

Andrew Carnegie, the great Pittsburgh iron millionaire, got married last week and sailed for Europe. Before getting married he settled \$20,000 a year on his bride, who was already in her own right a rich woman. Andrew Carnegie is a "self made man" as the phrase goes. A poor Scotch boy, he commenced life as a telegraph messenger and is now worth at least \$10,000,000—a matter which shows, according to the philosophy of some of our contemporaries, that any poor Scotch boy, who is industrious and energetic, can come to this country, commence life as a telegraph messenger, and get \$10,000,000 by the time he is fifty-four years old. Mr. Carnegie is not, however, one of those self made men who worship their maker, but, in spite of his wealth, has many noble and generous qualities. Dr. W. Mendenhall writes to the city of Pittsburgh, and has adorned his native Scottish town with a fine public bath and a good library, besides purchasing for himself a castle and estate in Scotland and making a beautiful summer resort in the mountains of Pennsylvania. He has, moreover, written some entertaining books, among them one called "Triumph of Democracy," in which he views the institutions and life of his adopted country through such rose-colored spectacles as a genial and generous gentleman who has made ten million dollars might naturally wear. We wish him much happiness in his new relation, and have no envy that he is able to settle on his bride an income of twenty thousand dollars as long as she may live. Nevertheless, that one citizen of the republic, and he by no means the richest, is able to settle twenty thousand dollars a year upon his bride and think no more of it than an ordinary citizen of the republic would of presenting his bride with a rolled-gold breastpin, is well worthy of consideration.

Andrew Carnegie's wealth comes in large part from what we call "protection to American industry," that beneficent system of taxation which we are told is imposed for the benefit of the American laborer, and which is supposed to keep the "poor American workingman" from being crowded to the wall by competition with the "pauper labor" of Europe. But whatever this system of "protecting" American labor may do for men like Andrew Carnegie, who are so fortunate as to become iron masters and get possession of iron mines, it certainly does not enable the men who do the actual labor to settle twenty thousand dollars a year on their wives.

Year before last—the last year for which we have any statistics—the wages paid to miners in the Center county mine of Carnegie Brothers & Co. were \$1.15 a day for inside miners, and \$1.10 for outside miners, and the number of days' work that the men got in the year at these wages was 119. Thus, Mrs. Carnegie gets as a wedding present as much as the aggregate earnings of one hundred and forty-five of these protected American laborers, working at this rate, for all the years of her life.

Shall we say, then, that Mr. Carnegie has presented his wife with the equivalent of one hundred and fifty protected Pennsylvania laborers? By no means. These protected Pennsylvania iron miners have to eat in order that they may work, and must have some sort of clothing and some kind of lodging, and, moreover, they likewise are men and are called on by nature to wed so many women—their sexual complements—whom nature, in Pennsylvania as elsewhere, brings into the world in due proportion to men. And if the race is to be perpetuated, they also must have children, just as, we trust, Andrew Carnegie will be blessed with children. Now, if Mr. Andrew Carnegie had presented his bride with so many Pennsylvania miners, just as a southern gentleman in the days preceding the war might have presented his bride with so many negro field hands, how many would it take to give her twenty thousand dollars a year? One hundred and nineteen days' work at an average of \$1.12½ per day would amount to \$134 per year. But after providing with some sort of shelter, the man, his wife and their due allowance of children, how much could a slave owner retain for himself out of \$134 per year? With prices as they are in Pennsylvania, the answer would be—nothing. But let us say that a man, woman and three or four children could somehow be fed, clothed and lodged in Pennsylvania for \$124 per year. On this supposition \$10 would remain. So, therefore, at this rate, what Mr. Carnegie has really presented to his wife is as good as the absolute ownership of two thousand protected American laborers!

We repeat, we have no envy of Mr. Carnegie, and hope he and his bride will enjoy to the fullest their European trip. But what sort of a social system, and what sort of a republic is it, in which one man, and he by no means one of the richest, can give his wife a bridal present equivalent to all that could be got by the hardest taskmaster from the ownership of two thousand American citizens? It is but fair to add that the wages paid by Carnegie Brothers & Co. are about the highest paid in the iron mines of Pennsylvania, an industry which has been the pampered pet of our "protective system."

A still more notable "wedding in high life" took place this week in San Francisco, and the gorgeous details, even to the name of the man who played the organ, and the sorts of costly roses that formed the pyramids of flowers, are telegraphed across the continent; for the great mass of our people whose life is a constant struggle to pay their rent have much the same instinct that makes an Englishman "love a lord," and delight to revel in imagination, in the

luxury of their "betters." Citizen Charles Crocker, the bride's father, is in all but title indeed a lord. In wealth and in power there are few English dukes who could claim precedence of him. He gives to his daughter, by way of wedding present, a check for a million and a magnificent house in New York. So far as brains go, Mr. Crocker is hardly the peer of Mr. Carnegie, but he is a much richer man. He is one of a syndicate who own thousands of miles of railway, millions of acres of land, town sites, hotels, steamship lines, senators, representatives and state legislatures. Twenty-six years ago Mr. Crocker kept a little dry goods store in Sacramento, just such a dry goods store as one of the one-horse dry goods stores that are to be found in the poorer parts of Third avenue. How did he get so rich? By energy, thrift and conscientious honesty? Bah! If Mr. Crocker is a strictly conscientious man, he is a thing as bribery, jobbery, and what could be called downright theft if it was in dollars instead of millions, he would still be keeping a little dry goods store, or more probably would be by this time run out of business by some larger house, and be keeping books or clerking it.

Mr. Crocker is worth nobody knows how many millions of dollars. Perhaps thirty or forty; it may be fifty. He has not, of course, so many actual dollars in his possession, but he has the power of obtaining the produce of labor, in whatever form he may choose to call for it, to that amount. He certainly, by no labor of hand or head, paid at the rates which most citizens of the republic get for labor of hand or head, could have got a million dollars' worth of wealth, or the hundredth part of a million dollars' worth of wealth. When men like Mr. Crocker can get the produce of labor without honestly laboring for it, it is not therefore clear that the men who do honestly labor must get less than they fairly earn?

