exploded in Chicago," he says, "may have been thrown by the eight condemned men, but they did not make it. Hard, sordid, grasping, pitiless greedy hands spent a good many years making that bomb."

THE reduction of fare on the elevated railroads to five cents has caused a serious falling off in the receipts of the surface roads, which is likely to continue for a time at least. Yet the surface roads cannot well reduce their fares. Besides operating expenses and taxes, they are loaded down with bonded debts and watered stock, and are constantly spending large sums of money to protect themselves from each other and from proposed roads, while the cost of collecting fares amounts to more than a cent per passenger. Under these conditions a three-cent fare, which would be the smallest reduction that would be likely to enable them to regain their traffic, could hardly pay. But this does not prove that cheaper transit is impossible. These roads could be operated by the city toll free at a cost of less than a cent for each passenger. If the city assumed the ownership of its railroads, both surface and elevated, all inflated values would disappear, clashing of individual interests would cease, opposition to new roads would not arise, the cost of collecting toll would be eliminated, and the best possible transit system with the greatest possible economy could be established. The cost of such a system could, without injustice to anybody, be levied on land values which free railroads would increase.

WE learn from the *Freeman's Journal* that Sexton, M. P., who has been elected high sheriff of Dublin, has ordered stunning new liveries for his servants. What does Patrick Ford say to this? The Irish movement is essentially a democratic movement, and it is a pity to see its leaders aping the forms of aristocracy as soon as they get a chance.

WHY should juries be limited by law in fixing damages in one case and not in others? Why especially should their verdicts in accident cases be limited when death ensues and unlimited when it does not? Yet so it is. A defendant may be mulct in any reasonable amount for breaking a leg, but in only $5,000 for breaking a neck. Some years ago a verdict of $30,000 was found against the elevated road for crippling a man; it could not have been more than a sixth of that sum if it had killed him. This is a kind of legislation foisted upon the people by railway monopolies. It should be swept away.

IN a lecture last week, Mr. E. Ellery Anderson informed the Constitution club that Gabriel and twenty-four first-class angels could not run things in New York against practical politicians like "Fatty" Walsh, Mike Cregan, Tim Campbell or Hugh Grant. Doubtless; but all the saviors of society are on the side of "Fatty," Mike, Tim and Hugh!

THE president recently advised a young man whom he had pardoned to go to work and make himself a useful citizen, adding, "There is plenty of room for you in the world." Where? There is certainly no place in this country where a repentant convict can find opportunity for work, unless he has a good deal of money.

THE supreme court of Pennsylvania has affirmed the constitutionality of a law absolutely prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine. Probably the judges do not know it, but this is the very extreme of socialism. In fact very few of the American socialists go so far as to urge the exercise by the state of a power to say what kind of food shall be manufactured for consumption by the people.

PENNED AND PICKED UP.

R. Schneider of Cheney, Spokane co., W. T., in subscribing for THE STANDARD, "drops into poetry" as follows:

The child you named "Standard" is born—I'm so glad;
In workingman's garb may it ever be clad.
To help to dress it one year I send two and a half.
In the battle of reason I'll draw sword in its behalf.

Two tramps, one of them a young man, the other well advanced in life, had just left a house where they had been supplied with a bountiful dinner. "I say, Bill," queried the younger of the two, "where do you s'pose we'll get our supper?" The old tramp turned on him with disgust. "Here—you've just had your dinner," he said, "and you begin to wonder where you'll get supper! If that's the kind of disposition you've got, young feller, you had better quit the profession and go to work!"—[San Francisco Mercury.

"Where is the ideal wife?" asks a lecturer. Well, if she is out looking for the ideal husband, her search will prove fruitless.—[Norristown Herald.

There is no music in the soul of a New York alderman. He hates Sing Sing.—[Philadelphia Call.

Gradually the Standard Oil company is getting the earth.—Philadelphia Times.

The Philadelphia *Record* expatiates to the extent of half a column on "What Philadelphia Ought to Be," when the three words "ashamed of herself" would have answered the purpose.—[Pittsburg Chronicle.

The train that carried 500 jugs into Atlanta was a corker.—[St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

If Prof. Smythe is found guilty, will there be no probation for the poor heathen after death?—[Boston Herald.

An irate female seeks admittance to the editor's sanctum. "But I tell you, madam," protests the attendant, "that the editor is too ill to talk to any one to-day." "Never mind: you let me in. I'll do the talking."

A celebrated lawyer once said that the three most troublesome clients he ever had were a young lady who wanted to be married, a married woman who wanted a divorce, and an old maid who didn't know what she wanted.

A minister may occasionally be carried away with the inspiration of his theme, but he generally gets back in time to take up the collection.

Little Bob—Mamma, sister Jean has picked all the leaves off my toy tree.
Mamma—Jean, why did you do that?
Jean—'Cause they isn't wight.
Mamma—Why were they not right?
Jean—'Cause it's winter.

Talmage says there will be everthing a person can wish for in heaven. "If you want to live beside a river," he says, "there is one wider and grander than the Amazon, Danube and St. Lawrence combined. If you want a crown you can take one from a mountain of diamonds and precious stones. If you want a palace they will be found there without number." Nonsense. Does Mr. Talmage expect us to believe that any such opportunities can be had for nothing in a country to which John Jacob Astor and Commodore Vanderbilt have already emigrated?

The question of "how many yards make a foot?" was sprung on a school teachers' convention in Ohio and thirty-four teachers handed in their answers—"three."

"Look here, Smith," said a rich fellow to his former schoolmate, who had asked for aid, "this is the second time you've applied to me this month. I'm afraid you don't live within your means." "Ah," said Smith, "I'm just trying to find the means to live within."

The *Evening Post* is in doubt about the use and value of editors. The editor of the *Post* is useful and valuable, like danger signals, as a warning to go the other way.

Two Boston boys formed a partnership for shoveling snow, on the basis that one was to do the shoveling and the other "the chinning." The latter solicited the work and the former did it. That "chinner" will probably always live by the labor of others.

Some one writes to the *World* that "Monopoly in the senate is the nest-egg from which imperialism will be hatched." The writer knows more of politics than he does of poultry. Nest-eggs are rarely if ever hatched.

Warden Walsh believes that he has saved the Tombs from a conflagration. But who will save the Tombs from Warden Walsh?—*World.*

Sentencing a Boy.

LAST Tuesday a boy of fourteen was brought before Judge Cowing to be sentenced for petty larceny. He was a bright, frank, honest-looking boy, and upon his plea of guilty Judge Cowing judiciously sentenced him to one day's imprisonment, which meant that he should go into the Tombs and immediatly out again. This boy was not dressed in velvet. He was a child of poverty. Had his parents been well to do his punishment would have been administered at home with a fond mother's slipper. As it was he spent two weeks in the criminal atmosphere of the Tombs, while a body of bankers, brokers and "gentlemen" investigated his case and presented a ponderous indictment against him. But for the good sense of the judge this boy would now be in one of the schools for crime under the patronage of the state.

Free Salt.

IN a letter to C. F. Prentice, president of the Western New York Salt association, Levi P. Morton says: "I voted for free salt in 1880, believing that farmers were entitled to the kind of salt then deemed necessary in making butter free of duty, and that this industry did not then need national protection. The salt industry has, I am aware, largely increased during the past five years, and is clearly entitled, with all other industries, to the fostering care of the government." Why is Mr. Morton not for free salt now? If the salt industry would get along without a duty in 1880, when it was weak and struggling, it can get along now that it is strong and self-sustaining.

The Magazine of Art.

The *Magazine of Art* for January contains many fine illustrations, and its letter press and press work are up to the usual high standard. The frontispiece is a photogravure of G. H. Boughton's fine painting, "The Councillors of Peter the Headstrong." "Round about West Drayton," by J. Penderet Brodhurst, delicately illustrated by H. R. Bloomer, and engraved by J. Harmsworth, Jounard, E. Sargant and J. J. Butler is the first of a series of notable articles.

Price of Coal.

THE price of coal is flying skyward; but it is pleasant to know that only the very poor will suffer by it. Some of them may freeze to death, but that makes no difference so long as our coal kings can add to their store of riches.

Sergeant Tims' Lecture.

A free lecture was delivered yesterday before the Caledonian club on "The Labor Problem," by Oliver Tims. A discussion followed and there was also singing.

THE WEEK.

Roundsman Robert Montgomery of East Fifty-ninth street station on last Saturday night discovered that Patrolman William J. Rourke of the same station had abandoned his post. Montgomery hunted up Rourke and found him half drunk in a shanty on a vacant lot. The roundsman accompanied Rourke back to his beat and left him there. He had gone but a few steps when Rourke shot him, and then rushing on him, shot him again, inflicting a fatal wound, of which Montgomery died on Tuesday. Montgomery was a faithful officer, while Rourke is a known drunkard, who has been frequently reprimanded and fined for neglect of duty and breach of discipline. He had, however, what is known as a "pull" through political influence, and though during the four and a half years he has been on the force twenty-six complaints have been made against him, the police commissioners have always acquitted him or let him off with a slight penalty. He was already reasonably safe of dismissal, however, at the time Montgomery caught him in a new offence, and in his rage he murdered the roundsman. It is the brutality and insolence of just such fellows as Rourke, kept on the force by political influence despite charges preferred against them, that makes the workmen so justly bitter against the police force as now controlled.

Another contribution to the philosophy and practice of machine politics in New York, for which we are indebted to that astute observer, Capt. Cregan, was made last week. When Mr. Rice was a candidate for congress, Capt. Cregan advised him to place $40,000 in the hands of some good man to be used for election purposes. Mr. Rice thought the proposition savored of buying votes, and the captain, with characteristic candor, explained: "You see," said he, "there are a certain number of votes in each election district: of these so many are democrats, so many republicans, so many George men, and so many floating votes. What you want to do is to get this floating vote. It costs about $5 a head. For $40,000 you can get all the floating vote. You might get it for less, but if the opposition knew you were spending money they would put up too." When Mr. Rice again remonstrated that the suggestion involved bribery, Capt. Cregan lost all patience at the innocence of his candidate and exclaimed: "Pshaw, we don't call it that; we call it hiring men by the day." As Mr. Rice did not agree with the captain, society lost $40,000 worth of salvation.

"Fatty" Walsh has already begun to complain of the arduous duties of his new office, which confine him to the Tombs almost as closely as if he were a prisoner. If this continues people of the Seventh assembly district may find themselves compelled to vote without their leader's advice and direction, and then who will save society?

Rollin M. Squire, the peculiar humbug whose career in this town illustrates the possible absurdities of government by deals, has appeared in Boston, where, in answer to a suit, he pleads the poor debtor act, and swears that he is possessed of no property. Brief as was his term of office, it is difficult to believe that he did not get away with a considerable sum. If he is as poor as he pretends, the lawyers who defended him must be rich.

Recorder Smyth appears to think that James A. Richmond and Jacob Sharp are not so ignorant as they pretend concerning the evidence on which they have been indicted for bribery, and he denies their request for a copy of the evidence submitted to the grand jury. It is believed that the demand is merely a part of their tactics of delay, by which rich criminals secure the protracted postponement of proceedings against them. A poor man against whom such charges were pending would have been "railroaded" into the penitentiary long before this; yet we are assured that in this country all men are equal before the law.

John Roach, commonly spoken of by his admirers as "the great American ship builder," died of cancer in the mouth at his residence in this city on Monday. He was born in Ireland in 1813, and migrated to this country when he was but fourteen years old. He worked hard and was shrewd and in the main fortunate, becoming in course of time the proprietor of the Morgan iron works in this city. In 1871 he bought the then unsuccessful Rainey iron ship building works at Chester, on the Delaware river, where he built up a large business. He had never learned that business, but entered it as a speculator, and very soon became a favorite government contractor. Aside from his government contracts it is doubtful if he ever made any money at the business. The natural disposition to speak no ill of the dead will not justify the ignoring of the fact that his relations with the navy department, under the administration of Robeson and Chandler, was the occasion for grave scandals. Aside from this yielding to the influence of the time in that scramble for wealth that ignores conscience and old fashioned honesty, Mr. Roach's career was on the whole a creditable one, and his reputation as an employer was that of a fair and sometimes generous man.

An anti-tariff meeting was held Wednesday night in Cooper Union. Everett P. Wheeler called it to order. Jackson S. Schultz presided, and F. W. Dawson, of South Carolina, Henry George and ex-Gov. Dorsheimer spoke. All the speeches except Mr. George's favored tariff reduction merely: he declared for absolute free trade, and favored tariff reduction only as a step in the right direction. Judging by the applause there were many more free traders than tariff reformers in the audience.

Prof. Adler gave some striking facts last Sunday concerning child labor. Statistics from New Jersey and New York relating to child labor were in his hand. The number of children between ten and fifteen years of age employed at labor in this state is 24,000; of these 9,000 are in our city. They are strippers of tobacco, paper-collar folders, insect-powder packers, hair workers, cash carriers, and workers in almost every factory occupation. It was stated that thousands of children of tender years, down to four years of age, are at work in the state. The speaker had not been able to verify these statistics, but he called for an official investigation and his auditors answered with the loudest applause. The age under which a child is not permitted to work should be raised. A sufficient and efficient corps of inspectors should be provided. No child should be allowed to work without a medical certificate of health and strength sufficient for the particular employment. The law we have was labeled as one of those pieces of insincere legislation which are thrown as sops to the labor Cerberus. A frightful list of evils resulting from overwork of young and feeble bodies was given—enfeeblement, stunting, blighting, deformity, bad habits, vice, disease, death. Ignorance was a sure result, if some others did not enter into the life. Examples of dense ignorance shown by children of ten to twelve years were given from examinations made in Utica and Cohoes. Industrial schools were proposed. Official investigation in Connecticut shows that child labor, long hours and monthly instead of weekly payment of wages are always found together.

A meeting of grand army men was held in this city on Saturday night in the interest of the re-election of Warner Miller to the United States senate. They recall in very vigorous language the fact that Mr. Miller was a soldier in the late war. How this gives him any claim to election to the senate that would not be equally good for every other ex-soldier is not explained. The whole incident is amusing. Mr. Miller has been so much deeper in wood pulp than he ever was in war that his military career was forgotten.

The chamber of commerce of this city approves of the inter-state commerce bill, except the clauses prohibiting greater charges for shorter than for long hauls and forbidding pooling. The chamber adopted a report recommending that the agricultural, commercial and railroad interests should all be represented upon the proposed commission. Col. F. A. Conkling thought it offensive and impertinent for the chamber to recommend legislation and suggest the appointment of a commission, but the chamber had no doubt of its competency to advise the government, and adopted the report. It also lent its sanction to the enormous job concealed by the proposal to fortify the coast.

The elevated railroads of New York are adepts in the matter of economy. Last Tuesday a car jumped the track between Fifty-third and Fifty-ninth street stations, and made a blockade for several hours. But passengers, ignorant of the accident, were freely taken aboard, and, upon arrival at Fifty-third street, invited to walk to Fifty-ninth. As no transfer tickets were given, every passenger had to pay two fares to get home. This simple plan probably realized enough to offset the company's loss.

Another economical feature in the operation of these roads is the practice of running refrigerator cars for passengers during the early part of the day. The saving in steam must be a considerable item.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western road also has an ingenious scheme in the interest of its exchequer. It runs its own sleeping cars, and to secure custom for them lights up the other cars very dimly. In the long nights of winter the brilliant lights of the sleeping cars are therefore quite attractive to passengers who want to read. Thus, while the road economizes in the matter of oil and wick, it also profits by the extra charge for seats in its sleeping cars.

In the Tombs police court, in this city, on Saturday, in a case where a saloon-keeper was held to bail for violation of the excise law, his counsel offered as bail the largest finished diamond in the United States, known as the "President," and valued at $45,000. The security was accepted by the court, though at first the police justice thought that a piece of glass had been offered him. Only saloon-keepers, gamblers, millionaires and politicians can afford to wear $45,000 diamonds.

The French Cable company wishes to withdraw from the Transatlantic cable pool, but the other members of the monopoly refuse to consent to its withdrawal, and will make a fight in the courts to compel it to continue in the pool.

On the night of October 10th, in a fight between two sailors on the Belgian steamship Noordland at her dock in Jersey City, one sailor killed another. The homicide was arrested. The king of the Belgians, through his consul here, claimed that the crime had been committed within his jurisdiction and demanded the surrender of the prisoner. The United States supreme court has just refused the demand. It decides that a felonious homicide is a subject for the local jurisdiction, and if the proper authorities are proceeding with the case in a legal manner the consul has no right to interfere to prevent it.

It is rumored that the Sing Sing prison authorities are likely to be punished for torturing convicts. It has long been suspected that cruel punishments are in use in this prison, a suspicion which the officials have earnestly tried to allay, but with difficulty, as the stories of discharged convicts became more numerous. At last an investigation was made by the prison commissioners, and it is upon their report that it is expected proceedings will be based.

"No party," says Governor Hill in his message, "can long retain power which refuses a fair enumeration of the people solely to prevent an honest reapportionment of the state." He ought to have added that no party can long retain power that refuses a fair representation to any considerable body of the people in a constitutional convention.

The democrats of Woodbridge, N. J., paid no attention to Gen. Jackson's day, but they are in a white heat of excitement over the momentous question, "Who shall be postmaster?" This is the only issue left between the old parties.

Two international copyright bills are to be discussed in the senate. The Hawley bill is upon the reciprocity plan. The Chace bill allows international copyright, but requires foreign works to be manufactured in this country. The copyright league favors the Hawley bill. Protesting that they have no desire to remove protection from the book manufacturer, they oppose protection to him at the expense of authors. Of the Chace bill, they tersely say that, while it allows copyright to foreigners on the absurd condition that copyrighted articles be not imported, it makes no provision for foreign copyright to Americans. Believing that the best means of reaching the public would be an open discussion of both measures, the league has requested the committee on patents to report both bills without recommendation.

Congressman Hiscock, of this state, has introduced a bill to reduce the tariff on sugar one-half and abolish the internal revenue tax on tobacco and on alcohol used in the arts. In order to conciliate the stupid Louisiana congressmen, who have always voted with the protectionists, Mr. Hiscock proposes to pay to all sugar growers a direct bounty of two dollars per ton. The bill, if passed, will reduce taxation about $53,000,000 and cause several other millions of the surplus to be disbursed amongst Louisiana sugar planters as a gratuity.