In the meantime Jacob Sharp is being brought to trial, and sits in court with the state prison staring him in the face. Mr. Sharp is an energetic and persistent man, who takes the world as he finds it, and who saw that New York needed a great public convenience, a railroad on Broadway. The land owners along Broadway had been for years suffering to prevent the building of a railroad, and with things as they are Mr. Sharp saw that the only way to get a Broadway railroad was to bribe the board of aldermen. This he did, and thanks to him and his bribery the means of transportation along Broadway are now a great deal better than when the public were confined to the lumbering old omnibuses.

But another syndicate envied Mr. Sharp and his spoils, and after being harassed half to death he is now on trial, with a good clear conscience, the state prison. Yet in reality he has only done on a comparative small scale what Mr. Crocker and his associates have done on a large scale. In reality he has only done what in the code of morals that prevails among the richer classes of New York and the country generally it is considered perfectly legitimate to do. Jacob Sharp's real crime is in being legally found out. If this had not occurred he would be to-day one of New York's most respected citizens, in spite of the fact that everybody knew that he had bribed the board of aldermen. And in what is he worse than the "saviors of society" who give thousands and thousands of dollars for the corruption of politics and the buying of voters whenever it suits their purposes? In what is he worse than the officials who try him? Jacob Sharp, the prisoner, and "Fatty" Walsh, the prison keeper! Is there not something incongruous in that? It may be refreshing to see a hoodler sent to prison and a hoodler put on trial, but rare spectacles of this sort cannot much affect boodles.

Mr. Charles A. Dana, in the *Sun*, prints one of those logical articles that are so well calculated to assure men who can afford to pay their cooks five thousand dollars a year, that the people who, by the hardest work, can only get a dollar or two a day, and think themselves fortunate when they get that, are kicking against the pricks of the inevitable when they complain of their lot. Mr. Dana figures it out that if all the wealth of the country were divided per capita, the individual American, man, woman or child, would only have two hundred and seventy-two dollars and forty-five cents worth.

If this be true, it certainly does appear that there is something monstrous in the conditions which enable a single man to get possession of wealth amounting to millions and scores of millions. Some men are bigger, some stronger, some brighter and some wiser than the average man; but there are no such differences between the average man and the superior man as there are between the wealth of the average citizen of the republic and the wealth of the wealthy classes of the republic.

Mr. Dana's notion, however, seems to be that two hundred and seventy-two dollars and forty-five cents is so little that there is not much temptation to an equal division. And to still further do away with even this temptation, he goes on to explain, by a process apparently satisfactory to himself, that if an equal division were attempted, nothing would have any money value, and therefore it would be necessary "to parcel out the land into fifty million shares, to separate the wheat, molasses, rum and calico into fifty million equal lots, to break up the peachblow vase into fifty million fragments, and so on to the end of the schedule."

This is dreadful, and will, no doubt, convince men who are bent upon an equal division of all things that such

an attempt would be fatal—at least to the peachblow vase. But if Mr. Dana will attend the next meeting of the united labor party in his district he will there find people able to tell him how a much more equitable distribution of the wealth of this country than now obtains can be had, and that without any danger to the peachblow vase either.

In the meantime, as appears from a quiet item in a subsequent issue of the *Sun*, he seems to have discovered that his arithmetic was somewhat at fault, and that an equal division, instead of giving only \$272.45 per capita, would, according to the census figures, give each man, woman and child something over \$850, which to the family of five would be what the majority of our people would consider the little fortune of \$4,250.

Let us hope the editor of the *Sun* will push his investigations further. If he does he will see that the present wealth of the country is as nothing compared with the wealth that existing powers of production are competent to produce, and that to utterly abolish poverty, and to make our whole population rich—in the sense of securing to the poorest all that would satisfy every reasonable desire—it is only necessary to abolish the monopolies that make "the leave to toil" a boon, and rob the producer of the fruits of his labor.

An associated press dispatch from Chicago, published in all the daily papers, declares that the red internationalists, the black internationalists and the socialist labor party have united to form a secret association which looks to a violent outbreak in the principal cities of the country in 1889. The anarchists, it is declared, look to 1889 as the time of a widespread depression of industry, accompanied by closing factories, starving workers, rioting and the use of military force, and they propose to get ready for this by secretly organizing their members in what is called scientific warfare, by which is meant the use of fire and explosives.

What the red internationalists, the black internationalists or the green internationalists, if such there be, may be doing or may be looking forward to I do not know, but beneath all the cock and bull stories of anarchical combinations that are telegraphed to the press there is a substratum of actual facts which it is the part of prudent men to look in the face.

It is just as certain as that night follows day that we are ere long to enter a period of industrial depression more widespread and more intense than any the country has yet known. We are now in a period of comparative prosperity, and that unfulfilling index, the stream of immigration, promises to be larger this year than ever before. As a consequence land speculation is rampant all over the country. The price of land is advancing in New York and its vicinity by leaps and bounds, while the "real estate booms" that are raging in fever through the west have had no parallel since the days that preceded the panic of 1837. The height of this speculative fever is the measure of the depth of depression that will follow it.

The philosophy of those periodical alternations of what we call "good times" and "hard times" is simply this:

By virtue of a natural law, increase of population, improvements in the arts of production, the opening of richer natural resources—all the things that go to increase the material progress of society, tend to increase the value of land—the element indispensable to all life and all labor. The intent of this provision in the natural scheme is clear. Were land treated as justice between man and man dictates that it should be treated, the advance in civilization would be an advance toward equality, by the constant increase of that fund due to social growth and social improvement, which can be taken for common uses without hampering production or lessening the legitimate reward of the individual producers. But by making land private property, by permitting its appropriation, and extending to its ownership the same rights which we justly accord to things produced by human labor, we permit the owners of land to take for their own benefit the enormous increment of wealth which comes from social growth and social improvement.

This inevitably leads to speculation—to the appropriation of land in advance of the need for its use, and to the holding of it at prices based, not upon what labor and capital can be forced to give for its use in the present, but on the prospect of what in the future they may be forced to give. Thus a check is imposed upon production, for labor and capital, the active factors in the production of wealth, are utterly useless unless they can obtain access to the passive factor—land.

This condition of things is chronic in an advancing society like ours, and even in the best of times there is, owing to the appropriation of land in advance of actual needs, and the holding of it at prices that discount the future, a "surplus" of capital seeking investment and a "surplus" of labor seeking employment. But when from any cause there comes a season of comparative prosperity, then the tendency of land values to advance gives a fresh impulse to speculation, which finally so checks production as to bring about a dislocation or paralysis of the interlaced network of production and exchange, and we have a "panic" or "commercial crisis," followed by a season of industrial depression, during which there seems to be an "overproduction" of all the things needed for the satisfaction of material desires while human beings suffer for the want of them. For, though the prices of land go

readily up under the stimulus of speculation, they do not go as readily down when the fever of speculation is over. The man who has bought land at a high price and the man who holds lands he might have sold for a high price, are naturally disposed to "hang on" as long as they can, rather than sell, for they know that the general tendency of social growth is to add to the value of land, and that if they only hold on they may yet grasp fortune.

The present fever of speculation in land must, under present conditions, have, therefore, for its inevitable consequence another season of depression, bitterer than any we have yet experienced, for even in these alternations of what we call "good times" and "bad times" the general condition of the mere laborer has been growing harder and more helpless, and the tendency has been to the eating up the smaller capitalists by the greater, and to the crowding of a larger and larger proportion of the self-employed middle class into the class of dependent workers. With this a bitter and largely a blind discontent has been growing. And while anything like anarchistic organizations may be ridiculously small in numbers, there can be no question that a considerable element among the bitterly dissatisfied classes have been becoming familiarized with the idea of a resort to physical force and to destructive agents. The bursting of a bomb in the Haymarket of Chicago, the explosion of an infernal machine on a steamer that left New York during the late freight handlers' strike, and the increasing number of cases in which during labor disputes in other parts of the country similar methods have been attempted are deeply ominous, for they both show and promote a dangerous habit of thought. And while the tendency of the great organizations of labor, such as the trades unions and the Knights of Labor, has been, by increasing responsibility and introducing a certain discipline to hold in check the disposition to resort to any other than peaceable methods, a season of deep depression, accompanied, as it is likely to be, with a greater or less disintegration of these organizations, furnishes just the conditions in which such ideas may take shape. There are times when a single fool or a single fanatic may start a conflagration that a thousand men cannot stop.

Whether they belong to any organization or not, there are to-day, as everyone acquainted with the labor movement knows, a considerable number of men who have come to believe that the readiest, if not the only, means by which existing unjust social conditions can be changed for the better, is through violence of some sort. Few of these men are avowed anarchists; most of them have no more definite idea than that there is some deep wrong in the constitution of society which can never get redress until the propertied classes find their own comfort and safety imperiled.

This is a dangerous element, but it is only the correlative of a still more dangerous element, that influential class, controlling most of the organs of public opinion and education, who exert all their power to suppress any honest inquiry into the causes of the injustice which the masses so bitterly feel. Violence is the method of ignorance and despair. Men who see the possibility of a peaceful remedy for their wrongs do not turn to it.

The real conservatives of to-day are those who, having traced social injustice to its real root, the fundamental wrong which disintegrates the masses and causes material progress itself to make harder the lot of the mere laborer, are endeavoring to popularize the simple yet efficient remedy involved in freeing production from the taxes now levied upon it, and taking for social uses the values created by social growth and improvement.

"This thing is absolutely certain: Private property in land blocks the way of advancing civilization. The two cannot long coexist. Either private property in land must be abolished, or, as has happened again and again in the history of mankind, civilization must again turn back in anarchy and bloodshed. Let the remaining years of the nineteenth century bear me witness. Even now, I believe, the inevitable struggle has begun. It is not conservatism which would ignore such a tremendous fact. It is the blindness that invites destruction. He that is truly conservative let him look the facts in the face; let him speak frankly and dispassionately. This is the duty of the hour. For, when a great social question presses for settlement, it is only for a little while that the voice of Reason can be heard. The masses of men hardly think at any time. It is difficult even in sober moments to get them to calmly reason. But when passion is roused, then they are like a herd of stampeded bulls. I do not fear that present social adjustments can continue. That is impossible. What I fear is that the dams may hold till the flood rises to fury. What I fear is that dogged resistance on the one side may kindle a passionate sense of wrong on the other. What I fear are the demagogues and the accidents.

"The present condition of all civilized countries is that of increasing unstable equilibrium. In steam and electricity, and all the countless inventions which they typify, mighty forces have entered the world. If rightly used, they are our servants, more potent to do our bidding than the genii of Arabian story. If wrongly used, they, too, must turn to monsters of destruction. They require and will compel great social changes. That we may already see. Operating under social institutions which are based on natural justice, which acknowledge the

equal rights of all to the material and opportunities of nature, their elevating power will be equally exerted, and industrial organization will pass naturally into that of a vast co-operative society. Operating under social institutions which deny natural justice by treating land as private property, their power is unequally exerted, and tends, by producing inequality, to engender forces that will tear and shatter. The old bottles cannot hold the new wine. This is the ferment which throughout the civilized world is everywhere beginning."

It is now five years since I wrote these words. What has happened since, and is now happening, has all the more convinced me of their truth.