Last summer the president was compelled to withdraw his nomination of Henry Ward Beecher's son, Herbert, to be collector of customs at Port Townsend, W. T. Ugly charges had been made against the young man, which, whether true or false, rendered his confirmation by the senate impossible. This same Herbert F. Beecher has recently been appointed a special agent of the treasury department. His appointment was urged by his father in return for services rendered to Mr. Cleveland in the last presidential campaign. Yet the mugwumps are opposed to the spoils system.

Dr. James E. Rhoads of Bryn Mawr and Philip C. Garrett of Philadelphia recently visited Washington in the interests of the Indians. They went home happy in the belief that Indians will soon be admitted to what they call "the privileges" of citizenship. Mr. Garrett thinks that the bill enabling the Indians to hold lands in severalty is a step in the right direction. All of the Oklahoma "boomers" and border land grabbers agree with Mr. Garrett, and have vastly better reasons than he has for the belief.

Mr. Springer, of Illinois, called on the president last Saturday, and declared that the pretence that the Pacific railways are not in a condition to meet their obligations indorsed by the government is false. In proof of this he showed that the junior securities of those companies which are subordinate to the government lien are now selling above par. Mr. Springer has submitted amendments to the pending bill to refund this debt that will require the companies to actually pay something on the bonds as they fall due, and prohibit any extension of bonds representing the unpaid balances for a longer term than ten years. Precisely what claim the Union Pacific company has to any extension is not made manifest. It is known that its nominal capital is vastly in excess of its actual worth and that this excess largely represents fraud and corruption in its construction and management. The government's lien was improperly subordinated to another mortgage, and if it takes the road it must take it subject to that burden. A private individual would unquestionably foreclose in case of default by the company, and take the property unless some one else would bid over the amount of his claim. The trustees of the people of the United States have no right to fool away these people's interests by extending the time of payment. Let the debt be paid, or else let the government acquire and operate the road. A beginning has to be made some time, and this is a convenient opportunity.

The senate rushed through a bill granting the widow of the late John A. Logan a pension of $2,000 a year, but there is a possibility that the measure may encounter opposition in the house. Gen. Logan did not die of any disease contracted in the army, and hence his widow has no better claim to a pension than thousands of poorer women whose soldier husbands have died since the war.

The court of appeals of New Jersey has decided that the charter of the Morris and Essex railway is perpetual and irrepealable, and that that company's successor, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, has acquired the Morris and Essex's right to immortal life and freedom from control by the power that created it. At one stage of the proceedings the supreme court of the United States concurred in this denial of the sovereign power of the people. The immediate result of the decision is to exempt the railroads affected from their share of the taxation imposed by the State of New Jersey on all railroads.

Oscar Baldwin, while cashier of the Mechanics' National bank of Newark, N. J., stole $2,500,000. He pleaded guilty to three indictments and was sent to jail for fifteen years, five years on each indictment. The point is raised that the sentences ought to have been cumulative, and that five years alone should be served. A writ of habeas corpus was granted by Justice Bradley of the United States supreme court, and it was argued on the 7th inst. by Cortlandt Parker for the prisoner. A petition is also circulating for signatures asking Baldwin's pardon if he does not get out of jail by the other proceeding. It is furthermore complained that the sentence of Baldwin to hard labor was not legally imposed. In case he is released through the habeas corpus proceeding a newspaper article says that the prisoner "will sue the government for damages for being compelled to work." This is evidently the worst indignity to which this pious and enterprising thief was subjected. If some poor fellow who is ordinarily compelled to work had stolen a shirt to cover his bare back, such lawyers as Cortlandt Parker would not have bothered their heads about him, and petitions for his pardon would not have been circulated.

Ericsson claims that his latest invention, the Destroyer, is capable of sinking to the bottom the Invincible, the most powerful war vessel in her majesty's navy, in fifteen minutes, and that ten such vessels would be sufficient to defend the entire Atlantic seaboard against the combined navies of the world. Whether a boat with such power has been invented matters not; but that invention is constantly at work, and is constantly bringing into human range new and more powerful forces of destruction, which, utilized, render former methods of construction or protection of no avail, should be borne in mind when men talk about spending vast sums of money on steel forts along the coast.

At the recent annual meeting of the Philadelphia Medical society the committee on hygiene reported that during the past year twenty-one persons had been arrested for practicing medicine illegally, and that in the cases brought to trial there had been no acquittal. The doctors' trade union was much pleased with the success of this boycott against "scab" physicians.

The Montana Central Railroad company was organized some time ago to build a railroad through certain rich but undeveloped districts in that territory. The road was to connect with the Manitoba system on the north, and with the Union Pacific and Northern Pacific roads at a place called Rimini. The road is graded and about ready for the rails. When the company applied to the Union Pacific and Northern Pacific for a rate on rails the managers of these companies, being hostile to the new enterprise, made the price so high that it is prohibitory, and there will be a delay of from eighteen months to two years, until the branch connecting the new road with the Manitoba system is completed. "In the mean time," says a dispatch to the *Sun*, "the people of the section which it opens up are deprived of the beneficial results of a line in developing the country, are without competition, must drive their stock and transport their supplies long distances—all because two railroads, built by the munificence of the public and the government have figured it out that it is more profitable to monopolize the business of the territory than to haul railroad iron at a profitable but reasonable rate."

A suit was recently tried in Waco, Texas, to decide which of two private individuals shall possess an immense tract of unimproved land that embraces within it the San Elizario salt lakes. The ancestor of one of the parties to the suit attempted some years ago to make good his claim to ownership, and the Mexicans, to whom the use of the lakes had been free for a period antedating the departure of Montezuma, shot the claimant to death.

A collision occurred last week on the Wilmington and Northern railroad, near Lenape station. The news reports assert that the conductor of one of the trains was to blame for being asleep while on duty. Nothing is said of the hours of duty required of the conductor, which might shift some of the blame to other shoulders.

The temperature in the west on last Saturday morning ranged from 12 below zero in Kansas to 39 below in Dakota. The coldest place reported by the signal service on Friday week was Bismarck, Dak., where it was 43 below zero. A telegram from Fort Keogh, Mon., says the spirit thermometers there on Friday week registered 50 below zero. As they do not register below that point, it is thought the temperature was really much lower. In Canada, on Saturday morning, temperatures were reported ranging from zero to 40 below.

It is understood that Sir John McDonald has decided to dissolve the Canadian parliament, owing to the numerous reverses met by the government in the recent local elections. The population of Canada is much smaller than that of New York, yet the debt of the Dominion is now $300,000,000, which is about $125,000,000 more than it was a year ago. The annual expenditure during the same period has increased from $23,000,000 to $28,000,000. This great increase of public burdens has joined with many other causes to make the so-called conservative ministry of McDonald unpopular, and a "liberal" triumph at the coming elections is generally predicted.

A telegram from Lima says that in consequence of the closing of Peruvian ports against vessels from Chili (on account of the cholera) the wheat supply from that country has ceased, and in order to meet the demand for wheat the municipality has been authorized to take steps to have the necessary supply brought from California.

The rickety tory and union government still holds together with difficulty, and the liberals calmly await Gladstone's return to power as one of the certainties of the near future. One reason for this growing confidence of the liberals is the prospect of a reconciliation between Chamberlain and his former chief.

Lord Iddesleigh, formerly Sir Stafford Northcote and leader of the conservatives in the house of commons, died suddenly at Lord Salisbury's residence on Wednesday. It is thought that his disagreement with Salisbury hastened his death. He was made a peer under Salisbury's ministry in 1885.

There has been some apprehension among Irishmen that the basis of a peace between Gladstone and Chamberlain might be a partial abandonment by the former of his attitude in favor of home rule for Ireland. This fear has been allayed by the positive denial by Gladstone of any disposition to make concessions in this matter. He, nevertheless, says: "I think things are moving in the right direction."

Sir Henry Bessemer has proposed to the English government that it should line its coast with steel forts cast in the lump on the spot. Brick walls are to be built and lined with fire-brick, a furnace is to be erected, and from it the moulten steel is to be run directly into the mould thus prepared. This new proposition is opportune on this side of the ocean, as it offers an excellent reason for delaying the attempt to build steel forts here in the old-fashioned way at the risk of selling them at second hand for junk in the course of a few years.

Another English savior of society, the Marquis of Queensbury, is in the divorce court as a defendant. Under similar circumstances the Prince of Wales is said to have "committed perjury like a gentleman." It remains to be seen whether Queensbury has attained to that degree of perfection in society saving.

The prurient curiosity of the English upper classes and their admirers continues to find abundant opportunity for gratification in the divorce court proceedings of the aristocracy.

The first meeting of the London Liberal-Radical union was a lively affair. Every mention of Gladstone's name was received with cheers, but an attempt by the organist to play "God Save the Queen" was interrupted by a storm of hissing and hooting that rendered the air inaudible. All of the members of parliament and other liberals on the platform arose when the music began except Mr. Bradlaugh. The refusal of the latter to thus honor the air was indorsed with thundering applause by the majority of the meeting.

England appears to contemplate taking part in the general war that all Europe is expecting, and troops are being mobilized while officers on leave have received notice to remain within easy call of the war department.

The tory government has been placed in an awkward attitude by the testimony of Buller, Plunkett and Beach in the Dillon trial. The charge against Dillon and other friends of "the plan" is that they have sought to force the landlords to a necessary reduction in rents. These government officers and witnesses, when placed on the stand, admitted that the government itself had been bringing a heavy pressure to bear on the Irish landlords to induce them to make reductions in rents that will allow the tenants to live. As the government had no warrant in law for such an attempt it appears that it and Dillon have both been working outside the law toward the accomplishment of the same end. The tory press, which has been branding as thieves all who sought to force a reduction in rents, is taken aback when it finds its guns trained on the tory ministry.

The "plan of campaign," constantly alluded to in cable dispatches, consists of offering to a landlord reduced rents, which, if not accepted, are placed by the tenants in what is known as an "estate fund" and used for the support of evicted tenants and against the landlord if need be. As formulated by members of the Irish National league, the tenants of several estates complaining of high rents are assembled and, presided over by a priest or representative member, they solemnly agree that all shall abide by the decision of the majority; that none shall communicate with the landlord or any of his agents, except in the presence of the others; and that no one shall accept a settlement that is not shared by all. The tenants in a body tender the rent, less the reduction agreed on. The plan does not tolerate compromise, and if the landlord refuses to accept their terms the tenants turn the money over to a managing committee, who in turn deposits it with a person whose name only they know. This is called the estate fund, and is absolutely at the disposal of the managing committee, its use depending upon the action of the landlord. The greater part, however, goes for the maintenance of those tenants who suffer eviction, which is pretty sure to follow.

Chief Baron Pallas has imposed savage sentences on the tenants of the Woodford estate for attempting to keep roofs over the heads of their families, and he has, in his wrath, presumed to severely lecture the government that appointed him for its laxity in the maintenance of what he calls the rights of property.

The Londonderry tenants of the Skinners company, of London, have declined to buy their farms at eighteen years' purchase. They are wise. There can be but one end to the Irish land movement—the nationalization of the land.

On Tuesday the German reichstag discussed the military bill providing for a seven years' continuance of the army regulations. Prince Bismarck's methods of dealing with an opposition are well shown in his four speeches. He began by talking about Germany as "we," a unit, and ended by dividing it into "you," the parliament and people, and "we," the government and army. Russia he had no fears off; Russia is Germany's friend. France, with her army, though, is a standing menace. He did not mention the fact that France's army was a necessity so long as Germany had half a million men leaning on their guns. "We demand a septennate," he said. "Shall the rise and fall of the German army be dependent on the majorities in the reichstag?" That is to say, he asked the representatives of 45,000,000 people if they had the impudence to demand that the army shall be their servant and not their master. Never! He will dissolve the reichstag if his demands are not complied with. Dr. Windhorst, of the Catholic party, mildly objected to the principle that the reichstag was elected to quietly approve whatever bill was laid before it. Bismarck replied by asking, "Shall our army be an imperial or a parliamentary force? Shall its strength be fixed here yearly? It shall not be." Well, it probably won't be. Bismarck will carry his bill most likely, and the chances are that so long as the army exists it will regulate both itself and the parliament. The Iron chancellor was evidently quite at his ease while speaking, for he managed to absorb some nine glasses of brandy and water while on his feet.

In France the war talk continues, and semi-official proclamation is made of the entire readiness of numerous Frenchmen in uniform to kill and be killed. The government has just expended a large sum in the purchase of 200,000 shells loaded with melinite, a new explosive the composition of which is kept secret, but which is said to have an explosive power ten times greater than nitro-glycerine and compared with which mere gunpowder is innocuous. There is also a rumor that a noiseless ride powder has been invented which in exploding causes neither sound nor smoke, and which is expected to be very useful to sharpshooters. Its admirable adaptation to purposes of assassination is not dwelt upon.

A singular rumor was circulated last week to the effect that the pope, anticipating a general European war, proposes to transfer the papal court to Monaco. In that event gambling is to be abolished in that queer little kingdom and the reigning power is to be recompensed for the loss of revenue thus caused by an annual indemnity from the holy see.

On last Saturday the Danish government dissolved the folkthing (lower house) because it refused to vote large sums for extraordinary armaments and fortifications, and to sanction arrangements made by the crown in defiance of the protest of the folkthing. The Danish constitution authorizes the ministry in cases of extreme urgency to make provisional laws and draw money from the treasury without a vote of parliament. The Estrup ministry has governed for years in defiance of the folkthing by the abuse of the power confirmed by this clause. The folkthing has been dissolved again and again and its president has even been sent to jail because of public utterances hostile to the ministry. The chamber consists of 102 members, of whom 15 are conservatives supporting the government, and 85 liberal and 2 socialists opposing the ministry. Frequent appeals to the people have not materially changed this proportion, and any pretense of popular government is therefore a farce. There is a growing excitement among the Danes that may at any time break out into a revolution that will drive the king and his maladroit ministry out of the country they are trying thus arbitrarily to govern. Danish news deserves watching.

UNITED STATES SENATORSHIPS.

Hot Fights in Several States for the Positions.

Indiana has got into a constitutional muddle which may affect the senatorship. Lieutenant-Governor Manson having been appointed to a federal position, both parties voted for candidates to fill the vacancy. The republicans elected Col. Robertson, who now claims the office; while democratic officials of the state insist that the president of the state senate is *ex officio* lieutenant governor. Gov. Gray, a democrat, would like to be United States senator, but will not run if Robertson would take his place as governor; if, however, Robertson is ruled out, the president of the senate, a democrat, would succeed to the governorship, in which case Gray is willing to make himself uncomfortable in one of the senate chairs at Washington.

Gov. Abbett of New Jersey is not so happy as he was. Senatorial probabilities are fading into a mere possibility, with "a right smart" chance of developing into an impossibility. The favorite of his party, which is in the majority in the legislature, he had no reason to doubt, when the week opened, that he would go to Washington as a Jersey senator. But he incautiously influenced the caucus against Wolverton in the speakership contest, whereupon Wolverton with two other democrats left the caucus, and uniting with the republicans and the two labor members, elected a speaker of their own—a democrat named Baird. The bolting democrats say they will vote for Abbett for senator, but Wolverton's republican "combine" was too smoothly effected for the governor's peace of mind.

The New York republicans have two leading candidates for senator, and a third ready to take the place of either in case of a deadlock. Any of them is rich enough to alarm the American house of lords. Levi P. Morton is conceded twenty-seven votes and claims fifty-one, while Warner Miller, the incumbent, is conceded twenty-four and claims forty-one. Frank Hiscock is conceded eleven and claims sixteen. Morton's friends parade the fact that twenty-nine out of thirty-five members of the county committee at Miller's home have petitioned in favor of Morton's election, but Miller evens up this by showing that local sentiment compelled one of the principal signers to withdraw his name. Miller's friends have worked up a grand army boom, and have even gone into the democratic camp and obtained a tacit indorsement from President Cleveland. Meanwhile Hiscock fraternizes with Morton's workers, who, it is expected, will go over to him if Morton cannot pull through. The "boodle" feature of the contest is as yet deep down in the well.

In Illinois there are signs of a protracted contest for senatorial honors, with Farwell in the lead and possibilities of Oglesby.

Hawley will go back to the senate from Connecticut, Eugene Hall will be sent from Maine, Nevada will contribute the services of William M. Stewart during that gentleman's leisure time, Van Wyck's anti-monopoly record will probably disqualify him for re-election from Nebraska, Pennsylvania will experiment with M. S. Quay in place of Senator Mitchell, and Texas will try to elect Reagan.

"Skinny's" Grim Witticism.

Chicago News.

A poor, starved, half-witted creature, who goes by the suggestive *soubriquet* of "Skinny," has been hanging about a well-known chophouse for several weeks past in an endeavor to get an occasional meal from the *habitues* of the place, with some of whom in happier days he was acquainted. On Christmas the barkeeper jocosely accosted him with:

"Well, Skinny, where are you living these cold days?"

"At the morgue," replied the outcast. "If you drop dead, come and see me."

MEN AND WOMEN.

The New Haven *Telegram* wants meetings of representatives of the labor press to be held in New York at an early date.

Dr. James E. Kelly, of Dublin, an eminent physician and surgeon, who for a few months past took up his residence in Boston, and who now has come to New York to practice, was tendered a complimentary dinner at Morelli's on Monday evening. Gen. M. T. McMahon presided, and around the board sat Patrick Ford, who graced the occasion with his first after-dinner speech, Mgr. Ducey, John Boyle O'Reilly, Hon. David Healy, Prof. John P. Brophy of St. Louis college, President Henry L. Hoguet of the Emigrants' Savings bank, John McMackin, Henry George, Dr. Paul Carus, Gen. J. R. O'Beirne, Col. James Cavenagh, Capt. Ed. O'Meagher Condon, Judge Courtney, Dr. E. Malone, Commissioner Voorhis, Commissioner Thos. S. Brennan, Commissioner Coleman, and many others. The fare was bounteous and the speeches bright and vigorous, and when his friends finished toasting him the doctor found that he had got pretty well into the next day. Dr. Kelly, who is a man of high rank in his profession, was a warm adherent to the national cause, and the compliments given him by the nationalists of Dublin when he left that city are now repeated here in New York.

Mrs. Mary Nash Agnew and Miss Grace H. Dodge were in their places on Wednesday in the New York board of education. Their first official service was on a committee to conduct the president of the board to the chair.

Mr. J. M. Mason of West Virginia, who writes us an article in behalf of government interference to preserve the people from the tyranny of the railway bosses, is a man who has made a gallant fight for popular rights in corporation-ridden West Virginia. His father, James Murry Mason, was the confederate commissioner to England and France, whose arrest in conjunction with that of his colleague, Mr. Slidell, created such a commotion during the civil war. His great grandfather, George Mason, drafted the Virginia bill of rights in 1776, helped Jefferson secure popular liberty and religious freedom in that state, and even at that early day opposed all measures tending to the perpetuation of slavery. The present Mason is a terror and a bugbear to the politicians of West Virginia, who regard any talk against the Standard Oil company, the Baltimore & Ohio or the Chesapeake & Ohio as treason against the powers ruling that state by a kind of divine right.

Archbishop Corrigan is going to Bermuda. No tears.

Thomas E. Edison, the inventor, who has been ill of pleurisy, is recovering.

Rev. Chas. McCready, of the Church of the Holy Cross, says that he is not going to take Dr. McGlynn's place as pastor of St. Stephen's. It would be uncomfortable, he says, for any clergymen to take Dr. McGlynn's place under existing circumstances.

Michael Cregan, the republican party manager of an assembly district in this city testifies that it cost him a year's salary to find out that the labor party could muster more votes than the republican machine. The rest of Capt. Cregan's political education was not so expensive to himself.

Mr. George W. Childs, proprietor of the Philadelphia *Ledger*, fell on an icy pavement last week, and received painful, though not serious, injuries. Any misfortune to Mr. Childs would be widely regretted. He is one of the fortunate ones and swims with the tide that carries the few on to fortune, leaving the many behind. He is, nevertheless, a benevolent man who has ever been ready to help those in distress, and, what is even more to his credit, he has always treated labor with courtesy and justice.

John G. Carlisle denies a report that he will be a candidate for the United States senate for Kentucky against Senator Beck.

Congressman Reagan of Texas has gone home to attend to his canvass for election to the United States senate. The hostility of the railway interest ought to be an element of strength to Mr. Reagan in his canvass.

Prof. Thomas Davidson lectured on co-operation before the Liberal club at German Masonic hall, at 220 East Fifteenth street, Friday evening, Jan. 14.

J. Oberkrieser, Jr., of 427 East Seventy-fifth street, had a son born to him on the 6th inst., to whom he intends to give the name of Henry George, in recognition of the principles with which that name is associated. If the infant lives the allotted threescore and ten he will doubtless see great changes, for these are busy times.

The "Feet" to Lord Tennyson.

"Set the feet above the brain, and swear the brain is in the feet."—*New Locksley Hall.*

Most noble friend, Lord Tennyson,
Allow us to repeat
A lesson we from doctors learned
One day about the feet.

It was that if the feet were kept
All nicely warm and dry,
Well shod, well clothed and always clean,
Disease would pass us by.

But if the feet neglected were,
And the head kept too warm,
The blood would fly up to the brain
And do exceeding harm.

Perhaps it is because the feet
Are now so pinched and cold,
That fevers seem to gather round
The high patrician fold.

Or it may be the head is full
Of humors gross and vile,
Because of too much surfeiting,
Which always will defile.

Suppose the food that's wasted thus,
Were given the feet instead,
Would it not all the better be,
Alike for feet and head?

Do please, good sir, just think of this;
Your youth was not all wrong
When you wrote "Clara Vere de Vere,"
And put brave thoughts in song.

You were a poet nobly born
Before rank spread its lure;
And poets never take the part
Of power against the poor!

Germantown, Pa. H. PETERSON.

Soggarth Aroon.

Hail to thee, priest of the people!
Peerless and fearless McGlynn!
Ever the champion of justice—
Sure in the struggle to win.
Millions are watching the combat;
Thine are the prayers of the poor!
Fierce is the battle with error—
Truth to the end shall endure.
Thanks to the power that hath given this boon,
Soggarth Aroon!

Long hath thine name been glorious,
Friend of the poor and distrest!
Thousand shall hail thee victorious,
By thy rich charity blest!
Fear not the rage of oppressors,
Fleeting is tyranny's day!
Bright is the dawn of the future;
God still His empire shall sway.
Darkness shall flee from the radiance of noon,
Soggarth Aroon!

JOHN ANKETELL, A.M.
Bellevue Hospital, New York City.

HANS AND HIS DUMPLINGS.

A True History, with Economic, Socialistic and Bimetallic Illustrations.

TIME XIXTH CENTURY.

Translated from the German of Michael Flurscheim.

I.

Hans and Peter were two neighbors, who lived quite contented and happy on an island. Although they had not riches, they had enough to eat and drink, and that is, after all, the chief thing. They each had a piece of land, on which they raised grain. The grain they ground with a small hand-mill, and from the meal they made baked dumplings, of which they were passionately fond, and they were contented and all things went well with them.

One day as Peter was on the seashore he found a curious big book that had floated to land in a chest, the title of which was "The Wealth of Nations," and the author, Adam Smith. On Sunday, when he had nothing to do, he read in this big book, and although he did not understand everything, this much soon appeared clear to him, that the manner in which he and his neighbor worked was a very unpractical one, and that they both spent much labor uselessly. And so he came to Hans one day and said to him: "Neighbor Hans, we have both been fools, in that we have given ourselves any amount of useless work, for the reason that we have not understood that magic aid to production called 'the division of labor.' Now, I will make a proposition to you. I will take possession of the land as my property, and will till the fields and gather the crops, and you can take the mill and the oven which we have built and all the utensils as your property, and can attend to the milling, baking, cooking, etc. In this way we will attain a division of labor that will enable us both, through better division of our time and greater skill in our special lines of work, to produce a much greater amount of wealth, whereby with the same amount of labor we can live better, or we can produce the same amount as at present with much less labor."

Hans, who had always had a great respect for the learned Peter, expressed himself as satisfied, and it was arranged as Peter said. Both attained such skill and so bettered their means of production in the special branches that they produced many more dumplings in the same number of hours than before. They divided their products honestly and fairly, and when they had eaten till they were full they lay down and slept or amused themselves to pass away the time.

But Peter read further in Adam Smith, and one day he again addressed himself to Hans, and said to him, "My dear Hans, we are still a pair of silly people. We live only for to-day, and don't think at all of the time when we shall be old and weak. We should use our time to lay up a store for the future. Then, our communistic manner of production is not economical, for only when each knows that he is working entirely and only for himself will the largest amount of wealth be produced. How would it be, then, if each should lay aside his productions and then exchange with the other?"

Hans agreed. Peter began to raise grain for future supply and Hans to grind meal and bake dumplings for future supply, and they exchanged their goods, so that each had an equal stock of grain, meal and dumplings on hand. They soon found, however, that the grain could be kept well, but the meal not so well, and the dumplings were almost useless if kept any length of time. Peter, therefore, found it more advisable to lay aside his grain and to exchange only when he wanted meal and dumplings. The result was that Hans could only work so long as his stock of grain lasted, and then he must leave off and wait till Peter wanted dumplings again. So that Peter gained a great advantage over Hans. On the one hand Peter could produce grain all the time and lay up a stock for the future, and exchange with Hans for dumplings only when he needed to do so. On the other hand, Hans had turned his grain into dumplings, in order to have work, and now the dumplings were spoiled, so that he only had work when Peter needed dumplings and gave grain therefor. The result was that Hans was compelled to live from hand to mouth, without being able to lay aside any stock, while Peter after awhile was the possessor of large stores of grain. But Hans' family was larger, and needed more dumplings than Peter's.

In order to get more grain, Hans began to work Peter's land for him; that is, he made his wife and growing boy do the work. He also invented, in order to lighten his work, machines, which enabled him to produce more grain, more meal and more dumplings with the same amount of labor and time.

But Peter, who had now no need to work any more, had not much of an appetite, and required less dumplings than before, and the less he consumed, the less opportunity for work had Hans in order to earn grain. Since Peter had no appetite, Hans must go hungry.

At last Hans came to Peter one day and said that things were not working fairly; for, in spite of the fact that Peter was idle the whole day, he had immense stores of grain and dumplings, and, notwithstanding that he, Hans, and his whole family worked, they could only obtain a bare subsistance. "Yes, my dear Hans," said Peter, "but there is nothing to do to alter this. See! Look for yourself! Here it all is quite plain in Adam Smith. Supply and demand alone regulate the relations between employer and employed. It comes about that I have no wants, therefore there is no demand for dumplings, and there is an excessive supply of labor. It is nothing to wonder at that you can find no work and are in need!"

"Yes," answered the afflicted Hans, "but that is not exactly true. There is a most decided demand for dumplings. Last night we all had to go to bed hungry because we had nothing to eat."

"That I can well believe," said Peter, laughing over the simplicity of Hans, into whose head he could, in spite of all his trouble, instil no grasp of political economy. "*Adam Smith doesn't mean that kind of demand, but the demand of those who are able to pay.* In order to get dumplings you must have grain, and I shan't give you grain because I am not in need of your productions. You have produced too many dumplings with your machines and arrangements. So there exists at present a formal *over-production—a dumpling crisis!*"

Now, overproduction was a word that made a great impression on Hans, for he had in general great respect for Peter and his Adam Smith, and it was indeed clear that there was an overproduction, so that he could find no work for his oven, mill, etc.; for the only purchaser, Peter, had too much of his (Hans') productions. And yet he could not get it into his head that he could get no dumplings because there was an overproduction. And then, again, the grain which Peter now owned was produced by his (Hans's) work, and Peter had done nothing. In spite of this, Peter had more than enough, while he and his family went hungry.

About this time there sailed by the island a stranger, who made a visit there of a few hours length. His name was Mr. Bimetal from Papermoneyville; to him Hans complained of his distress. "My good man," said Mr. Bimetal, "it is easy to believe that you haven't been able to feather your own nest to any extent. You have on your island a standard which permits of far too little expansion, namely, grain, the production of which is limited by nature, and it is no wonder that overproduction exists when your goods are so cheap, and in spite of that, find no purchaser. There is a very simple remedy. Hunt for all the pebbles you can find on your island, and use them as second medium of exchange, as a money standard, and all will be well." "But if Peter won't consent?" said Hans. "Then compel him to adopt the new standard; you are stronger than he."

Hans did not wait to be told twice, but went at once to Peter and demanded, in addition to the grain standard, the pebble standard. Peter considered the matter, for he saw that this time Hans was not joking, and finally agreed.

The pebbles of the island, which of course all belonged to Peter as owner of the land, were now made the medium of payment. The result was, in the first place, a dreadful confusion, for Peter didn't dream of making the amounts of pebbles and grain equal in the transactions; he gave at first ten pounds of pebbles to Hans for a certain amount of work and dumplings, and then afterward cashed the pebbles with one pound of grain—that is, he gave only one-tenth as much grain as pebbles—and by and by, after many pebbles had been found, he gave only one-one-hundredth as much. Moreover, the relation in value of grain to pebbles changed every day according to the amount of each on hand. Grain now became a "ware," a goods, from being a means of payment, and the pebbles fixed the price. No one spoke of returning to a double standard. The pebble standard ruled supreme on the island. In consequence of the small worth of the medium of payment prices rose enormously. Hans received now one hundred pounds of pebbles where he had formerly received one pound of grain; and yet, strange to say, his position was no better, but even worse, for the pebbles belonged to Peter as well as the grain, and Peter consumed no more dumplings than before. Hans was always hungry and out of work.

II.

As generally happens, both the rich Peter and the poor Hans died in the course of time, for Democrat Death does not bother himself about the class or the fortune of men. Peter's descendants remained in possession of the land of the island, and, of course, also of the stored up wealth. But the descendants of Hans worked from early in the morning till late at night, and yet it didn't help them, for they lived in wretchedness and want, from hand to mouth.

In the course of time the origin of the inequality of the two classes of inhabitants was forgotten. The Peters at last came to think that they were a different race of men, with blood of a quite different color from that of the Hanses, and the Hanses believed it because it was dinned into their ears so often, and because, in truth, on account of the leisure which the Peters had to cultivate themselves, they really seemed to be a higher race than the Hanses, who had no such opportunities. Then there arose divisions among the Hanses. One part of them got possession of the machines and tools, and when the dumplings were divided they took the lion's share before the others got any.

The Peters, as "lords of the soil" and owners of the grain and pebbles, found it to their interest not to allow these Hanses who owned the machines, to get too ragged and poor, for the fact was that the different machine-owners carried on such competition among themselves—the one offering more dumplings and such articles that were now made on the island by the Hanses, than the other—that in the end they all ruined each other. In spite of this, there were many of the poorer Hanses that did not own machines, who ascribed all their misery to these machine and mill owners, in which belief the Peters encouraged them, until certain of their number began to attack them (the Peters). Then the Peters and the machine owners made a law to restrain these Hanses, who owned nothing, which they named the "*Anti-Socialist Law.*"

But some of the machine-owning Hanses had managed by special shrewdness, to get some of the Peters lands, or got them to mortgage them, through which the first product of their lands went into the pockets of the richer Hanses. And the more carelessly the Peters managed their farms the more they were compelled to mortgage them to the rich Hanses. After awhile so many of these machine-owning Hanses, through purchases and mortgages, got in possession of the knout which the Peters had for so long swung over the Hanses, and so many Peters were pauperized, suffering often quite as much as the poor Hanses, that no one knew what was the cause of all the trouble. The Peters, indeed, pointing to the increasing wealth of the machine-owning Hanses (who were now called "capitalists") tried to make the poor Hanses believe that these "capitalists" were the oppressors. But the fact was no one had a clear idea of what was wrong. Each man who felt that he was being oppressed hit out at the head that was nearest him, like the Irishman in the riot. One party thought they could remedy everything by confiscating the machines and making them common property; the "protectionists" thought that they carried on too much trade with other islands that were suffering from the same social disorders. The "Malthusianists" talked about "over-population" "emigration," big families instead of the "one or two-child system," although the island had quantities of unused land, and no one asserted that there was a lack of absolute necessaries, the fact being that the land-owners, since they could, with a small quantity of grain, purchase more than enough dumplings and other wares, would not put the rest into circulation.

And so it goes on to-day—if indeed they have not all died or killed each other; for no one amongst them thinks of abolishing the real cause of all the misery, namely, the owning of the land by the Peters; no one thinks of the one means of preserving the community—making the land the common possession of all.

W. B. SCOTT.

The Unsold Lands.

This spirited song, a great favorite of the earlier land reformers, was written in 1846, when, according to official reports, the United States, held more than 1,000,000,000 acres of unsettled lands.

A billion of acres of unsold lands
Are lying in grievous dearth;
And millions of men in the image of God
Are starving—all over the earth!
Oh! tell me, ye sons of America,
How much men's lives are worth?

Ten hundred millions of acres good
That never knew spade nor plow;
And a million of souls in our goodly land
Are living in want, I trow;
And orphans are crying for bread this day
And widows in misery bow!

To whom do these acres of land belong
And why do they thriftless lie?
And why is the widow's lament unheard,
And stifled the orphan's cry?
And why are the poor house and jail so full
And the gallows tree built high?

Those millions of acres belong to man!
And his claim is—that he needs!
And his title is sealed by the hands of God—
Our God! who the raven feeds;
And the starving soul of each famished man
the throne of justice pleads!

Ye may not heed it, ye haughty men,
Whose hearts as rocks are cold!
But the time will come when the fiat of God
In thunder shall be told!
For the voice of the great I AM hath said:
That "*the land shall not be sold!*"

—*A. J. H. Duganne.*

To Henry George.

The surest triumph cometh slow;
Who holds the hand of God can wait
In darkness, while the seasons go,
His patience needs not to abate;
And he shall see, his mind informed
By Justice, Pity's finer law,
Falling, the ramparts which he stormed,
And the great conquest he foresaw!

—*Joseph Dana Miller, in the Union Printer.*

I observe that when all things in early life appeared to be going well for me they were by no means going well in the deep of them, but quite materially and rapidly otherwise. Whence I conclude that though things appear at present adverse to my work and me, they may not at all be adverse in the the deep of them, but quite otherwise.—*John Ruskin.*

HOW TO CONTROL THE DRINK TRAFFIC.

Make the Liquor Seller an Officer of the State.

How to control the drink traffic is a question asked wherever we find civilization and rum, especially the highest civilization and the meanest rum.

Gothenberg seems to have answered the question. Intelligent Switzerland adopts the same plan, in making the manufacture of spirits a federal monopoly, all distillers being required to sell what they produce to the state, which will then resell to consumers. The quality is secured, the retail price is increased, and a revenue provided to check the consequences of the abuse of drink. Wine, cider and beer are not included in the provisions of this law.

The moral sense of American communities forbids the proposal of any scheme that would make the state the rumseller. But may we not adapt the idea to our praiseworthy prejudice without further hurt to a good conscience than our license laws now occasion?

Let it be assumed that all restrictions which have been found to be constitutional and wise remain in the law. Without reciting these, I confine myself to a consideration of two points, and refer only to the sale of spirits.

With these proper restrictions the most urgent need is that none but good citizens be permitted to sell to consumers. The calamity of society which tries to legislate in a moral and sanitary direction in the control of the drink traffic, is that bad men are in the business—men who dislike the law and violate it, or at least evade its provisions when they can. A good citizen, accepting the law and wishing to see it complied with, would retail liquors with a sense of responsibility and in the most careful manner. This fact has been recognized in our legislation; we do not require certificates of good character to sell dry goods, but we do require them of a man who wishes to sell drink. How worthless such certification has been is not forgotten; but it may be insisted upon that it can be made almost as exclusive in fact as in intention of the law. The objection that good men will not go into the business cannot be allowed; there are some most worthy citizens in it now, suffering all the disadvantages of rivalry with bad dealers who make more profit than they do.

My first proposition is that every one licensed to sell spirits shall be made an officer and servant of the state. His authority should be threefold, coming from three independent sources.