Finley Bell, secretary of the Scottish land restoration league, 65 Bath street, Glasgow, writes to me to ask if some money cannot be raised in the United States for the purpose of propagating radical land ideas in Scotland, and especially in the highlands.

John Ferguson of the publishing firm of Cameron & Ferguson, Glasgow, a man who, though living in Scotland, was one of the six originators of the Irish land league, and one of the most active promoters of the movement, writes to me to the same effect. Mr. Ferguson says: "The time has come for a bold effort in the highlands. Can you raise some money for the good work? Irish, Scotch, Germans—all 'humanitarians'—should aid in this cause. We have now a good cause. We shall do our best. A few hundred pounds will enable us to take high ground. We can now carry mining and crofter constitutions upon the bottom principle. Would you try if your readers will help the crofters and committee?"

The *Irish World* of this week also publishes a letter from Mr. Ferguson to the same effect. He recalls, what is indeed true, that the land movement in Skye was kindled by Irish aid. Patrick Egan advanced \$200 from the Irish land league funds, subsequently repaid from Glasgow, and Mr. Ferguson sent Edward McHugh, an Irish Scotchman, whose soul was in the cause, up to Skye to sow the seed on ready ground. Mr. Ferguson now asks for more aid for the same purpose, promising that not a cent shall go in payment of rent, as unfortunately much of the American fund expended in Ireland went.

Are there not among us some Scottish Americans with love enough for the old land to do for Scotland what Patrick Ford and his associates did for Ireland, and who will take charge of this matter, and begin the raising of a Scottish land league fund? The Irish land movement never could have made the headway it has but for the funds contributed on this side, especially in the beginning. The people were too far down. Very much the same condition of things exists in Scotland. The crofters and cottiers of the highlands, especially of Skye, have, as I personally know, a firm hold of the truth that "God made Scotland for Scotchmen," but they are desperately poor, and the money that has been raised for them has been put in the hands of respectabilities whose endeavor it is to let the movement get no further than some picaresque demand for "tenant right" or reduced rents. The Caledonian club of this city donated some months ago a handsome sum to aid the crofter agitation, but it was unfortunately sent to "whiggish" hands. The men who can make money tell are the radicals, such as compose the Scottish land restoration league, and whose aim is not to reduce rents, but to appropriate them.

Cannot our Scottish clubs get up a committee to aid in the matter? In the meantime, if anyone desires to send pecuniary aid to the good cause in Scotland let them remit to Finley Bell or to John Ferguson. Or if they choose they can send the money to THE STANDARD and it will be acknowledged and forwarded. HENRY GEORGE.

DR. M'GLYNN IN BROOKLYN.

He Delivers His Lecture on the Cross of the New Crusade to an Immense Audience.

On last Wednesday evening it was Brooklyn's turn to do honor to Rev. Dr. M'Glynn. A big audience collected in the Academy of Music to hear the famous divine deliver his lecture on "The Cross of the New Crusade," a full report of which THE STANDARD published at the time of its first delivery a few weeks ago here in New York. Among those present were Thomas G. Shearman, John P. Crawford, John McMaclean, General Benjamin F. Tracy, Supervisor at-large Quintard, William C. De Witt, the Rev. Dr. Justin D. Fulton, Supervisor James Waters, ex-Assessor Howard Breen, ex-Judge William Watson, Lawyers Place, Gaynor and Patterson, Ralph Robb, Postmaster Joseph C. Hendrix, H. K. Sheldin, Dr. Gray, Franklin Allen, John V. Brown, Dr. Mcninger, John T. Casey, Judah B. Voorhes, Henry J. Gildersleeve, John F. Malone, James Ball, John P. Campbell and Charles F. Wingate.

From the moment that Dr. M'Glynn came upon the stage with Henry George, Victor A. Wilder, chairman of the general committee of Kings county united labor party, and John McMaclean of New York, great enthusiasm prevailed. Dr. M'Glynn's address was listened to with intense interest, and the hands of the clock pointed to almost 11 when the lecturer ceased speaking. Henry George presided.

Enger to Read "The Standard."

SPOKANE FALLS, W. T., April 20.—Right here in Washington territory the battle cry of "the land for the people" does not find general acceptance. One reason is that there is a class of gentry here known as real estate brokers that send out their doggers to the east, where hundreds of unthinking individuals fall into the trap. Then there are mortgage companies which advance money to the needy pioneer, who is fortunate enough to have got 100 acres from Uncle Sam. In the course of ten or twelve years Mr. Pioneer's farm will be absorbed, and he, with his family, must look to the town as a place of better possibilities, competing for work with those who are already there. Nevertheless, there are thinkers here, and so eager are they to get THE STANDARD that it is actually stolen at times. Money is very scarce or they would buy it. Yours for justice. W. R. VAN DOLAN.

A MANLY PROTEST.

Rev. Dr. Curran Refuses to Sign the Archbishop's Address.

The following correspondence explains itself:

NEW YORK, April 21.

Rev. JAMES T. CURRAN.—Rev. and Dear Sir: As Wednesday, May 4, will be the anniversary of the consecration of the most revered archbishop, we, the undersigned, in common with a number of the clergy whom we have consulted in the matter, think that it would be a fitting occasion on which to present to him the appended address.

Already it has been signed by over two hundred of the secular priests of the diocese, and by a large number of the regular clergy.

If the address has not been brought to your notice, or if you have not yet signed it and desire to do so, we respectfully ask you to subscribe to the accompanying copy, and return it at your earliest convenience to Rev. John F. Kearney, No. 263 Mulberry street, New York city.

JAMES H. MCGEE, St. Peter's church.
GABRIEL A. HEALY, St. Bernard's church.
JOHN J. MURPHY, S. J., St. Francis Xavier's church.
FRED WM. WAYRICH, C. SS. R., St. Alphonsus church.
JOHN F. KEARNEY, St. Patrick's church.
JOHN EDWARDS, Church of the Immaculate Conception.
NICHOLAS J. HUGHES, St. Mary's church.
THOMAS LYNCH, Transfiguration church.
MARTIN J. BROPHY, Church of the Sacred Heart.
ANACLETUS DA ROCCAGORGA, O. S. F., St. Anthony's church.
JOSEPH F. MOONEY, St. Patrick's church.
JAMES DOUGHERTY.

(Inclosed Address.)

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP.—We, the priests of the archdiocese of New York, come before you to express our sincere attachment to you and our unfeigned and cheerful loyalty to your authority.

We recognize in you our ecclesiastical superior, who, being in full communion with the head of the Catholic church, the successor of St. Peter, lawfully rule, teach and judge this portion of the flock of Christ—the archdiocese of New York.

Conformably to the exhortation of St. Paul, we look up to you as our "prelate who speaks to us in the word of God, whose faith we follow." And, pondering the grave injunction of the same apostle: "Obey your prelates and be subject to them; for they watch as being to render an account of your souls, that they may do this with joy, and not with grief: for this is not expedient for you." Hebrews xiii, 17. We desire also, on this occasion to record our emphatic disapproval and reprobation of the act of disobedience and disloyalty to your authority of which a certain member of our body has made himself guilty—an act of disloyalty aggravated by his subsequent course.

We have been patiently hoping and praying that our dear brother would change his mind and return to his father's house. But, observing that our charitable silence is construed into acquiescence in, and approval of, disobedience, and that it causes some surprise both here and abroad—learning, moreover, that it is publicly asserted that he is believed to uphold the cause of the clergy in general, we feel it our duty to make this solemn declaration to you, that the clergy of the archdiocese of New York utterly condemn all disobedience to lawfully constituted authority, especially to the authority of the church, and can have no sympathy with the efforts of those who in any way set that authority aside. Our motto shall always be: "An obedient man shall speak of victory."—Prov. xxi, 28.

NEW YORK, April 28, 1887.

To Rev. James H. McGee, Rev. Gabriel A. Healy, Rev. John J. Murphy, Rev. Fred Wm. Wayrich, Rev. John F. Kearney, Rev. John Edwards, Rev. Nicholas J. Hughes, Rev. Thomas Lynch, Rev. Martin J. Brophy, Rev. Anacletus da Roccagorga, Rev. Joseph F. Mooney and Rev. James Dougherty:—*Rev. and Dear Sirs:* I have received from you a circular letter requesting my signature to a printed address to our archbishop. I cannot conscientiously comply with your request. I regret that you and other priests of this diocese find it necessary to express in a public document your loyalty to authority. I should feel guilty of a calumny if I should sign the paper sent to me, containing, as it does, these words: "We desire, on this occasion, to record our emphatic disapproval and reprobation of the act of disobedience and disloyalty to your authority, of which a certain member of our body has made himself guilty; an act of disloyalty aggravated by his subsequent course." It is not disloyalty to act according to admitted principles of Catholic theology. These principles teach us that every Catholic is free to adhere to an opinion until it shall have been condemned by the one legitimate authority.

You speak of a "certain member of our body" as disobedient and disloyal. I know of none such. The priest to whom I am told you refer in your address has declared again and again that if the doctrine, for refusing to abandon which he is still suspended from his pastoral office, should be condemned by the only authority we all recognize in such matters, he would, as a Catholic, repudiate it. And I know with certainty that that authority, so far from condemning, has never even examined the doctrine. I am entirely at a loss to know what "aggravation" of his alleged disloyalty you are able to find in what you call "his subsequent course." It is not true, on the contrary, that Dr. M'Glynn has maintained a discreet silence, broken only by a statement made necessary to supplement the incomplete presentation of his case in an authoritative published document. Moreover, I should feel guilty of a pharisaic hypocrisy, if, after seeing by my signature to approve that portion of your address which I have just said I could not sign without feeling guilty of calumny, I should join with you in saying: "We have been patiently hoping and praying that our dear brother would change his mind and return to his father's house. It would seem to me mockery to call one my 'dear brother' at a moment, when I knew I was calumniating him, and while pharisaically praying for the return of the 'dear brother' to his father's house. I should be conscious that I was calumniating him by implying that he had ever abandoned his father's house. This calumny would be all the more unpardonable since the 'dear brother' has several times publicly asseverated with the greatest emphasis and solemnity that he never has and never will abandon what you must mean by 'his father's house,' the holy Catholic church. If, by his return to

the length and breadth of Australia. We intend, by holding public meetings, to "spread the light."

A Dakota County Superintendent of Schools
is not thinking about it.

MADISON, Dak., March 7.—During the year 1886 the revenue from customs amounted to \$192,905.23. This sum of money was advanced by the importers and added to the price of the goods. The consumer consequently paid both the original price and the duty. This is what we call *indirect taxation*.

Now I simply wish to show how indirect taxation operates, and what loss the people actually sustain by upholding such a system.

In the first place, it costs from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 to collect this revenue; and, in the second place, it enhances the prices of the goods. It is this second part that I wish to make clear, as a great many do not have the faintest idea of what it amounts to.

The average duty on imported goods, according to Secretary Manning's report, is somewhat more than forty-six per cent.