First, he should be appointed a deputy inspector of liquors by a chief inspector of some reputation as a chemist. This chief inspector should require testimonials of character satisfactory to himself, and should be assured that applicants for appointment can distinguish pure spirits from that which is concocted or adulterated. Such experts occupying the retail market could prevent distillers and wholesale dealers from placing in that market a dishonest article. The deputy inspector, if he succeeds in his effort to enter the business, should be required to affix to every bill of purchase a certificate that after delivery to him he has found the liquor to be pure and good. The appointment of a deputy inspector should be for one year, with the provision that it be revoked at any time, and be purely honorary.

Secondly, on receiving the above appointment, the party should be required to seek another official position, as temporary and honorary as the first, that of special constable empowered and ordered to preserve the peace and to protect citizens' premises to be occupied by him. This appointment should be made by a judge of a court of high grade, and he ought to require evidence satisfactory to him that the applicant will prove to be a good servant of the people.

Thirdly, when a man has secured the two appointments as indicated, then let it be necessary for him to be licensed by an excise board, who will require testimonials satisfactory to them and evidence that the location of the proposed business is unobjectionable, all other precautions being taken that a good liquor law enjoins.

If only such men as could pass these ordeals were permitted to sell to consumers, it might make the business respectable, which does not appear as an objection to the writer. Surely good citizens would not sell to a drunken man; would not allow any one to become intoxicated on their premises; would not sell to minors who are evidently such; would not sell poisoned stuff, and would protect their places from becoming the haunts of criminals.

Of course, some unworthy persons might slip through all the tests required. It would be necessary to hang over the heads of dealers the severest possible liabilities for malfeasance in office.

The second proposition respects the revenue from the trade. The state has to deal with the woful consequences of the drink habit, which can only be alleviated under the most rigid restrictions that have ever been presented. The state ought to do more—a larger, better, more costly work than it has ever done for the drink disease. Especially is this demanded by a humane compassion for victims who are of the poor. A large revenue may be justly exacted from the traffic to meet the expense of treating the evil results of drink. Shall we have "high license?" It has been objected that this would be a trespass on the right of a poor man who wishes to engage in the business. Suppose a fair cost be charged for examinations and license, and that a monthly sworn return of the amount sold be required from every dealer by the excise board, the return to be verified by examination of bills, books, and stock on hand whenever the board may choose to make such examination, and that additional revenue is taken according to the amount of business done. Would we not then have all the advantage of a high license without any injustice or hardship?

To those who drink and to those who deal in drink; to those who prate of individual right, or the right of capital invested in the business, it may be said in no uncertain tone, civilization will soon impose the most stringent regulation or command prohibition.

JOHN W. KRAMER.

Supreme Court Judges

West Virginia Democrat.

If the railroad managers and those interested in monopoly are to control appointments to the United States supreme court, the public may as well abandon all effort to check the aggressions of these corporations. Federal judges are nominated by the president and confirmed by the senate. If the president seeks to serve monopoly he will nominate men who entertain the views so common among railroad attorneys. If a majority of senators are in the interests of monopoly they will refuse to confirm a nomination that is not favored by the managers. Fortunately, a president must act in the sunlight of public criticism; but unfortunately, senators vote on nominations under the cover of a secret session. Hence a senator may prevent the appointment of a good judge or may effect the appointment of a bad one without even being suspected by his constituents, because votes in secret session are never disclosed. Herein we find one reason why railroad managers are so extremely anxious to secure the election of certain gentlemen to the senate.

Driven to Shame.

The Rev. Charles H. Eaton, the late Dr. Chapin's successor, said in a recent sermon that destitution drives twenty thousand women into evil ways every year in this city. In six trades, employing from 100,000 to 200,000 men and women, he had ascertained that the average wages were $1 a day. Two hundred and forty-four dollars was the average annual income of the males and females engaged in the factories of the United States. The woman's protective union had in the twenty years of its existence prosecuted 200,418 cases of fraud practiced by employers upon employees. One-fourth of the needle working women of London resort to the streets to eke out a living

MANUAL TRAINING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

It Does Not Mean Teaching Trades, and Ought to Begin Early.

The deadlock between the board of education and Mayor Grace has been broken by the latter's retirement from office, and the mental confusion of the newspapers on the subject of manual training has been for the moment most opportune, since it was pretty certain that whatever would otherwise have been done in relation to the subject would have been the wrong thing. Mayor Grace, with suspicious enthusiasm, proposed schools of stenography, bookkeeping, etc., for the normal school girls, and advocated industrial training, as it is called, in the grammar schools, fully believing that he was in line with the subject. The *Tribune* gravely states that parents do not want their children to learn trades, preferring them to lead the easier lives of clerks.

These propositions and this newspaper writing only tend to show that manual training, as it is understood by its advocates, is appreciated neither by the late mayor nor by the editorial writer in the *Tribune*. The proposition to teach trades is at once at variance with our political system so far as it relates to the public schools, and has never been contemplated by those who are most interested in furthering manual training.

Probably what is meant by manual training finds its best exponent in the manual training school attached to the Washington university at St. Louis, Mo., a school that has served as the model for similar schools in Chicago, Philadelphia and several smaller cities. A brief statement of the theory on which the school is based is that the chief object of manual training is mental development. Certain intellectual faculties, such as observation, judgment in deductive reasoning, cannot be properly trained except through the hand. In order then to furnish this manual training necessary to mental development through the use of tools and materials, all the mechanical processes and manual arts and typical tools of the trades and occupations of men have been abstracted and arranged into a systematic course of instruction. Thus, without teaching any one trade, the mechanical principles of all trades are taught.

This view of manual training brings it into union with intellectual training, not along parallel lines, but as alike necessary parts of a general educational scheme, and is much more in consonance with our habit of thought and system of government than the technological schools of Russia and trade schools of Austria that have found many adherents here.

The manual training school of St. Louis, it may be stated for the *Tribune*, is not a public, but a private, school, in view of the tuition charged. Its place with reference to the collegiate department of the Washington university is that of an academy or high school. Its students are the sons of men who expect their offspring to go through college. Let us see then what influence their manual training has had on their choice of professions. It is equally instructive to compare it in this light with the influence the training of the College of the City of New York—a free school—has had on its graduates.

Referring to the school report for the year 1884 we find that the graduating class in the St. Louis school numbered thirty-one pupils. Of these nineteen, after leaving school, entered either upon studies or occupations directly proceeding from their mechanical studies. In the College of the City of New York the class of '84 numbered forty students. Of these the occupations of twelve are not given. The remainder, with the exception of three, went into the professions of medicine, law or theology or became teachers and clerks. Of the three two went into engineering and one went into the signal service.

The class of '85 numbered thirty-four. Of these one has taken up engineering, the others are to be doctors, lawyers, preachers, teachers and clerks. The contrast between the results of the St. Louis school and of the New York college is more significant, as has been intimated, from the fact that while the college course is free that of the St. Louis school is not, and the inference is that it is attended by boys whose worldly position, at least in point of money, is better.

Referring again to the proposition of Mayor Grace, with which he harried the recalcitrant board of education to introduce industrial training, as he unhappily calls it, in the grammar and normal schools, the results of the modicum of manual training introduced in the College of the City of New York are again instructive. It is evident that the students of the College of the City of New York are almost uninfluenced in their careers by the instruction they receive in manual training. Against this we learn from the school report that of the nearly one hundred and fifty thousand children in the public schools only two per cent ever reach the college. Eighty per cent leave school at the age of eleven and do not pass through the grammar schools. The children who thus fall out are the children of the poor, who at that early age are obliged to begin the task of self-support. It is precisely these children who need all that the public schools can give them as an equipment for the future, that receive the least.

Toward this end and for these children manual training is conceded to be especially valuable. There seems, then, to be a certain absurdity in putting in motion all the cumbrous legislative machinery necessary to effect any change in the curriculum, and especially any change requiring the expenditure of money for those it benefits least, and in ignoring the necessities of that grade for which no argument is necessary to point out its practical value, for it is well known that the children of the lower grades who drop out become for the most part artisans, and consequently any home skill they may have acquired, any proficiency in drawing, or knowledge of mechanical principles, will be of immediate use to them.

It is, moreover, an unhappy truth, as any one who makes the effort will discern, that whereas the younger pupils who leave school enter the trades, those who pass through the grammar schools regard the trades as beneath them. The boys as a rule become clerks, unless their ambition soars to the professions. Maud Maitchin, with whom we are acquainted in "The Breadwinners," lives under many aliases. A teacher of long experience in the grammar schools says: "As far as I can discover my girls leave school with but two desires—to become teachers, or what they call 'saleslades.' Domestic employment even in their own homes is a makeshift to escape from as soon as possible. They would scorn to become seamstresses or dressmakers."

How inadequate is the training for the collateral duties of those who become teachers however sufficient may be their intellectual knowledge and skilful their methods of imparting it, may be known from the testimony of a school trustee, who says, "I find rarely a teacher who understands the practical use of a thermometer in her school room." An engineer connected with a large public school system says: "I scarcely ever find a teacher who understands the theory of the ventilation of her school room. The ventilators are usually closed. If the room is too cold she turns on the heat, and if too warm she opens the windows."

In view of all this, President Walker's indorsement of Mayor Grace's opinion advanced in his inaugural address of 1885, and reiterated more recently, concerning the introduction of special teaching in the normal and grammar schools, to wit, that a change must be considered, and must work from the top down—from the college to the grammar schools, into the grammar schools before the primary schools, becomes important. Although Mayor Grace has left office this seems to be the accepted view even by the board of education, on which the subject seems to be forced. As we have seen the drift of the students on leaving the college does not appear to have been influenced by the manual training there. The fact is that when the students reach that educational stage it is too late to alter the bent which all their previous training has tended to strengthen. Influence of this sort must begin earlier to be of force.

When we consider in addition the fact before alluded to that by far the larger number of children do not pass through the grammar schools, it is evident that manual training, if it is to do its greatest good—combine utility with ethical and intellectual benefits—as the authoritative utterances of the board of education concede, it must be introduced into the lower grades.

MARY GAY HUMPHREYS.

9 University Place, N. Y.

Walks with the Madonna.

What angel whispers charmed thy saintly heart—
What sacred hopes, subduing maiden fears—
What looking forward to thy wond'rous part
In proving the predictions of God's seers!
How thou did'st mark each precious passing hour,
With none but Joseph mindful of thy tryst;
But, yes! Elizabeth, in her blest bower,
Yearned for her cousin when her babe she kissed.

A few rude shepherds shared thy joy so dear,
Amazed at heaven's pageantry the while;
But, now, the millions swell the carol clear,
And view with thee the cherub's first sweet smile!
O'er all the world, children from Christmas dreams
Wake, hoping that the star may shine e'en now!
Peer forth long ere the pink of morning gleams;
Then turn to count their gifts on festal bough.
But first and best of gifts, O Virgin blest!
That peerless one that lay upon thy breast!

Seven days, maternal love, hath graced thy brow;
The world now stands with thee, obedient one,
In the fair New Year's light—as reckoned now—
To hear the name of *Jesus* crown thy son.

And soon, in thought, Madonna, we will tread
The temple aisle where Simeon, serene,
Lifts heavenward his sage and silvered head,
Adoring God for what his eyes have seen!
Long has he waited for the mystic sign,
Nor knew how soon his patient watch should cease;
But, lo! within his arms the child divine!
"Now, let thy servant, Lord, depart in peace!"

O gentle Jewess! turning from the spot—
Thy glory and thy grief to thee made known—
Thou walk'd'st right on in faith, and faltered not,
A sword before thee, and beyond, a throne!

Anon, we see thee in retirement meek,
Waiting—unconsciously—guests from afar;
There camels, bearing each a lordly sheik,
Halt at the door, where paused their guiding star.
They enter, unannounced, the lonely place,
And fall in worship at the young child's feet;
They gaze with awe upon Messiah's face,
And then with virgin dignity so sweet,
Departing, silent, as from holy ground,
They leave rich gifts before the infant king,
While thrilled anew with thankfulness profound,
"These things" we see thee deeply pondering.

That night we see thee roused by Joseph's dream—
"Herod doth seek the young child to destroy!"
And long before the morning; cruel gleam,
Thy consort flees with thee to save thy boy.
No place in David's heritage for Him!
A softer shelter 'neath the stony spring
Ye find, and tho' the record here grows
We know thy patient heart ne'er dims, droops nor shrinks.

. . . . . .

O, might we ever walk by faith with thee,
In light and shadow, girded by His word;
The legend shining on our shields should be
Thine own—"Behold the handmaid of the Lord!"

Jan. 1, 1887. MRS. JOHN L. BUTLER.

LABOR IN THE WEST.

Steps Taken Toward Forming the New Party.

CINCINNATI, O., Jan. 9.—The new year opens auspiciously for the labor movement in this city. On Dec. 26 the most dignified, harmonious and respectable political mass meeting I ever attended was held at Workman's hall and steps taken to form a labor party in Hamilton county. A committee composed of five from the united labor party, five from the Central Labor union, five from the Land and Labor club No. 1 and five from the mass meeting, empowered to propose a scheme of organization to a representative meeting to be held Jan. 16, 1887, recommended that all delegates be required to signify their willingness to abide by the decisions reached in the conference; that all delegates and all the bodies they represent be asked to sever all connection with the old parties and attach themselves to the new; that each ward or other labor organization be invited to send five representatives to the conference, and that precinct, ward and central organizations be formed.

Since the meeting events have transpired that demonstrates that an undercurrent of duplicity is being generated within certain branches of the Knights of Labor that has for its object the defeat of the land and labor party. The true animus of this unknightly scheme is easily discernible in the light of other occurrences with which your readers are familiar. The land and labor club No. 1 of Ohio, after demonstrating its ability to attract public attention, and after receiving substantial recognition from labor organizations and materially influencing the work of the committee of twenty appointed to formulate a plan of organization for the labor party of Hamilton county, was maliciously stabbed in the back by a "prominent Knight of Labor," who desired to conceal his identity by not allowing his name to be published.

Pretending to favor the theories of the land and labor party, he shows his devotion by informing a reporter that, in his opinion, the movement in Cincinnati was anarchy in disguise, and replying to inquiries joins names of individuals in a cowardly manner, considering that his own was withheld. This false and utterly unfounded accusation was intended, coming from one "high in authority," to not only prejudice knights against the movement and ruin the influence of the club, but also to operate on the credulity of outsiders and play on the prejudices of the masses. It is but one more effort of the ecclesiastical authorities to dominate when they can and to use the power possessed in certain quarters to stifle a growing movement whose influence with the masses they oppose. But it will fail. The united labor party, at its convention on the 16th, will adopt a platform embracing all the salient points of the platform upon which the labor party of New York stood in the last campaign. This confirmation of the popularity of the free soil idea will add to the increasing anxiety of the capitalistic parties, and also emphatically declare that with matters of political progress in the United States the prelates at Rome have nothing to do.

A. S. HOUGHTON, M. D

LAND REFORM IN GERMANY.

The Works of Stamm and Flurscheim—An Earnest Propaganda.

Some years before the appearance of "Progress and Poverty," Dr. A. Theodore Stamm of Wiesbaden published in Germany a book entitled "The Salvation of Perishing Humanity." The author proposed the nationalization of the land as a remedy for pauperism and its cognate diseases in the body politic. His method was to give the State the monopoly of the right to loan money on mortgage up to the full value of the land. Such loans were not to be payable, and the State would thus become the virtual and eventually, through foreclosure, the nominal owner of the land. This proposal included a gradual acquisition of land by the State, with compensation to owners. It is in this last feature that it radically differs from the proposal made in "Progress and Poverty."

This idea of granting compensation to those who have lived on the proceeds of the work of others, and who have absorbed the results of the community's growth and activity, has, to say the least, two sides to it, and the English speaking advocates of land nationalization have pretty generally decided against such a scheme. The plan proposed by Dr. Stamm was, however, taken up by a society organized in 1874, but the time, shortly after the Franco-Prussian War, when German industry was rapidly extending, was inauspicious, and apparently little progress was made.

"Progress and Poverty" was translated into German in 1881, and this translation was followed shortly by a book called "The Peaceful Method," by Michael Flurscheim. Herr Flurscheim advocated the same plan as Dr. Stamm. Both books were well received, and "Progress and Poverty" ("Fortschritt und Armuth," as it is called) is now sold everywhere in Germany, and is to be seen in almost every book-store window in Berlin.

Through the efforts of Herr Flurscheim and a few active workers a society called the Land League was organized on the 4th of July, 1886 (a well chosen date), for the purpose of pushing the reform. They got control of the first two pages of a paper (weekly) called the *Berlin Exchange News*, devoted to reports of the produce market and general agricultural affairs, and also issued some 40,000 copies of a "call" on the voters of Germany for support. The paper was a good medium, and the determined way in which the agitators went to work soon attracted much attention to the question, Herr Flurscheim being called on to explain his views in detail before some of the leading politicians of the country. On the 3d of October last the league started a weekly paper of its own, called *Land*, under the management of Herr Hildebrandt of Berlin, by means of which a lively newspaper discussion has been raised. But it is chiefly due to the tireless activity of Michael Flurscheim that the success of the movement in Germany is due. He has traversed the country from end to end, lecturing and debating before all kinds of audiences, and the full reports of his labors would probably read very much like the accounts of Cobden and Bright during the Corn Law agitation in England.

To have a clear understanding of the precise status of this movement in Germany, however, it will be necessary to call to mind the general conditions that prevail there. Since the days of Lasalle and Marx, the Socialists (Social Democrats) have been in Germany a strong and constantly growing party. They claim and probably have 1,000,000 voters, or say one-seventh of the entire voting population. Through the efforts of the "Iron Chancellor" the Reichstag passed the anti-Socialist laws a few years ago. These are very general laws, which admit of much the same kind of stretching as does a protective tariff; and to-day they have been made to apply to almost every kind of working people's clubs in the country. The Government has dissolved organizations by the hundred; the press is almost dumb; in Berlin it is difficult for many of the trades unions even to get the necessary police authorization for a meeting. Permission is refused because it is feared that they might make "wrong" uses of the privilege; that is, they might commit the unpardonable offense of discussing some of the burning problems of the hour instead of doing the mere routine work connected with the organizations. A small citizens' meeting was held a short time ago in Berlin, and one of the newspapers, in commenting on it, said that it was the first of the kind in months. But the *coup d'etat*, if it may be so called, was the recent seizure, trial and conviction of seven of the Socialistic members of the German Reichstag on the ground that they had read and distributed the *Social Democrat*, the organ of the party—a paper, it may be observed, which is on the exchange list of every newspaper and in the house of every political economist in the country. And all this at the instance of Bismarck, who has called himself a Socialist, and who would probably be glad to see all the means of production controlled by the government (the very thing that the Social Democracy is striving for), the difference being that the autocrat wants it done in his own way without any interference on the part of the people.

The strangest phase of the situation is that any movement that partakes of a so-called "scientific" character may be advocated with impunity, and the most distinguished political economists in the country, men who advocate anything from partial land nationalization to State regulation of wages, call themselves "Socialists of the Chair." George's books, Flurscheim's books, and, until lately at least, even Marx's "Capital," the bible of the Social Democracy, are sold right and left; and yet a body of poor men are not allowed to discuss the problems of government, and the trades unionists are driven to hearing at their meetings lectures on subjects such as "German Peddlar Industries in the Light of Poetry and History."

The fact that there are some ten political parties represented in the Reichstag would make an outsider think that the right of free speech at least was pretty well recognized, but examination only proves that most of these parties are only things to hang a name to—representative signboards, as it were.

It is in such a country as this that the land nationalization ideas have taken root. The very fact that the open discussion of very many of the other schemes is crushed out by the despotic acts of the government, makes it perhaps at the first all the easier to push this proposition.

When the German Land League issued its "Call" it asked all true men to join the movement for humanity's sake—"for Kaiser and Fatherland." It created some amazement in the ranks of the good orthodox writers, that the men who proposed such a scheme should have the boldness to do it in the name of the emperor and their country. But the time is not far away when it will be recognized that making a government just is not annihilating government, and that giving all men an equal right to the land of a country will not prevent grain from growing, houses from being erected, nor men and women from working for themselves and those about them. As Herbert Spencer has said: "Such a doctrine is consistent with the highest civilization."

The Coal Oil Democrat.

Washington Correspondence Cincinnati Enquirer.

The secretary and Mrs. Whitney have brought the matter of entertainment in this very peculiar community to a point of perfection that has never before been attained. The same quality of terrapin and champagne is given at a New Year's or general reception, where everybody is free to come and be served at their house as is offered to guests on private occasions and to the president when he dines there.

A CURIOUS LAND TITLE.

An Illustration of the Law's Regard for Vested Rights.

An ingenious romancer of the legal profession has startled his brethren with the history of a Boston land title. The facts, as lawyers say, if not true, might be with no strain upon the law and only a mild forcing of coincidences.

Within the limits of the Boston fire of 1872, says this historian, lies a parcel of real estate which in 1805 was in the undisturbed possession of William Ingalls, who derived title from the will of his father, Thomas. Thomas Ingalls died in 1830, after specifically devising this land to his wife for life, and upon her death to William, his only child, to whom he left all the residue of his property, after directing him to pay a legacy to each of two nephews. When Thomas died his estate did not yield enough to pay the legacies, but the widow held the land in question until her death, in 1845, when William took possession. Fifteen years later, when from its increase in value William was enjoying a handsome income from the land, he was invited into court by his cousins, who demanded that the land be sold to pay their legacies. William, having with his mother held undisputed possession of the land for over thirty years, felt no uneasiness, relying upon the statute of limitations to protect him. But upon consulting a lawyer he found that he had no defense. There was no limitation of actions for legacies. Moreover, since the will gave him, after his mother's death, the same interest that he would have had without a will, the law deemed him to have taken the land by descent and not by will; wherefore, the legacies, with interest for thirty years, had to be fully paid before he could take anything. Accordingly the land was sold, bringing less than enough to pay William's cousins, and he relinquished possession to contemplate the virtue of benevolence as exemplified by his father.

William's cousins, named Jones, regarding the land as a good investment of their legacies, purchased it at the sale. But hardly were they familiar with the rent roll when one John Rogers sued for the land. They were as much surprised and more in the dark than William Ingalls was when he responded to their invitation; but as they had taken the precaution of having the title searched by an eminent and expensive real estate lawyer, who pronounced it clear, they took courage until the facts came out. It seems that for some time prior to 1750 the land belonged to one John Buttolph, who left it to his brother Thomas, and if he died without issue, then to his brother William. Thomas held until 1775, when he died, leaving an only daughter, who married Timothy Rogers. Mrs. Rogers held until 1790, when she died, after willing the land to her daughter, who in 1800 sold it to Thomas Ingalls, father of the unfortunate William. But Mrs. Rogers had two sons, Peter and John. Peter was insane, but lived until 1854, leaving no children, and John was the father of the John Rogers who so cordially invited the Messrs. Jones into court. The latter and living John stood in the shoes of his father. And this was his claim: The Buttolph will meant, in law, that the land should belong to Thomas Buttolph and to his issue as long as his issue should last; but upon failure of such issue it should go to his brother William. This kind of an estate in land does not descend in Massachusetts, like other real estate, to all the children of the deceased owner in equal shares, but to the oldest son if any, and to the daughters only in default of a son; nor can it be passed by will. Therefore, the living Rogers claimed that under the will of John Buttolph the land went first to his son Thomas, next to Thomas' only child, Mrs. Rogers, and at her death, instead of passing by her will to her daughter, it went to her elder son, Peter, the lunatic, and upon Peter's death to his brother John. But Peter had been out of possession since 1800, which would give the Joneses the benefit of the statute of limitations. By no means. Peter was a lunatic all his life, and did not die until 1854, and as the law allowed John Rogers ten years after Peter's death to claim the land as heir of his father, Peter's brother, the Joneses were compelled to retire in favor of Rogers, who began suit in 1855.

The case of Rogers against Jones caused a good deal of talk among lawyers and set a young member of the profession at work studying the facts of the case. Curiosity led him on until he traced the title to the land in question far back of John Buttolph's time. He found that Mr. Buttolph bought in 1730 of Hosea Johnson, who had bought in 1710 of Benjamin Parsons. It was in the deed from Parsons to Johnson that this young lawyer found the making of himself. Parsons had conveyed to Johnson without adding the word "heirs," and so, under a decision of the supreme bench, which the lawyer had recently read, Johnson took only a life estate, and at his death the land, in whomsoever's possession it might be, reverted to Parson's heirs. Investigation disclosed the fact that Johnson did not die until 1786, and that Parsons' only heir was a granddaughter, aged eighteen, and just married. This young woman and her husband both died in their diamond wedding year, 1861, and as she had been under the legal disability of coverture until her death, and from the time when, by the death of Johnson, she, as heir of Parsons, acquired her right to the land, the statute of limitations gave her heirs ten years, or until 1871, within which to bring suit for their birthright. These heirs proved to be poor, and the lawyer interested a Boston speculator named John Smith in the matter, with the result that John Rogers was evicted. The land was sold nominally for the benefit of the heirs, and John Smith became its owner by purchase at the sale. Soon after Smith took possession the fire of 1872 swept over his land, but the ruins were hardly cold before he was at work rebuilding. He also bought an adjoining lot, and covered the whole with a splendid block of buildings.

Mr. Ingalls, from whom the land was taken in the first place, was amazed at these rapid and involuntary transfers, and sought legal advice. His lawyer evidently thought the game worth working, for he took up the chain of title where the young lawyer had dropped it, and in due time was rewarded for his diligence. It appeared that all the land now owned by Smith had, in 1643 or 1644, constituted one parcel in the possession of Madid Engle, who in 1660, under the name of Manditt Engles, conveyed to John Vergoose on the express condition that no building should ever be erected on a certain portion of the premises. It happened that this portion had never been built upon until after the fire, when Mr. Smith unwittingly broke the covenant and the whole property was forfeit to the heirs of Manditt Engles, against whom, since their right accrued in 1872, no statute of limitations could apply. It only remained to find the Engles, and William Ingalls found the one who was entitled to inherit from Manditt. It was himself. It occurred to him that "Engles" was similar in sound to "Ingalls," and he instituted a search into his own genealogy, which enabled him to prove his case.

Mr. Smith's pluck, for which he had been noted, was gone. He went to Mr. Ingalls and made the best terms he could. The law, which is extremely jealous of the rights of property and abhors anything like confiscation, would have taken from Smith and given to Ingalls not only the land originally taken from him, but also the income the land had yielded to Smith, the adjoining land and all the buildings. Ingalls, however, was more gracious. To avoid a lawsuit he paid Mr. Smith for his outlay in improvements and took possession with a clear conscience.

The author of this history shrewdly observes in conclusion that Boston lawyers now look more disgusted than ever when "requested to just step over" to the register's office and "look down" a simple title which some careful lawyer did in less than half an hour last year and found all right, and for which his charge was $5.

MONOPOLISTS INDICTED.

Standard Oil Company Men on Trial for Criminal Conspiracy.

The Standard Oil company case came up before Justice Childs of Buffalo last week. The persons indicted were John D. Archbald, Henry H. Rogers and Ambrose McGregor of the Standard Oil company of New York, and Charles M. and Hiram B. Everest of the Vacuum Oil company of Rochester. The indictments was found a year ago. The defendants demurred. The demurrer was overruled and the defendants entered a plea of not guilty. The case came up on a joint motion: (1) for leave to inspect the evidence before the grand jury, upon which the indictments were found; and (2) for a bill of particulars of the crimes charged in the indictments. The general charge is that of conspiracy, the prosecuting witness being C. B. Matthews, president of the Buffalo Lubricating Oil company. The defendants are accused of subornation of perjury; that they employed Albert Miller, superintendent of the Lubricating Oil works, to so construct the buildings that they could be easily destroyed by fire from an explosion; that Miller, under their direction, did plan an explosion; that by unusually hot fires he exploded one of the stills, and, believing his work to be accomplished, took refuge in the defendants' works near by to watch the result; that he was taken in charge by the defendant Hiram B. Everest; that the greatest secrecy was observed, such that Miller's wife was only able to find out about him by calling on the Everests at their office in Rochester; that together they went to New York, and there consulted with others of the Standard's head men; that Miller and Everest slept together at Young's hotel in Boston; that they went together to San Francisco and remained for a year and a half, only returning when their detectives advised them that the work of Miller was not generally known; that Miller was paid a salary of $1,500 and expenses; that he and others of the Lubricating company's trusted employes were induced to leave, and were supported in idleness; that malicious suits were brought to harass the defendant and the corporation he represented, and, in fact, that every method that could be devised was employed to force him to abandon the business in which he was engaged. It is understood that Miller turned state's evidence and made full confession to the grand jury, and that it is upon his evidence the prosecution relies.

Mr. Bacon, for the accused, argued that the charges in the indictment constituted a legal drag-net, into which the prosecution would be allowed to draw any and all evidence they might produce between now and the time the courts should give the proofs to the jury. This policy the court should not allow. The Standard Oil company could not, perhaps, expect a full and fair trial, but its officers did think they had a right to a list of the crimes with which they were charged. They were charged with attempting the control of the oil product of the globe, and under the present schedule there was nothing to interfere with the people going to the Caspian sea to bring witnesses of the fact, so vague were the charges. It seemed to him that C. B. Matthews, and not the Standard Oil officials, was guilty of conspiracy. It was but simple justice that the alleged "poor, miserable criminals" should know what crimes they were guilty of. They should know, for instance, whether the self-confessed scoundrel, Albert Miller, was coming into court to testify to his own rascality, and they should be provided with the names of the persons they were charged with hiring to perjure themselves.

District Attorney Quinby in opening for the prosecution said the motions pending were but two of many methods employed by the defendants to break down the prosecution. They desired to wriggle out of the indictments without their being tried, and for an obvious reason. They desired to carry the idea that the charges were foolish and baseless. It had been claimed that the state's witness, Miller, was a rascal not to be believed. All he had to say in answer to that was that one of the defendants was in his company constantly for a year and a half, and slept with him every night. The Standard Oil company, it was presumed, was therefore fully posted as to his character. The district attorney, in answer to the application for a bill of particulars, said the defendants could get a very good idea of the charges against them by reading the evidence taken at the trial of the civil action. The real objects of the obstruction was either to kill time, so that the bar of the statute of limitations might run against them, or to find some bit of illegal evidence upon which the indictments were found upon which an application might be made for their discharge. The particulars asked for might all be found in the evidence, which was in court. Anything else they could doubtless ascertain from their "detectives, attorneys and tools" scattered all over the habitable globe.

The court took the papers and reserved decision.

Poverty Leads to Crime.

Last Saturday night Mrs. Steinger, a widow with five small children, was arrested for stealing a bottle of hair oil. Upon her person were found small articles in great variety, which she had stolen. The *Herald* says she told a sad story of want. When desperate, her rag-clad children crying for food, she was tempted to steal. The police found she had told the truth about the condition of her home. Her five children were almost naked, the rooms were cold and cheerless, and there was not even a crust in the house to satisfy the cravings of hunger of the puny babes, whose features told too plainly that they were starving.

Love Lightens Labor.

A good wife rose from her bed one morn,
And thought with a nervous dread
Of the piles of clothes to be washed, and more
Than a dozen mouths to be fed:
"There's the meals to get for the men in the field,
And the children to fix away
To school, and the milk to be skimmed and churned;
And all to be done this day."

It had rained in the night and all the wood
Was wet as it could be;
There were puddings and pies to bake, besides
A loaf of cake for tea;
And the day was hot, and her aching head
Throbbed wearily as she said,
"If maidens but knew what good wives know,
They would be in no haste to wed."

"Jennie, what do you think I told Ben Brown?"
Called the farmer from the well;
And a flush crept up to his sun-burnt brow,
And his eyes half bashfully fell:
"It was this," he said, and coming near,
He smiled, and stooping down,
Kissed her cheek—"'twas this, that you were the best
And the dearest wife in town!"

The farmer went back to the field, and the wife,
In a smiling and absent way,
Sang snatches of tender little songs,
Unsung for many a day.
And the pain in her head was gone, and the clothes
Were white as the foam of the sea;
Her bread was light and her butter was sweet,
And as golden as it could be.

"Just think," the children all called in a breath,
"Tom Wood has run off to sea!
He wouldn't, I know, if he only had had
As happy a home as we."
The night came down, and the good wife smiled
To herself, as she softly said:
"'Tis so sweet to labor for those we love,
It's not strange that maids will wed!"

GUILD OF THE IRON CROSS.

An Order Composed of Workers—Its Yearly Convention on the 25th Inst.

The Guild of the Iron Cross carries its own description in the name it has adopted. It is a society of Christian men, and has for its foremost object the bringing of Christian principles to bear upon some sides of the great problem—the emancipation and elevation of labor—to the solution of which THE STANDARD has so nobly devoted itself. One of the primary declarations of the guild is that *all* men are bound to labor. This declaration is based on the most essential doctrines of the Christian faith, and it is put forth fearlessly to rich as well as to poor. To emphasize this principle the guild admits no one a full member who does not work with his hands. It is a society of workingmen and working boys. One of the two chief objects aimed at by the guild is the *sanctification of labor*—giving to labor its rightful place as not only the bounden duty of every man, but a means of his attaining perfection. The other object aimed at is the binding together of workingmen in a crusade against three crying forms of vice—intemperance, blasphemy and impurity. Each member takes a pledge to resist these sins in himself and to use his influence to keep others from committing them. The pledge contains no reference to total abstinence; the members are left free to adopt that as a practice or not, as they choose. Any baptized workingman who will sign this pledge may be elected a member. Any man signing the pledge and hanging it up in his room may be an associate. Priest-associates must be priests in the Episcopal church. The head of the guild at present is the chaplain-general, the Right Rev. Frederick D. Huntington, bishop of Central New York. The yearly convention of the guild is to be held on St. Paul's day, the 25th of this month, at St. Augustine's chapel, Houston street, just east of the Bowery. On the evening of that day, at 8 o'clock, there will be a special service for the guild and a sermon by the chaplain-general, Bishop Huntington.

In asking the presence at this service of the readers of THE STANDARD in this city, whatever their religious views be, I believe I am only doing what most of them will grant me an entire right to do. There are some of us—more, it may be, than openly acknowledge it—who find our support and inspiration in this great struggle for social justice and political purity in the teaching of the Catholic faith. The Episcopal church, as a part of the Catholic church, inherits that faith, and her duty and privilege is to deliver it free from human addition and unimpaired by human denial to men of all classes and of none.

If she has failed in any measure to do this in the past, through the oppressive influence of wealth and rank and alliance with the world, then it rests upon all who now serve at her altars to declare the more plainly to those she has hitherto neglected the message handed down unchanged from the lips of Christ and his apostles, and set forth in ever increasing clearness by the councils of the universal church. And may we not say that it rests with fair minded men to hear the message thus delivered? Perhaps when this is faithfully done on both sides, it will be found that the church has a word for workingmen that they can not afford and will not wish to neglect.

It certainly will be found that the church has a far better mission than merely to preach, as her clergy have sometimes done, to the rich alms-giving and to the poor resignation.

The Guild of the Iron Cross is a medium through which the true message of the church may reach the ears of workingmen. My brothers, in this struggle for the right, will you not give us the opportunity to put before you what to us seem the really vital truths in this issue?

I have not been at pains to deny the stupid calumny that the Guild of the Iron Cross was created in a spirit of hostility to one great labor organization, the Order of the Knights of Labor.

Many members of the Iron Cross are knights, and they feel no sense of disloyalty to either body. Certainly the knights themselves would be the first to deny that a society which exalts the dignity of labor and strives for temperance, reverence and purity is opposed to their order.

If any uncertainty still exists let them give us an impartial hearing at St. Augustine's chapel, Tuesday evening, Jan. 25.

JAMES O. S. HUNTINGTON,
Supt., C. H. C.

HOW LAND VALUES GROW.

A Phenomenon of Private Landownership Illustrated in California.

A correspondent of the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, in writing up the Southern California health resort, Pasadena, incidentally illustrates an interesting phase of private landownership in a new and rapidly growing community:

"I might give hundreds of instances, coming under my own knowledge," says the correspondent, "in which persons here have doubled, and many quadrupled their money invested in lands within twelve months, but will confine myself to a few.

"Mr. White, photographer, of Cincinnati, resolved to come to California for his health. He finally landed in Pasadena with his wife, who bought a lot, 130x200 feet, for $1,300, built a residence and a photographic gallery upon it, costing $4,000, and started business. To-day she could sell her home and gallery for $25,000. Her husband, having got a new lease of life, purchased a sixty foot lot at ten dollars per foot, and after holding it for six months has been offered sixty dollars per foot for it.