Let us take a unit, one dollar's worth of imported goods, and suppose that it goes through the hands of three wholesale dealers and one retail dealer before it reaches the consumer, and that the profit on capital invested is ten per cent to each wholesale dealer and twenty-five per cent to the retailer. We shall then have the following progression of costs:

Value of the goods, \$1.00

Duty, 46

First cost, \$1.46

Profit, 20 per cent, .292

Second cost, \$1.752

Profit, 10 per cent, .1752

Third cost, \$1.9272

Profit, 10 per cent, .19272

Fourth cost, \$2.11992

Profit, 25 per cent, .52998

Cost to the consumer, \$2.6499

Now, let us suppose this same dollar's worth of goods imported free of duty, and that it passes through the same number of hands at the same rate of profit to each, as in the former case. The progression of costs will then be as follows:

First cost, \$1.00

Profit, 10 per cent, .10

Second cost, \$1.10

Profit, 10 per cent, .121

Third cost, \$1.221

Profit, 25 per cent, .30525

Cost to the consumer, \$1.52625

The difference between the two costs is, of course, 75 1/2 per cent, of which the government gets 46 cents, minus the cost of collecting it. The extra cost, however, is more than 30 cents above what goes into the treasury, and by examining the two examples we see that those 30 cents go to the different merchants who handle the goods, as a legitimate profit on the extra capital invested on account of the tariff. As far as the consumer is concerned, he might just as well have lost that much money on his way to town as to be beaten out of it by an indirect method of taxation. Of course the merchant, as such, does not care much whether there is a duty or not as long as he is in a position to charge a legitimate profit on the extra outlay and to transfer the whole burden to somebody else. But how are the farmers and the day laborers to transfer it?

Why do we uphold such a system of indirect taxation? If we must pay the 46 cents tax any way, why not pay it directly and at once before it has increased over sixty-seven per cent? Farmers and day laborers complain of hard times. But are they not needlessly making beasts of burden of themselves?

This 30 cents' waste is on one single dollar's worth! And as forty-six per cent is an average duty, so is 30 cents' loss to the consumer only an average loss. On the common necessities of life, which the farmer and day laborer need, the duty is much higher and the loss greater; while on luxuries and costly goods the duty is much lower and the loss smaller.

If we divide \$192,905,023 by 46 and multiply by 30 we get \$125,000,000 as the actual loss for the past year! Not a tax, remember; that must be paid besides; nor as the price paid for "protection," but as the unavoidable waste connected with our tariff. It is a dead loss of \$2 for every man, woman and child in the country. A total loss of \$10 for every family of five persons and \$20 for every family of ten. In twenty years it is a loss of over three and a half billions of dollars.

But the greater part of this enormous waste, as well as the greater part of the tax, is paid by the rich consumer. It may be said, "I don't see it." The duty on luxuries is a great deal lower than the duty on the necessities of life. Then, again, the families of the rich are generally small, while the families of the farmers and day laborers and workingmen in general are large. And it takes just as much salt to preserve a pound of meat for a poor man as it does for a rich man, and just as much sugar to sweeten a cup of tea for a working girl as it does for the richest daughter in the land. Moreover, the farmers and day laborers constitute at least five-sixths of the whole population. And there are hundreds of thousands of day laborers without any really possessive property, who must pay any taxes at all. Now they help to pay all indirect taxes more than the rich, for they pay according to the size of their families.

This enormous loss of three and one-half billions of dollars for the last twenty years has been computed in the most conservative manner on the "duty for revenue only." The goods were supposed to have passed through four hands only at a moderate profit, leaving out the commission of druggists entirely, while a great many things, according to good authority, pass through twenty or thirty hands before they reach the consumer. And at every hand there is a little loss, growing in the same ratio to the tax as the revenue.

These three and one-half billions represent the loss from only one single kind of indirect taxation out of many.

If you tax the merchants in a city they simply add the tax to the price of the goods and charge a good round profit on it. If you tax the warehouses, the owners will pay the loss for what you sell them; if you tax the railroads and telegraphs they will roll it back again with crushing force by adding to the charges of freight on all the thousand articles that they transport.

This it goes all around, indirect taxes and compound profits, and "the devil take the hindmost," who, under present methods of taxation, are mainly farmers and day laborers, who finally have to foot the whole bill.

Thus we continually live in a network of compound interest. We are forced to borrow money in paying all these indirect taxes long before we get the use of the goods; and we are forced to pay compound profit whenever the goods change hands. Even if we have the cash in our pockets to pay with this indirect system prevents us until the tax has increased, on an average, seventy-six per cent!

Under such a system there is not even sufficient grounds for justice. We are absolutely helpless. And, of course, that is the reason why so many of the wealthy and powerful desire its continuance.

It is not the tariff tax alone we ought to abolish. All indirect taxes are essentially the same; they all have the same aim, and they are all hatched from the egg of deceit in the secret closet of the few, conspiring against the masses, who thereby unknowingly are made to pay taxes they otherwise never would consent to.

Well, what shall we adopt in the place of our present system?

My opinion, belief and conviction is that there is but one single just and equitable method of raising money for public expenses, and that is the method so ably advocated by THE STANDARD, to take out of the public fund which already exists in the "unearned increment" in land, what may be needed. There is no way but this, because "Thou shalt not steal."

E. H. EVANSON.

THE NEW YORK LETTER CARRIERS.

A Day's Work Described by One of Them—A Substitute's Earnings.

NEW YORK.—The substitute letter carrier who wrote you a description of his experience, told what was correct in every particular. What can we say of a government which permits such a state of affairs to exist? What of the government that limits the amount a substitute can earn by carrying these "special delivery letters" to \$30 a month. If he should carry one month only \$10 worth (at 5 cents apiece), he must do the best he can to make both ends meet; but if on the following month he should carry \$40 or \$50 worth, instead of receiving the above amount he has earned by his labor, the government confiscates every cent over \$30.