"Prof. I. M. Coyner was formerly a teacher in Indiana. His wife invested $3,000 in real estate, held it six months, and sold for $10,000, with which she bought again, and now the second purchase has doubled in value, while her purchaser resold in a few weeks for $15,000.

"Mrs. M. V. Longley, of Cincinnati, brought her invalid husband to Pasadena in 1885. Near by she bought two acres of land at $500 per acre, covered with orange, apricot and lemon trees, but without a house or a street. In about a year's time other lots have been sold and houses built upon them, new streets laid out, giving her two corner lots. She has sold a portion of her ground at the rate of $2,000 an acre; and while retaining her home lot of 150x100, she could now sell the rest for $3,000, thus more than quadrupling her investment.

"Less than three years ago Mr. Dougherty sold to Dr. Hunt fifty-eight acres in 'South Pasadena' for $60 per acre. After selling off six acres of it for about $9,000, Dr. Hunt has just sold the remaining fifty-two acres to a syndicate for $25,000, which is about $500 per acre—ten times the price paid for it, and twice as much as he asked for it a year ago. This syndicate will subdivide, and expect to resell within six months for double what they pay.

"Ten months ago Mr. John F. Jewett bought a small lot in the Highlands for $500, for which he has just declined $1,500; and he has recently bought a house and lot for $6,000, which was offered him less than a year since for $2,000.

"As an indication of the value of business lots in the central part of the city, I will mention the sale yesterday of twenty-five feet at $180 per foot, that was purchased in April last at $77 per foot.

"Grace hill is a fancy tract of five acres, without any house, near the Raymond hotel, which sold for $4,000 a year ago. One day this week it filled the eye of a wealthy newcomer, who rolled out $30,000 for it."

THE INDIAN QUESTION.

Reflections, Moral and Otherwise, on Buffalo Bill's Show.

I went the other night to see Buffalo Bill and his Indians. I like the way B. B. is utilizing the red man and woman and converting them from Ishmaelites and wanderers to actors and actresses, illustrating the wild and barbarous life of the native forest to us—the superior race, the tenement-housed race, the often badly-fed, hard-worked, and sometimes badly-governed race, who have in our "strides toward civilization" cleared off the wild woods and with them their pure air, pure water, free wood, free game and free house lots, in places exchanging the same for long leases, a mortgage on every other house and a dead cat in every other gutter.

For myself, having lived the life of an Indian, I prefer it to that of a white man or woman in the sixth story of a tenement house, in arrears for rent, with a different smell on every floor, and a different clothes line out of every back window. But that was when I was poor. I was poor because I was poor in mind. That is, I thought I must necessarily be poor. I kept a county poor house in my intellect. I lived in it. I said, "I am destined to poverty and hard luck." For that reason I had poverty and hard luck." When I changed my mind I ceased to be in hard luck. I found that a belief in one's own hard luck, a belief that everything one undertook must fail, a belief that one is fated to live on a low level and live cheap and eat cheap and dress cheap and die cheap, is as certain to carry one into the diabolical domain of cheapness, ten cent restaurants and Chinese wash houses as a greased Norwegian shoe will carry you down the slope of a snow covered mountain at the rate of forty miles per hour, more or less.

If you want to get rich commence first by feeling rich. If you feel rich you will make those around you feel that you feel rich. They all do it. I mean those who are getting rich. You take a man who hasn't five dollars in his pocket and who is cultivating by himself the idea that he has a hundred thousand dollars somewhere, who cultivates this idea all alone by himself in the privacy of his room, who insists upon it to himself that he has that hundred thousand somewhere, when that man buys a two-cent newspaper he'll make the newsman feel that he has a power of money in his pocket. If he pulls out that two cents with the thought that its the last two cents he'll ever have in this world or the next, he'll make the newsdealer feel that he's a "poor fool," as we used to call all poor cusses on the east end of Long Island when we shot our own or other people's ducks for a living. Because your thought is a thing as real as your bank account (if you have one). This thing that you send out of your mind every hour and second is felt by all you meet and makes them think of you just as you think of yourself. When a confidence man plays his racket on a stranger, do you think he is all the time saying and thinking to himself, "I'm a fraud?" Not a bit of it. He is saying in thought to himself and shooting this thought right into Hayseed's brain: "I'm a good, square, honest and pious man, I am. I wouldn't rob a fly of a meal's victuals, I wouldn't. I'm a good angel, I am a ministering spirit, a sanctified lamb, I am." That's what does the business. The confidence man is up, you see, in metaphysical laws, and instead of maundering and pottering over it like so many of our closet philosophers, he puts his theories into practical operation to make his daily bread and beer.

I am by birth a Swedenborgian, and believe implicitly with him in the doctrine of correspondences. In plainer and more sensible words, I believe that a man or a woman's material condition as to health or fortune is an exact type of that man or woman's spiritual or mental condition. If a man wears a seedy, slovenly coat on his back it's because he does not aspire above a seedy and slovenly coat in his mind. If a man or woman is always a hireling on wages and grumbling at the exactions of hard employers, it's because they are afraid to take the risks and responsibilities of bossing a business for themselves. They're afraid they'll fail. They're afraid they'll get in debt. Well, supposing you do fail. Every successful man fails two or three times before he gets his grand bounce on the road to fortune. Supposing you do get in debt? Who that goes into business doesn't get in debt? What corporation or combination is there that doesn't borrow money to push a big thing ahead? What does the railroad company do but borrow your money to build what it hasn't built when you subscribe for the stock? What do you get when you get the stock? Some pieces of paper promising you so many shares in the road when it's built partly by your money. "Keep out of debt" is the goody goody advice poured into the young man's ear, when every big scheme in the world is founded on a debt. Such advice is pernicious.

But where am I? Whom have I come to see? Shall I knock on the outside or the inside of my friend's door? What have I come for? Am I in? Who am I? What do I want? I started out with Buffalo Bill's Indians. It reminds me of the way Uncle Peter Cooper once got stuck on a quotation in an after dinner speech. His quote was "Lo, the poor Indian whose untutored mind—" He got that far and stopped. He stuck. He was silent. He could not recollect the rest of the sentence. Everybody else was silent. Finally Uncle Peter went back and took a fresh start. "Lo, the poor Indian—" then his memory cut off the rest of the sentence. "Whose untutored mind" was now blotted from his recollection. There were lots at the table who knew the verse well, but every one felt that the old gentleman would be better pleased to recollect it himself. "Well, really gentlemen," said Uncle Peter, "I thought I had that verse by heart." Then he took another start. This time he go no further than "Lo," and gave it up entirely. The symptoms were that if he'd tried again he would have forgotten "Lo," also—as I seem to have done.

I believe myself it is better to forget many things than to remember them. I think the art or science of forgetting should be cultivated in our public schools. What's the use of remembering and being troubled about a debt—until you've got money to pay it? What's the use of remembering any trouble and having it pester you while you're working to stave off the trouble? What's the use of not being able to forget the case of smallpox next door that you're mortally afraid of? What's the use of keeping in mind all day the man that's after you with a derringer because you won't marry his sister or his aunt or his wife's sister? Wouldn't you pay a high price for a pill which would make you able to forget all about him or her forever? If I was going into the patent medicine business, I'd invent a forgetting pill—one dose taken before bed time, causing a total discharge from the memory of everything that had troubled it for the past ten years, and you can bet your old suspenders I'd have a carriage, a footman, a coat of arms and a daughter to marry into the English nobility within a year.

One great trouble of our day and time is that there's more stuffed into people's brains than they can make any profitable use of. I never could see the exact use of knowing that the sun was ninety-six millions of miles from the earth. It may not be a fact either. Some future astronomer may discover that the present measurements are all wrong, and then down goes your house and the temple of happiness you had built on the lie that the sun was ninety-six millions of miles from our own terrestrial football. If knowledge is power, why don't the school masters and mistresses own all the railway stock and telegraph lines? If knowledge is power, why don't the college professors run more of the banks of this country? If knowledge is power, why is Jay Gould, with his mouse trap, more than a match on the fields of finance for a barn full of college presidents, with the Concord school of philosophy thrown in?

I know it is heretical to ask these questions, but I can't help it; they will come to me. In coming they will pop out. I want to know, for instance, why it is that when a young man is turned out of college with one finished education he has to go to work and learn another before he succeeds in the business he undertakes, if he succeeds at all.

These thoughts inspire my now not youthful mind
To be the greatest of mankind.
Great, not like Cæsar, stained with blood,
But only great as I am good.

I had no idea when I started that I should be so long in getting to the Indian question. The subject seems much farther off than when I started to consider it. But I will try again next week, and see if I can't get at least to the borders of the Indian territory.

PRENTICE MULFORD.

PROF. WALKER ON LAND TENURE.

Remarkable Admissions by One of the Champions of Conservatism.

Mr. Francis A. Walker has an article on "Socialism" in the January number of *Scribner's Magazine*, in which he thus discusses the theory of the ownership of land by the community:

"The last of the socialistic measures to which I shall advert is the proposal for the nationalization of the land.

"Now, I think I hear one-half my readers exclaim, 'The nationalization of the land! Surely that is communism of the rankest sort, and not socialism at all!' while the other half say, 'Socialistic, indeed! Well, if the man who advocates the nationalization of land is not to be called a Socialist, out and out, whom shall we call Socialists?' To these imagined expressions of dissent I reply, that the project for the nationalization of the land, as explained by John Stuart Mill, for example, has not the faintest trace of a communistic savor; and secondly, while it is highly socialistic, the man who advocates it is not for that reason alone to be classed as a Socialist, since he may be one who, in all other respects, holds fully and strongly to individual initiative enterprise in industry. He might conceivably be so strenuous an advocate of *lassez faire* as to oppose factory acts, public education, special immunities and privileges to savings banks, or even free roads and bridges, as too socialistic for his taste.

"*There is a substantially unanimous consent among all publicists that property in land stands upon a very different basis from property in the product of labor.*

"Nothing has ever been adduced to break the force of Mr. Mill's demonstration that a continually increasing value in any progressive state is given to the land through the exertions and sacrifices of the community as a whole.

"If private property in land has been created and has been freed from the obligation to contribute that unearned increment to the treasury, this has been done solely as a matter of political and economic expediency. The man who proposes that, with due compensation for existing rights, all future enhancement of the value of land not due to distinct applications of labor and capital in its improvement shall go to the state, by such fiscal means as may be deemed most advantageous to all concerned, is not to be called a Communist. *He only claims that the community as a whole shall possess and enjoy that which the community as a whole has undeniably created.* The Communist is a man who claims that the community shall possess and enjoy that which individuals have created.

"So far as England and the United States are concerned, the project for the nationalization of the land, notwithstanding the tremendous uproar it has created, especially in the former country, does not appear to be in any high degree formidable. Doubtless in England, where an aristocratic holding of the land prevails, this agitation will induce serious efforts to create a peasant proprietorship. It is, also, not improbable that the discussion regarding the tenure of the soil will lead to additional burdens being imposed upon real estate. Yet the advantages attending private ownership, *notwithstanding the admitted fact that the system sacrifices, in its very beginning, the equities of the subject matter*, are so manifest, so conspicuous, so vast, that there seems little danger that the schemes of Messrs. Mill, Wallace and George will ever come to prevail over the plain, frank, blunt, common sense of the English race."

The Inter-State Commerce Bill.

Louisville, Ky., Evening Post.

Jay Gould and Mr. Chauncey M. Depew are full of vaticinations of evil over the Inter-State Commerce bill. They say its passage in the form approved by the conference committee of the two houses of congress will drive grain and provisions from the great east and west trunk lines, which are the backbone of our American railway system, to the Canadian roads and the Mississippi river. What of it? Transportation will as surely seek the cheapest route as water does its level, and if carriage via the lakes or the Mississippi to Atlantic ports is less expensive, commerce will choose those outlets and avenues whether any inter-State bill is passed or not. Really, the assertions of Messrs. Gould and Depew must be taken with a liberal allowance of salt. The fact is, while our business system is very elastic and our business men are very patient under exactions, neither possess enough of the spirit of self-sacrifice to submit to the exorbitant charges of the American trunk lines when they are not absolutely compelled to do so. So, then, this transportation tub of ours must stand on a proper bottom, no matter what Wall street says about it. The question of freights will, perforce, adjust itself to conditions permitting the best profits.

Mules and Men.

The *North American Review* has been publishing a series of articles by Henry George on the condition of Pennsylvania coal miners, presenting facts gathered on the spot. These facts are not only stubborn but frightful. Now comes the *National Labor Tribune* of Pittsburg, with a humor that is grim indeed, telling us that an agent of the humane society for western Pennsylvania, is inspecting the mules used in the mines; ordering out for rest and medical attention the beasts unfit for work and prosecuting owners who do not comply with the law against cruelty to animals. The miners have much law on their side, but, it is said, there is no society looking after the enforcement of it in their interest.

The Lazarus of To-Day.

Atlanta Constitution.

Lazarus, "full of sores," lay at the gate of the rich man, who was "clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day." Now we are all taught that the rich man was very wicked and hard-hearted; but suppose a beggar in the fix of poor old Lazarus should attempt to lie at the gate of an Atlantian what would be done? The police would be telephoned for and the black maria would carry Lazarus off the highways.

The Usual.

Denver Enquirer.

Denver Merchant—Say, John, I can't see how you can support Henry George, with his teachings.

Denver Workingman—Well, Mr. B., what are his teachings?

D. M.—Confound him, I don't know anything about such cranks; I never waste my time in reading their slush.

MUSIC IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

The Existing System Should be Improved or Abandoned.

Study of the subject in 112 cities, towns and villages in the middle, eastern and western states compels me to state that the way in which notation singing is taught in most public schools is a delusion to the public, a fraud on the taxpayers and a snare to the pupils.

The late Richard Grant White earned the contempt of all educated musicians (as has the living John S. Dwight of Boston), for absurd and empirical screeds on the music of Wagner, Liszt and Berlig, names which are now leading the world; but Mr. White earned our respects and thanks for his scathing denunciation of the hollowness and pretensions of our public schools in many ways, although interested city hirelings of course tried to contradict him at the time. Mr. White, however, omitted to do anything like justice to the so-called "music" of our schools, which in Brooklyn costs about $15,000, and in New York between $20,000 and $30,000 a year in singing teachers' salaries, with never a public examination in music nor a public concert of any kind to give the taxpayers some "show for the money."

To personal exceptions taken at the present stupid way of carrying on common school music, I have always been met by the rejoinder that "the schools are not music schools, and therefore a high grade of musical proficiency must not be looked for in them." The reply is that whatever is done at all should be done well, and because a child is not expected to calculate an eclipse, is no reason why that child should not be thoroughly taught that "two and two make four."

In teaching singing in some of the schools the notes come in for no attention at all, and the singing is "by rote," or is only "technical" so far as it goes. But so defective is this that, after four or five years of such singing, the children know not how to sing two sounds smoothly, or with simple *portamento*, know nothing about the proper position of the tongue, correct emission of sounds or repression of the breath.

In other schools full attention is given to the study of the notes; but even with such classes it is a very rare thing to find a pupil, even as old as fifteen, who can really read the notes and sing sharps and flats with accurate intonation. When one finds such a scholar it is seventy-five to one the case that its proficiency is owing to private teaching at home and not to public school teaching.

Now, the object in teaching music at all in the public schools is the same as that of teaching the other branches, namely, to put the pupils "on their feet" as to "rudimental life," so to speak, so as to help them to help themselves to make a living; and as to music, there are only two conventional ways by which its practitioner can "make it pay," namely, either by making music or teaching it. To compose it is so rare a talent and is so uncertain of compensation, that it can scarcely be counted upon. Therefore, if a child can neither sing nor read music after five years' schooling, it is a pretty good evidence of the waste of money in musical school exercises.

What is the system?

I will describe it.

Hundreds of children (four or five hundred at a time is a common class), with no discrimination of sex, age, or natural talent, are taught twice a week for from twenty minutes to an hour by teachers, many of them without a piano to guide the ear and train it "to standard," and scarce one of whom has natural "positive pitch" by which to substitute a piano, and through which to correct the voices when they fall from the "diapason" and flatten. I maintain that this permanently deforms the ear of the pupils.

The English alphabet has twenty-six letters, which are, of course, learned thoroughly and properly applied in reading, writing and pronunciation by the pupils.

The musical language has but seven letters, and yet four or five years' repetition of them fails to give the pupils the slightest idea of their relation to each other, their groupings, successions or modifications, while as to their dynamics (answering to orthoepy in grammar), a knowledge of this is simply beyond all expectation; consequently the lettering style prevails.

It is folly to deny that while children are intelligently taught singing in other schools (notably in the German turn schools of this city) it is impossible in our public schools.

The advocates for notation study (supposing it to be honestly conducted) believe that it is more valuable than technical study in qualifying the pupils to become teachers: but the advocates of technical study hold that it is the more profitable because the pupils are thus taught to give pleasure by singing. The question is as to which can bring pay the soonest after school days—teaching or performing?

Now to my mind it seems that a good singer is better than a poor teacher, and the country is cursed to-day by hundreds of presumptuous young and old teachers who are totally unfit to teach music in any department, but who might make very acceptable performers at good pay. They now simply trade upon the ignorance of the community who pay them for misleading their children in art instruction.

And more could be written on this topic, but no improvement can be looked for without a turning upside down and radical change of the present unphilosophical way in which music is now "dabbled with" in our schools; and to do this the highest grade of teachers must be employed. Girls must not be taught with boys. Girls under fifteen and over fifteen must not be taught together, and boys over fourteen must not be allowed to sing at all, or during that period when their beards and voices are about equally valuable and ornamental. Neither time nor money should be wasted on unmusical pupils.

True it is that as a musical nation we are not yet "out of the woods." We don't even know how to listen to music, for at our "swell" operas and concerts the audiences talk the loudest.

I maintain that to remedy all this, it is absolutely indispensible to begin with the young, and to begin in a sensible way.

If our teachers of reading, arithmetic and writing showed results after one month as discreditable as our music teachers do after a year's probation, they would not be retained for five minutes. Music should be properly taught in our schools or not taught at all.

JEROME HOPKINS.

Clover Hill Hermitage, Jan. 9.

Giving and Living.

Forever the sun is pouring its gold
On a hundred worlds that beg and borrow;
His warmth he squanders on summits cold
His wealth on the homes of want and sorrow
To withhold his largess of precious light
Is to bury himself in eternal night—
To give
Is to live.

The flower shines not for itself at all,
Its joy is the joy it freely diffuses,
Of beauty and balm it is prodigal,
And it lives in the light it freely loses.
No choice for the rose but glory or doom,
To exhale or smother, to wither or bloom,
To deny
Is to die.

The seas lend silvery rains to the land,
The land its sapphire streams to the ocean;
The heart sends blood to the brain of command,
The brain to the heart its lightning motion;
And over and over we yield our breath,
Till the mirror is dry and images death.
To live
Is to give.

He is dead whose hand is not open wide
To help the need of a human brother;
He doubles the length of his lifelong ride
Who gives fortunate place to another;
And a thousand million lives are his
Who carries the world in his sympathies.
To deny
Is to die.

RELIGIOUS.

The Indwelling Spirit.

God is never so far off
As even to be near.
He is within; our spirit is
The home he holds most dear.
To think of him as by our side
Is almost as untrue
As to remove his throne beyond
Those skies of starry blue.
So all the while I thought myself
Homeless, forlorn and weary,
Missing my joy, I walked the earth,
Myself God's sanctuary. —*F. W. Faber.*

A Short Sermon.

By Two Clergymen.

Two clergymen, one a Catholic and the other an Episcopalian, recently spent part of an evening together studying the ethics of the land question. The text selected was Psalm, cxiii., Donay version, cxv., King James' version, 16th verse. They agreed upon five points:

1. Social adjustments have not come scientifically; they have been expedient outgrowths of society in a more or less rude state, and power and greed have always seized advantage.

2. God gave the land, as he did the air and the sunshine, for all his children; hence appropriation of it by individuals, beyond their use of it, is an exclusion of brothers who may need it, and is to that extent wrong.

3. Trace back the titles under which land is held as private property in our older States, and every one will be found to have its origin in what modern ethics discerns to be injustice.

4. Population gives an unearned increment of value to land, the whole of which value, less a small tax, now goes to the landholder. It does not belong to him in economic justice for the reason that it is unearned by him and should belong to the community by whose aggregation this value is created. The injustice is aggravated in the case of those who hold land idle for speculative purposes, and are rewarded for so doing by being taxed less for an unimproved than for an improved lot of ground. These owners of land, whether improved and used, or unimproved and unused, win wealth created by their brothers, and they win it by hindering their brothers.

5. Any readjustment in a right direction should do the least harm to those who are found holding privilege under an ancient wrong. The taxation of land values—virtually the resumption by the commonwealth of what is the property of all—will confer the greatest good upon the poor and do the least injury to any others.

We hold the right of every child born in this world to his own foothold on the earth, and the right of every man to room among his fellows on the land, to labor for himself."

News and Opinions.

Dr. Barbour resigns the pastorate of Yale college, and this brings up the question whether chapel attendance shall continue to be compulsory there.

There is much excitement in consequence of the endeavor of the American board of foreign missions to force this new reading of the Apostle's creed upon its missionaries:

I believe in one God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; in the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he entered into Paradise, the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge, according to the things done in the body, the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy scriptures; the holy church universal; the communion of saints; the new spiritual birth; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the dead; the final separation of the righteous and the wicked; and the life and death everlasting. *Amen.*

The changes made are the addition of a new first article, the alteration of "descended into hell" to "entered into paradise;" also "judge the living and the dead" to "judge according to the things done in the body, the living and the dead" (aimed at the new theology), the addition of the "holy scriptures," the substitution of "universal" for "Catholic," the addition of "the new spiritual birth," and the substitution for "the life everlasting" of the last two clauses above, which is also a blow at the new theology.

An effort is being made to supplant agnosticism by Buddhism in some New York circles.

The Guild of the Iron Cross is to hold a service on the evening of January 25 in the chapel of St. Augustine, this city. The guild is intended to unite workingmen of the Protestant-Episcopal church in a pledge of temperance, chastity and reverence. There is much promise in the fact that Bishop Huntington, the father of the Rev. James O. S. Huntington, who was prominent in the George campaign, is to preach at this service, on "The church and the labor world." There is quite a long list of honorary chaplains (bishops), chaplains and priests' associate, not many of whom are known to have given much attention to labor problems.

The Bakers' Union No. 1, has asked the ministers in New York to propose some relief for bakers, who are said to be the hardest worked toilers seven days in the week and in heated cellars.

The Bishop of Carlisle suggests that the ten commandments were originally given in this simple form:

1. Thou shalt have none other God before Me.
2. Thou shalt not make thee any graven image.
3. Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah, thy God, in vain.
4. Thou shalt remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.
5. Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother.
6. Thou shalt not kill.
7. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
8. Thou shalt not steal.
9. Thou shalt not bear false witness.
10. Thou shalt not covet.

A Jewish theological seminary has been opened in New York intended to give as thorough a scholastic training to those who are to become rabbis as is afforded by the best rabbinical seminaries of Europe. It is meant to be under influence that is in sympathy with modern scientific methods of research and with American habits of thought, and yet is to be identified with historical Judaism.

The statistics for 1886 show that the churches of the country have grown considerably, and that contributions have increased. The Congregationalists have added to their membership 27,150, the Presbyterians (north) 51,177, the Methodist churches have large gains, the Protestant-Episcopal has also had a proportionate increase, and the Roman Catholic has not been behind any of the others—perhaps ahead of them in relative growth. The most important question is whether this growth keeps pace with that of population, and census returns are required for the answer.

LAND AND TITHE.

The Tithe Really a Land Tax That the Land Owner Dodges.

There is a general impression in this country that the clergyman of the Church of England goes around taking from every well-to-do neighbor, whatever may be his religious convictions, a tenth of his earnings. Nothing could be further from the truth. The tithe is on the land. The present agitation is bringing to light some interesting facts that stalwart journals like the *Church Reformer* are spreading before the people. These facts are of interest here whether or not we care anything about disestablishment or the North Wales agitation on the subject of tithes. Whatever the merits of these questions, their history is but another exhibition of landlord greed. A contributor of the paper referred to above says, "The landlords have stolen from the nation 7,000,000 acres of common land in the past 150 years. They now pocket nearly £40,000,000 every year, which they covenanted to pay the nation in the shape of land tax."

They would be very glad to add the tithes to the same pocket. But whether tithes belong to the church or the state, they do not belong to the landlord. Perhaps those who bequeathed the tithes had no right to do so, but they had as much right to say that the clergy should have one-tenth of the produce of the land as to say that their own descendants should have the other nine-tenths forever. There is indeed no sound argument offered for disendowment, which does not speak as strongly for land restoration. The tithe is no longer a pure tenth, as in 1836 the landlords passed through parliament a scheme of commutation, which, according to Sir James Caird, robbed the clergy of £1,700,000 per annum. The land owners never gave their tenants the benefit of this reduction of tithes. Not they! The *Spectator* shows how ready they have always been to bleed the tenants and to keep open the lancet wound as long as possible. It says "an enormous increase of rents took place after the Crimean war, and little of that increase has yet been permanently remitted. Land is not worth as much to farm as it was in 1850, and rents ought to be lower instead of higher than they were then." Under the Robbery act of 1836, the *Church Reformer* shows that the farmer was to pay the tithe and the landlord was to deduct the same from the next year's rent. But the law did not protect the tenant by making it illegal for the owner to contract himself out of the obligation. Hence, many landlords have compelled farmers to sign contracts which have thrown the burden of tithes upon the latter. In cases where this has been successfully resisted, who is to gain from the proposed abolition? If the clergy are to lose, surely the landowners should not gain their loss.

FARMER JONES ON THE TARIFF.

He Begins to See That the Farmer and the Laborer Bear the Burden.

I was mightily struck by what I read the other day, that men always try to get what they want with the least work. The first idea that hit me was that it meant that all men are lazy, and I felt like arguing the case; but the more I thought on it that evening over my pipe the clearer it was to me that the man that wrote that was right. Now I ain't called a lazy man by my neighbors. I'm up early and down late and never shirk work; and my observation convinces me that most farmers are no lazier than I am. But if the man that wrote that is wrong, I'd like to know what all of us farmers are buying reapers and mowers and such for. What do I pay a couple of hundred dollars for a binder for? I can cut my grain with my cradle yet, and bind it too, the old way. If it ain't to save muscle, to get done what I want with as little work as possible, what is it for? And when you come to think it over, isn't it this disposition to save time and muscle that accounts for all these patents and contrivances, more than necessity, which is said to be the mother of invention?

But it kind of seems to me that the consequences of this thought are mighty interesting to us farmers. If, under what may be called natural conditions, men are continually trying to find a short cut, they will try to do that same under what may be called unnatural conditions. For instance, suppose I'm on the boundary line between this country and Canada, and want to buy a plow. I can't buy one over the line and bring it home without paying a tax of forty-five per cent. or its cost, though I can buy it cheaper there than here. Under natural conditions I would buy my plow where I could get it cheapest. That tax, then, makes what I call an unnatural condition. If I smuggle that plow home I'm obeying the law to get what I want with the least work. Now, human nature is pretty much the same all over the country. If three or four fellows have a stick of timber to carry, it's the naturalest thing in the world for each one to try and let the others carry the heaviest end of it; and its just as natural for a man to try and shift off onto some one else any kind of burden that any unnatural condition makes him carry. For instance, if goods rise in price the storekeeper ain't going to stand the rise. He passes it on to the next fellow. If the price of iron goes up the blacksmith is bound to get more for his work. That's his way of getting what he wants with the least work.

If the state puts a license on liquor and such, I reckon that the saloon man don't stand it; he makes the fellows that use the stuff pay it. So the State of Minnesota puts a tax of 3 per cent. on all that a railroad earns, and thinks, perhaps, that it's all clear gain; but it don't take a lawyer to see that the people who use that road have to pay enough to make the tax good, and for the trouble it makes the company besides. So it goes all around the sap-bush: every one in trying to get what he wants with the least labor shifts off on to the others all the extra burden he can. He may not get it all off: some may stick; but take it with those who shift off more than they ought to, I calculate that pretty much the whole burden is shifted as a general thing. Now, it don't make a bit of difference in what shape the burden comes—rent, insurance, rising prices or taxes—its human nature to get rid of it. The man who brings in goods from foreign ports pays the tax on them, and the man he sells to has to pay just that much more.

The man who makes the same goods in this country adds to the profit on his goods just as much of the tariff as he can, and the man who buys them has to pay it. This buyer tries to get his money back when he sells, and if the man who buys it last consumes it, he evens up with the rest by asking more for something he makes to sell.

And so the "shifting" goes on. But *it must stop somewhere*, and that's the mischief of it. If it could only be kept on going clear round the ring until it came back to the first shifter, it would not be so bad. It would be six of one and half a dozen of the other. But the trouble is that it does stop somewhere, and it's mighty heavy for the shoulders of them that it stops on. And where is that? Why it's as plain as daylight that it stops on the shoulders of those *who can't raise the price of what they sell*, and a man need not be all-fired smart to find out who they are. The man who's got only his muscle to sell says to the man that wants some work done, "I want two dollars for my day's work; I can't live decently on less." "I can't help that," says the employer. "I have to look out for myself, and I can get the same work done for a dollar a day." I take a load of wheat or a drove of hogs to the market. "I can't take sixty-five cents a bushel for my wheat," I say to the grain buyer; "I can't make my salt as it." "I'm sorry for you," he may say, "but there's the price in Liverpool, and there's the price in New York, and there's the price in Chicago, and there's the freight, and I must live, too, and that's all I can pay."

With the pork buyer it is the same. So you see that the two unfortunate cusses who have to stand the bulk of all the burdens, and can't help themselves, are the farmer and the day worker. Most every other class of workers are able to shift the burden off on to others. And this is the main reason why all of those fellows take such little interest in helping us get rid of these burdens. They can stand it if we can. But all the same it's this carrying of the heft of the tariff burden that accounts for a large part of the mortgages on farms and the army of tramps. The question is, How long are we going to stand it? P. J. SMALLEY.

Caledonia, Minn., Jan. 10.

Land Speculation in the Far West.

PORT ANGELS, Wash. Ter., Dec. 25.—The United States government sells 50x140 feet lots in this city, 10-acre and 160-acre farms close by, with the usual result that non-resident speculators appropriate land to a degree that creates poverty and stops all progress. The advantage from the growth of population or extension in the arts that make land more valuable is reaped by these land holders, though their land may remain in a state of nature. This value attaching to land, whether or not improved, should be taxed to its full extent. This should be particularly so of city land, which is the most valuable. If the values of the land on which Chicago is built were taxed, say one per cent, all the costs for which state taxes are levied could be paid, leaving the farmers of Illinois comparatively free of tax, because their land, being less valuable than the city land, would have to bear less taxes H. G. C. GORDON.

LABOR.

The protracted strike of the coal handlers continues, and it has for more than a week been practically impossible to bring any considerable amount of coal across the Hudson river, though there is plenty at Hoboken and Weehawken. An attempt was made by the Delaware and Hudson company to put a gang of fifty men at work on Tuesday, but the strikers persuaded forty-seven of them to refuse the job. The men were obtained by the company on the false pretence made by an intelligence office that they were needed to work at ice-cutting. The strikers demand 25 cents an hour and the companies have continued to resist the demand. They say they will starve the men into submission and the men declare that they never will submit. The unanimity with which the strikers are supported is remarkable. The foreman of the Erie docks says that while work was in progress he had twenty or thirty applications a day for work, but since the strike began not a man has applied. Meanwhile the coal supply in New York is running short, and the retail dealers have been quick to profit by the situation and have advanced prices. A portion of Havemeyer & Elder's sugar refinery in Williamsburg has stopped work for want of coal. The companies appear entirely indifferent to the inconvenience they are causing the public, and have apparently but one thought—the starving of the strikers into submission. The New York Steam Heating company, which appears to be proud of a bad pre-eminence in oppressing labor, brought a number of Scandinavians from Scranton to handle its own coal. The men were indignant when they understood why they were brought here, and announced that they would return to Scranton if their fares were paid. The continuance of the strike has affected the coal regions, and it led on Tuesday to the suspension of operations at the Bellmore, Morris Ridge, Logan, Centralia and all other collieries in the district dependent solely upon the Lehigh Valley railroad for cars. Two thousand men are thrown out of employment.

One of the grounds for the strike of the coal handlers is objection to what is known as the percentage system. Vessel owners do not pay the "trimmers" who stow the coal in their boats, but pay the money for this service to the coal companies. The latter keep to themselves a large percentage of this payment. The companies thus obtain over $200 a year out of each man's earnings. Mr. Frederick A. Potts, when asked to explain this matter, answered, "when I first heard of this percentage charge I went down an investigated it, and I found that the boss trimmer was making $8,000 a year out of the men. I thought the company might as well have that money as he." Putting the matter more bluntly Mr. Potts discovered that some one was robbing the men of money actually paid for their labor and instead of putting a stop to the practice, he determined that his company should oust the robber and steal $8,000 a year in his place. The agents of all the companies concerned expressed a belief that they had a right "make this profit," as they called it, out of the labor of the men.

Representatives of all shades of political opinion united to fill the platform and floor of Cooper Union hall on Monday to discuss the early closing and Saturday half-holiday movements. Ex-Judge Noah Davis presided, and offered to devote his experience, influence and weight to push the measures. He also advocated a Wednesday payday. Henry George was welcomed tumultuously, and three cheers were given for Dr. McGlynn. Mr. George said he had been called a socialist, but the recommendations of Judge Davis regarding the enforced closing of all stores on Saturday afternoon and Sunday seemed not only socialistic but anarchic. Still he approved them. If six days labor a week was enough in the middle ages, then five days was enough now with our improved methods. Rabbi Brown, who followed, and in the course of his speech spoke of his "brother, Dr. McGlynn," mentioned the beneficial effects of the modern Jewish custom of taking a Friday half-holiday before the Saturday Sabbath. Several sympathetic letters were read and received with applause, but those from Mayor Hewitt and Governor Hill were hissed, for it seems neither of these two gentlemen thought the movement of sufficient consequence to sign their names to the letters, but allowed their secretaries to reply for them. Rev. Dr. Mingins, Rev. Matthew H. Pogson and James E. Quinn delivered telling addresses.

A mass meeting of workingmen was held in Cooper Union hall on Tuesday night, to discuss the militia bill and the Blair educational bill now pending in congress. The militia bill grants an appropriation to the militia in the various states. The speakers were Chairman McMackin, Richard J. Hinton, Editor S. E. Shevitch, Louis F. Post, Edward King and Robert Crowe. A letter from Master Workman E. A. Quinn was read. The speakers one and all discussed the militia bill, which was characterized as an outrageous attempt to equip and maintain a standing army, not for defense against foreign forces, but to put down uprisings of oppressed citizens. What mobs we have, said the speakers, can and will be put down as the rebellion was—by the citizens at large, not by a standing army. And more than that, none of these mobs exists without a cause; if, therefore, the government has money and time to spend on this question let it seek out the cause and do away with that. The Blair educational bill provides for the distribution of money by the federal government among the various states for educational purposes. It was warmly advocated by various speakers. Mr. Robert Crowe, on mentioning the name of Dr. McGlynn, was interrupted by a tumult of applause. He then said: "If the inquisitorial arms of the Church of Rome close against Dr. McGlynn, the wide open arms of the laboring masses of this broad country will enfold him in a protecting embrace." Upon which the entire assemblage arose and cheered for Dr. McGlynn.

The long strike of the longshoremen against the attempt of the Old Dominion Steamship company to reduce the wages of freight handlers continues, greatly to the inconvenience of the shippers. The employers have not been able to get new men, but they stubbornly hold out, regardless of the inconvenience to their customers.

The president of the Broadway railway has agreed to submit the demand of the men for $2.25 a day to the directors at their meeting next Tuesday. The men hope to obtain what they ask without resorting to a tie-up.

Though there is dissatisfaction among Brooklyn street railway men with the new schedule arranged by the company, the prospect is that the difference will be compromised without resort to a new strike.