Previous to being assigned as a regular carrier, he must pay \$1 to a postoffice official (who is already drawing a large salary from the government) to be sworn in, notwithstanding the fact that he has paid the affidavit fee previous to being appointed a substitute. After being made a "regular" (if he should be given a carrying route) he will work as follows: Early day—report 6 a. m. get mail set out and leave on first trip at 7:30, taking a very small portion of the entire route to enable him to get back in time to leave again at 9:30 on his second trip; gets in on his second trip about 11:30. If there should be a letter with a "special delivery" stamp on it, and no substitutes available to deliver it, he is sent out with it, for which service he receives nothing, except threats and abuse should he remonstrate. If there should be nothing of this kind, then he can go to his dinner. He must be back by 12:45 to get his mail ready for his 1:30 trip, at which time he leaves the office, getting back about 3:45. He will then set out and get ready for his 4:30 trip, leaving at that time and getting back about 6:30. If he has any letters then that he has failed to deliver on account of mistakes in directing, etc., he must look in the directory, and if the correct addresses are found must forward them, or if not he must enter them in a book provided for that purpose. Then if there is nothing else to do he may go home. The following day is his late day. He will work as follows (with variations in the way of extra work as mentioned previously): Reports at 6 a. m.; leaves at 7:30, taking the main portion of the route, getting back at 11; gets mail ready and leaves at 11:30, returning about 1:30 p. m.; goes to dinner, getting back at 2:45; sets up his mail and leaves at 3:30; gets back about 5:45; sets up his mail and leaves on his last trip at 6:30, returning all the way from 9:30 to 10:30 p. m. Now, how can the government consistently appoint arbitration boards and committees to inquire into the business of corporations and capitalists, looking to the amelioration of the wage worker, and at the same time work its own employees like slaves and refuse to investigate their wrongs? How can it expect corporations to make concessions to their employees in the face of such an example? Why does not the government begin at home and show by the way it treats its employees (who, by the way, are neither workmen, mechanics or laborers) how it expects corporations, etc., to treat theirs. Verily it is, "Do as I say and not as I do." God help the wage worker whose employer takes the government for a guide.

THE STANDARD has filled a long felt want. It is a medium through which the oppressed and down-trodden may make their condition and wrongs public. It is also the educator of the masses. I believe I only echo the sentiments of each and every reader when I wish THE STANDARD long life and great success.

A LETTER CARRIER.

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us abolish all taxes except on land values,' they all escape it with might and main. To-night we say to them: 'We are going to relieve you of this burden, or a part of it, at least, by taking taxes off of your personal property and improvements and putting them on the value of land. But instead of thanking us, these rich men who say we are going to exempt the rich, bitterly object. Why would object to having his riches raised? Why do these monopolies find fault when we wish to relieve them (a part of a part of their burden) why do they insist that we shall not help them? The truth is that they know that this measure will help those they say it would hurt. When they antagonize a measure we may be sure that it is one which benefits the whole working people of this country.'"

THE President of the Boston Central Labor Union on the True Platform.

John Swinton lectured in Faneuil Hall, Boston, last week, to a large audience, and made one of his striking speeches. In introducing him, Daniel H. Biggs, president of the Central Labor Union, declared himself in favor of putting all taxes on land values, and alluded thus ironically to those who declare that to do this would be to relieve the rich from taxation and to increase the burdens of the workingman and the farmer:

"There is a class of corporations that say they are taxed to death. But when the people say 'let us

THE BIBLE WAR IN 1870

Even Washington Territory Sees the Need of It.

Whatcom, W. T., Reveals.

So much should be more than he can utilize and improve is a doctrine that is coming rapidly to the front, and the theory of making real estate—not the improvements thereon, but the naked real estate of itself—bear the entire burden of taxation, is the one, the practical application of which will solve the problem now afflicting the millions. Air, land and water, in their natural conditions, are gifts of God, and as long as they remain in their first or natural conditions should not be speculated upon by syndicates, corporations or private individuals for private or individual gain.

Arbor Day.

Philadelphia News.

This is arbor day, and the many farmers who have been out and put in their trees as he wants. But the lodger up on the floors back doesn't feel much interested in arbor day.

HISTORIC LAND GRABS.

When the white man first set foot on the territory now known as the state of New York, he found it a wilderness inhabited or controlled by the most powerful confederacy of Indian tribes that ever existed within the present limits of the United States. These people were called the Iroquois by the French, the Five Nations by the English, and they called themselves "The People of the Long House," and sometimes, when oratorically inclined, "Onwé-Honwé"—men surpassing all others. Though they dominated a wide area, the land that they called their home extended from the eastern valley of the Mohawk to the falls of Niagara. Here they built their houses and tilled the soil and rested on their return from their numerous war expeditions, which extended from Canada on the north to the Chesapeake or even further southward, and westward to the Mississippi. Though savages, they possessed many of the rudiments of civilization. They had a rude religion and some skill in agriculture and manufactures. They had established a system of representative government, each tribe sending a prescribed number of sachems to the great council. Their women took part in public matters, and appear to have had a council of their own, which formally communicated their wishes to the sachems and chiefs. In matters relating to land and property their voice is said to have been potent. Minor local councils discussed local affairs. All decisions required a unanimous vote, and if this was not secured through argument and deliberation, the matter was postponed until another council. The Jesuit priest, Leston, speaks of their great council as a senate, and compares the sachems as "discussing affairs of state with as much coolness and gravity as the Spanish junta or the grand council of Venice." Hon. Ellis H. Roberts, in his history of New York, (1) from which these facts are extracted, speaking of the Five Nations (who became known as the Six Nations after the Tuscaroras joined them in 1715), says:

"The annals of mankind do not afford in the same grade of general civilization any parallel to the political system which existed among the Iroquois, a confederacy, or among the tribes composing it."

Again, speaking of the Indians of the Five Nations as a body, he says:

"They believed in a Great Spirit, and in immortality in happy hunting grounds. In their 'keepers of the faith' a priestly order may be discovered, and in their festivals and form of burial are elements not without scientific and spiritual significance. Their religion lifts them above brute barbarism to a semi-civilization, which separates them from the tribes surrounding them. They respected woman and honored matrimony, which distinction was from the female. Chivalry did not accord woman so much as did these red men, for they gave her a part in their councils and their governments, and made her voice potent in the election of chiefs. They had a sacred institution, and children were carefully trained. For the aged high regard was exhibited, and the rites of hospitality were honored with chivalric strictness."