The twenty-first session of the state workingmen's assembly will meet at Albany on the 18th. Among the questions to be brought up are repeal of the conspiracy laws; strict enforcement of the "eight hour law;" discontinuance of giving the state printing to a firm which discriminates against organized labor; creation of a state printing office; abolition of letting out the labor of convicts by contract; protest against the introduction of the piece price system; increase of the power of the state board of arbitration; reduction of the hours of labor to ten per day of all employes of railroads operating in and holding charters from the state; a just and uniform apprenticeship law; amendment to the mechanics' lien law, by which the wages of the workers will be made more secure; increase in the number of factory inspectors to enforce the child labor law; passage of a law that will give to labor a fair representation at the forthcoming constitutional convention; and abolition of such laws as discriminate against workingmen serving on juries.

The employes of the consolidated street roads of Boston struck work and tied up the road on Monday. The officers of the company denounced the strike as unjustifiable. The principal grievance of the men was that many of the extras and some of the regular hands were employed as trippers and given poor pay for long hours. The difficulties were amicably adjusted that evening and the cars resumed running on Tuesday morning. This was Boston's first experience of a tie-up.

Some time ago the carpenters of Rochester resolved that on and after the opening of the building season for the present year they would only work nine hours a day. The masons of the city succeeded in maintaining the nine hour system last year, and their example has encouraged the carpenters. The boss carpenters have resolved to resist the demand, and there is a prospect of a protracted contest over the matter.

Committees of the brewers' pool and the Brewers' union of St. Louis settled their differences on Saturday last and a strike began last September was brought to an end. The pool adopted a resolution that unless boycotts instituted by the union against two local brewers were lifted all union men would be discharged. The men struck and have remained out ever since. All left the city except sixty-nine. These will be reinstated and their names will be stricken from the black list. The men's wages have also been raised, the previous maximum price being now the minimum rate. In return for this the union has lifted all boycotts against St. Louis breweries.

T. B. McGuire of this city recently told a St. Louis reporter that "all the reports in the newspapers in regard to a split in the ranks of his order and a general disruption of the Knights of Labor were too ridiculous to be noticed. . . . The talk of calling a special session, going the rounds of papers, was not indulged in by any of the order. Of course, there were cases of individual dissatisfaction, just as in other orders, or even in the churches; but nothing of the kind had become general, and probably never would."

Over a hundred men have been thrown out of work in Pittsburg because of the closing of factories when the Pennsylvania supreme court declared the law prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine constitutional.

The wages question at the Edgar Thomson steel works, at Pittsburg was settled by arbitration last week. There will be an average advance of ten per cent. The works, which employ 3,000 men, resumed in all departments on Monday last.

The journeymen barbers of Wilkesbarre, Pa., recently formed an organization for the purpose of enforcing the closing of all barber shops on Sunday. Out of 38 places in that city 36 were closed last Sunday.

The united labor conference in Chicago decided in favor of "a pledge declaring that the delegates had ceased to be members of either the democratic or republican parties," and refused recognition to all who would not sign. A new committee of twenty-one was elected.

In the city court at New Haven on Saturday Judge Pickett gave his decision in the case of Superintendent Stacey B. Opdyke of the New Haven and Northampton railroad and Assistant Superintendent William H. Wallace of the New York, New Haven and Hartford road, charged with conspiracy to injure Thomas F. Meaney by blacklisting him and preventing him from obtaining employment, Judge Pickett says:

> The court is equally satisfied that any conspiracy to prevent, obstruct or hinder any man from putting his labor on the market when, where and for such compensation as he may agree for, if the same be lawful, is highly criminal at common law and more disastrous than other forms of conspiracy, except that to take life.

The accused men were found guilty of the offense charged. Necessarily much of the evidence was circumstantial, but the court was satisfied that Wallace and Opdyke had an understanding between them and a common design to keep Meaney from getting work. This understanding and design, the judge holds was a practical boycott upon Meaney. The defendants were sentenced to pay a fine of $50 each and costs, but being men of means, of course were released on bail pending an appeal. Judge Pickett is the man who convicted the men who had boycotted the *Journal and Courier* a year ago, and in that case he imposed the same penalty for asking men not to buy a newspaper that he imposes in this case for an attempt to starve a man to death. The offenses do not appear equally flagrant, though the judge does appear to differ from most of his fellows on the bench in laying down the same law for the rich and for the poor.

At an alleged democratic banquet in Boston last Saturday night Mayor O'Brien of that city included the workingmen who had voted for McNeill among "the worst elements of the city," and declared that the democratic party would soon be in power in Massachusetts. Col. Fellows of New York assured the revelers that the democratic party will carry New York State by 50,000 in 1888. That will depend a great deal on circumstances yet to come. If Mayor O'Brien's sentiment concerning men is still echoed by the local democracy here, as it was during the last municipal canvass, Col. Fellows' reputation as a prophet will suffer.

At Reading, Pa., on Tuesday, a committee of six employes of J. H. Sternberg's rolling mill called on that mighty individual and respectfully asked that wages be increased ten per cent., which would make them equal to those paid in Philadelphia. Sternberg, who probably imagined that he was following the "no outside interference" formula, declared that he "never treated with committees, but only with the employes as individuals," and thereupon he discharged the members of the committee from his employ. When the result of the interview was reported to the other hands, who were Knights of Labor, they promptly quit work, and the mill was at once shut down. No more justifiable strike can easily be imagined. Sternberg seems to be a phenomenal ass.

A Lutheran church in Wisconsin declares war on the Knights of Labor. The pastor threatens to expel all his members who remain in the order. The knights must have made the cushioned pews uncomfortable.

What is called the anti-Chinese prejudice amongst workingmen is not confined to the United States. A few days ago a committee appointed at a public meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, called on a number of Chinamen, recently arrived from Victoria, and "requested" them to leave. The Chinamen left, their passage back to Victoria being paid by the citizens. It is said that the mayor of Vancouver and other citizens implicated in the expulsion will be prosecuted.

Miners and Laborers' subdivision No. 1 of district assembly No. 105, Knights of Labor, held a convention which closed last Tuesday. It formed a single body, embracing 100,000 workmen in the anthracite coal fields, and P. F. Brennan as master workman.

A coal mine in Connelsburg, Davis county, Indiana, owned by the Knights of Labor, and provided with a shaft costing $30,000, cannot be operated because the two railroads leading from the place refuse to carry the coal.

The delegate convention of river coal miners in session at Pittsburg last week perfected the organization of their new sub-district of the Knights of Labor, and then adjourned. The new district will have a membership of nearly 12,000, and, in the future, in making any demands the miners of the three rivers, as well as those in the coke region, will work in unison.

The officials of the Coal Miner's National Federation at Pittsburg have issued a circular to the miners throughout the country, requesting the attendance at the national convention of miners and operators at Columbus, Ohio, on February 8th of "all who are favorable to the arbitration plan of settling wages differences." At this convention a scale of wages for the ensuing year from May 1st will be adopted.

THE WORKINGMEN AND THE MILITIA.

Our Volunteers Not the Militia of the Federal Constitution.

Much criticism has recently been expended on the hostile attitude assumed by the workingmen toward the bill to increase the efficiency of the militia now under consideration in congress.

No effort, however, seems to have been made by the critics to ascertain the underlying motives for the universal and ever increasing suspicion with which the industrial classes of the nation regard the "citizen soldiery."

There must be a common cause for an effect so widespread. Wherever large bodies of workingmen exist they invariably learn to regard the organized militia as an institution opposed to them and to their interests. This could not be were our militia system the constitutional organization intended by the fathers of the republic.

It is beyond question from the phraseology of the constitution that it intended to provide for a system of militia duty to which the entire body of the arms-bearing population should be liable, or such portions of it as congress might impartially select. In an organization so composed as in the German landwehr, the Swiss federal militia, and in fact all the territorial militia systems of continental Europe, no class distinctions can exist. However aristocratic the form of the government a national militia so constituted must be a purely democratic system.

The constitution of the United States declares (section 8, subdivision 16), that congress shall have power "to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, reserving to the states respectively the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by congress." It is evident that the framers of the constitution intended that congress should exercise this power; but with the exception of the acts of congress of Feb. 28, 1795, passed in view of the whisky insurrection, and the acts of Feb. 2, 1813, and April 18, 1814, enacted during the second war with England, the plain intention of the organic law has been entirely neglected. It is not intended to assert that in default of legislation by congress there is not concurrent power in the states, but merely that the constitution intended that congress should provide for one uniform method of organization for the militia. The time has come when such legislation is imperatively required in the highest interest of the welfare of the republic. When congress shall deal with this subject, then the laws it shall enact will be the supreme law of the land, and all interfering state regulations will necessarily be suspended in their operation.

The practical effect of the methods of supporting militia regiments in the states is to entirely exclude from membership the workingmen or persons working for daily wages. They are, in fact, little more than voluntary clubs for mutual amusement and perfection in military drill. If they were nothing more they would be harmless indeed; but as the soldiery of the state, as its armed representatives, they should be composed of all the elements of its social organism. They have not been thus composed for many years.

The privates are composed of clerks and young business men—at any rate, of anything but laborers. To read the list of field and staff officers is like a roster of the young men of fortune of the neighborhood. The field officers select their staffs from among the families most likely to afford them social distinction. The general result is shown in the city of New York in the gradual extinction and final disbandment of every militia organization composed of artisans.

It is from their intuitive feeling that in the rank and file of the militia the workingman has no place from which proceeds that bitter hostility to the entire system which has caused some worthy people such astonishment.

In the militia of the constitution would be found a force selected by lot from the whole arms bearing people of the states. No one physically sound would be exempt, the millionaire and the day laborer would practise the goose step side by side. It is indeed a strange anomaly that the nation of all others freest theoretically should tolerate a system of militia service more aristocratic, or perhaps it would be more proper to say, more plutocratic, than any other. The remedy is in a national militia, compulsory service, no exemptions and adequate remuneration for the time taken from the citizen by the nation. Such a system will never be inimical to the interests of any section of the people.

AUGUSTUS A. LEVY.

The Starvation Army.

A London Handbill.

Reader, we are the Starvation Army. Hundreds of our fellow workers, after a life of toil, die yearly of starvation, our daughters are driven to prostitution, our sons to crime, our aged have to finish a life of toil within the workhouse gates. And why is this?

1st. That we may have a family of German paupers called a queen, princes, princesses and dukes.

2d. That we may have a class of idle loafers known as landlords, who have taken possession of our common birthright, the land, and now rob us by compelling us to pay a rent for the use of it.

3d. That we may have a class of thieves who rob us of the results of our labor in the shape of profits and interest; these are the capitalists, bankers and money lenders.

4th. That we may have a class of highly paid officials who rob us of the results of our labor by rates and taxes.

5th. That we may have bishops and parsons who are very careful to look after the good things of this life for themselves, but are subsidized by the other thieves to teach us to honor and obey those placed in authority over us (all those who live on our labor), to be content with misery and starvation in this world, that it is God's will, and that we must look for our reward in the world to come.

6th. That we may have an army of trained cut-throats who are prepared to slaughter those who protest against this system in any part of the world.

Help for the Widow Guelph.

San Francisco Call.

A committee has been organized in London with a view to raise a fund for a women's offering to Queen Victoria, in honor of the fiftieth year of her reign. Subscriptions will be received from one penny to one pound. There are doubtless several thousand sewing women in London whose average weekly earnings do not amount to more than $2.50 who will find a penny to throw into this fund. A good many will do so in the fear that a failure to donate something might be construed as a lack of loyalty rather than of money. The queen, of course, is not responsible for the condition of the sewing women in England. She is not responsible for the ejectment of Irish tenants from their holdings on account of inability to pay rent. She is simply, by the accident of birth, the exponent of a system of government under which a large majority of her people are born to a condition as hopeless of improvement as that of a slave.

JUST OUT.

AN ACCOUNT
of the
GEORGE-HEWITT CAMPAIGN
in the
NEW YORK MUNICIPAL ELECTION OF 1886.

By Louis F. Post and Fred. C. Leubuscher.

1 vol., paper covers.

CONTENTS:

CHAPTER I.: History of George's nomination.—His letter to the labor conference.—The platform.—The Chickering Hall meeting addressed by Dr. McGlynn.
CHAPTER II.: Formal nomination.—George's speech of acceptance.
CHAPTER III.: Nomination of Hewitt.—Hewitt's letter to the "Saviors of Society."—His speech at Cooper Union.
CHAPTER IV.: The correspondence between George and Hewitt.
CHAPTER V.: Mr. George declares his position and answers questions at Chickering Hall.
CHAPTE VI.: Hewitt's miscellaneous speeches.
CHAPTER VII.: George's meetings and speeches.
CHAPTER VIII.: Irving Hall.
CHAPTER IX.: Father McGlynn.—The O'Donohue-Preston correspondence.—Archbishop Corrigan's pastoral.—George's reply.
CHAPTER X.: The parade.
CHAPTER XI.: The election.—Official canvass of the vote by election districts.—George's midnight speech.
CHAPTER XII.: Permanent organization.
CHAPTER XIII.: A review of the principles advocated by Henry George.

Price, 20 cents.

Address
HENRY GEORGE & CO.,
25 Ann street,
New York.

THE EMPIRE STATE TYPE FOUNDING COMPANY,
61 and 63 Frankfort street, cor. Jacob street.

IT SPEAKS FOR ITSELF.

The type and general outfit of this paper was supplied by the above company.

A large supply of
NEWSPAPER, BOOK AND JOB TYPE
ALWAYS ON HAND.
All of the best and most durable quality.
ESTIMATES CHEERFULLY FURNISHED.
CASES, STANDS, CABINETS,
LEADS, BRASS RULES, GALLEYS,
STONES, FURNITURE, ETC.,
ALWAYS READY.
SEND FOR OUR NEW SPECIMEN BOOK.

HENRY GEORGE'S NEW BOOK.
PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TARIFF QUESTION WITH ESPECIAL REGARD TO THE INTERESTS OF LABOR.

12mo. Cloth. Price, $1.50.

OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Progress and Poverty, 12mo. cloth	$1.00
" " paper	.50
Social Problems, 12mo. cloth	1.00
" " paper	.50
Property in Land, paper	.15
The Land Question, paper	.10

For sale by all booksellers, or sent post-paid on receipt of price.

HENRY GEORGE & CO., 25 Ann Street, New York.

DAVITT'S LAST WORDS IN AMERICA.

SUNDAY EVENING, JANUARY 23, 1887.

A grand demonstration in honor of Michael Davitt, founder of the Irish National Land League, will be given at

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN,
Cor. 26th st. and Madison ave.

On this occasion there will also be given a grand concert, such as is enjoyed by most persons but once in a lifetime, if at all, by

GILMORE'S SUPERB MILITARY BAND,

Consisting of sixty-five pieces, being admittedly the largest and finest association of musical talent in this or any other country, under the inspiring leadership of Mr. P. S. Gilmore, the Napoleon of bandmasters. No additional charge for this grand musical entertainment.

ADMISSION TICKETS 50c. RESERVED SEATS, $1 and $1.50.

Doors open at 7 o'clock. Lecture at 8 o'clock.

The band will play an hour before and an hour after the lecture.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION of the Gospel among Landlords solicits the support of Christians. All previous efforts having proved of no avail in inducing landowners to restore to the public those values which the natural necessities of the people give to the land, this society has been formed to appeal to the landlords' conscience by means of gospel truth. The attention of landlords is respectfully called to the fact that they have become rich without labor, through laws made by their class whereby the state-earned increment upon land, instead of being voted for taxes and public purposes, as it should have been, thus doing away with all other taxes, has slipped into their pockets. It is now hoped that the efforts of this society to propagate the gospel truths of justice and equity will so awaken the landlord conscience that it may come to see what so many Christians already apprehend, that their appropriation of the commonwealth property is the cause of lack of work and starvation among workers and the enrichment of the idle so prevalent all over the world. The society will shortly issue a series of tracts, and as soon as its funds will justify special missionaries will wait upon those whom the tracts have not converted. Meantime the society offers a reward of £5 for the tract showing the best method by which the aforesaid landlords can be brought to a realizing sense of their conduct and its consequences. A copy of prize tract will be supplied gratis to all subscribers. Address Secretary, 5, P. G. A. L., Holborn Viaduct, London, E. C., England.

LAND AND LABOR.

The Central Committee is now prepared to furnish, postage paid, the following named tracts, at prices indicated:

	Per 100.
The Right to the Use of the Earth. By Herbert Spencer. 4 pages	15 cts.
First Principles. By Henry George. English or German. 8 pages	30 cts.
The Great-Great-Grandson of Capt. Kidd. By Henry George. 4 pages	15 cts.
Land and Taxation. David Dudley Field and Henry George. 8 pages	30 cts.
Platform N. Y. Labor Convention. English and German. 2 pages	8 cts.
Declarations and Resolutions. Cooper Union Mass Meeting. 2 pages	8 cts.

Address
JOHN McMACKIN, Chairman,
28 Cooper Union,
N. Y. City.

THE DEMOCRAT.

A RADICAL REVIEW MONTHLY.

The Democrat advocates Land Restauration and those reforms which are necessary to make the English people a free people. It asks "compensation" not for those who have benefited by unjust legislation, but for those who have suffered thereby.

For one dollar the Democrat is supplied for 18 months to any address in the United States or Canada.

Address Clements House, Clements Inn passage, Strand, London, W. C.

"CAPITAL," BY KARL MARX.

The greatest work on Political Economy has at last appeared in English; translated by Sam Moore and Ed. Aveling; edited by Frederick Engels; 2 vols., cloth, $5.75, post paid. List of Land and Labor publications free.

BORDOLLO'S LABOR NEWS AGENCY,
104 East Fourth Street, N. Y.

A.— TO SECRETARIES OF TRADE AND LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

We have received an order to send a copy of "PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE" to every trade and labor organization that may wish to receive it, up to the number of one thousand. A copy will be accordingly forwarded to the secretary of any labor organization or local assembly of the K. of L. on receipt of twelve cents for postage. HENRY GEORGE & CO.

TAX REFORMER.

The first paper published in America devoted to the advocacy of the principles of "Progress and Poverty."

Subscription, one year, with a copy of "Progress and Poverty," given free, 50 cents; with "Progress and Poverty" and "Social Problems," 75 Cents.

E. BATTLE, 9 Spruce Street, New York.