These Indians were savage in war and remorseless in avenging wrongs, but they were, according to the picture drawn by Mr. Roberts, a people who deserved a high consideration at the hands of a more civilized race migrating to the land that these tribes called their own. How frequently this was forgotten by the whites is shown in the earlier pages of this interesting work. Like all of the series of "American Commonwealths" Mr. Roberts' history of New York is a careful summary of known historical facts rather than a work of original research, but it brings the story of the commonwealth down to our own times, and though traces of bias are visible, the political struggle in which the chief part was taken by the participants are treated with commendable fairness. Take it as a whole this work is a valuable addition to a most useful series.

It has a special value to the student of the politics of the future, because it incidentally brings out, without apparent design, the vital part that the land question has ever played in the stormy history of this commonwealth, from the day in 1609, when Samuel de Champlain first crossed the St. Lawrence to assist his red Canadian allies in their battle with the Iroquois, down to the present day. Among the Dutch, who were the first white people to actually settle in New York, the idea appears at first to have been trade rather than colonization, but nevertheless the Dutch West India company was given the land of the Iroquois by the states general of Holland and commanded to advance the peopling of its unsettled parts. Indian rights were, however, in a measure recognized, and the Dutch, the French and the English became in turn eager to take advantage of the readiness of the red men to whom the very idea of private ownership in land was inconceivable, to grant large tracts for the use of individuals or colonies.

The first of the great land grabbers to take advantage of this ignorance of the Indians appears to have been a Dutch lapidary named Kilian van Rensselaer, a director of the West India company, who had grown rich by cutting and polishing diamonds and pearls in Amsterdam. This purchase was made in 1614, under a charter of privileges and exemptions creating patroons, a system that was the cause of serious troubles many years later. Van Rensselaer became in this way the owner of the greater part of the land now constituting the counties of Albany, Rensselaer and Columbia. Michael Pauw, another director of the company, bought the whole of Staten island from the Indians in 1621, the consideration being "certain parcels of goods." The company itself bought Manhattan island for \$24. The success of these land-grabbing ventures excited the jealousy of their fellow members, and in course of time they were compelled to share the booty with the other directors.

This process became general, but so long as unclaimed land was abundant it caused no serious trouble, except such as arose among the land-grabbers themselves or between the patroons and the West India company.

Immigrants settling on the land of these patroons were allowed as much ground as they could cultivate, but were required to pay one-tenth of the produce as rent. Aside from the Indian war, brought about by the greed and avarice of Director-General Kieft, about 1673, most of the troubles with the Indians appear to have grown out of land claims. Governor Peter Stuyvesant had trouble with the patroons because of the refusal of the land grabbers to pay taxes for the maintenance of the forts on which they depended for protection. Old Peter took a high hand in 1648, and sent troops to enforce his decrees, finally releasing from the control of the patroons much of the land on which the city of Albany now stands. Stuyvesant got into trouble with the people, as well as the patroons, and when he was called to Amsterdam to give an account of himself, the chamber of commerce there censured him for, among other things, the purchase of lands on Manhattan island for private use.

The first public remonstrance we hear of against land grabbing was made by the convention that met on this island in 1683 to devise means for the defense of the colony against a threatened attack by the English colonists of New England and the Indians whom they were supposed to have investigated "against the course of the director and council in enacting laws and appointing officers without the consent of the people, and against the granting of large tracts of land to favored

individuals. Thus early in the history of New York were land granting and the oppression of the people joined as objects for denunciation. In course of time the agitation caused the West India company to secure all patron rights in Staten island and to give grants there to the Walldenses, Huguenots and other actual settlers.

After the English obtained possession of the colony the policy of buying land from the Indians was continued. Yet the British, like the Dutch and French, claimed in a general way the ownership of the whole country, and the many wars between them, in the course of which Indian massacres decimated whole colonies, arose from these rival claims to dominion over the territory of "the people of the Long House."

During the brief administration of the earl of Bellmont as governor, from April 1683 to March 1701, there was much stirring up of this land business. Among the charges against Nicholas Bayard, secretary of the colony, was one that he had taken to himself a grant of land belonging to the Mohawks as large as one of the middle counties of England without a reasonable quit rent. Though Bayard denied the other charges, he attempted to justify the land transaction. Mr. Roberts, on page 224, vol. 1, says:

"His case was only one of many. Land began to promise large returns, and speculation reached its height. Robert A. Livingston, who had begun his career in Albany, on a visit to England secured grants for many thousands acres on the Hudson, which became known as Livingston's manor. Transactions with the red men led more and more to purchases of land, or acquisitions less regular. Clergymen were members of combinations, such as would now be known as 'Indian rings and land rings.' Dominie Godfrey Dellius, the Dutch pastor at Albany, Livingston's neighbor, but in his hostility to Leisler, and yet appointed by Leisler a commissioner of Indian affairs. He was charged with fraudulently securing deeds from the red men for vast tracts. Pinebarne, a member of the council with associates, obtained patents for the Mohawk valley, two miles on each side of the river, for fifty miles along its banks. Peter Schuyler was one of several who, at first interested in buying these lands, had withdrawn from the association on account of the frauds practiced. The courts vacated the patents, Dellius was suspended from the ministry, and a temporary check was given to the greed of the land jobbers. But the vast domain of the Dutch continued to offer temptations, and governors and officials of various grades and capitalists, small and large, grasped for a share of it, until only scanty reservations remained to the original owners."

The influence of this monopoly appears to have been clearly perceived, for in 1715 Governor Hunter declared, "I cannot say that the inhabitants increase as in the neighboring provinces, where the purchase of land is easier." This governor devised a novel scheme, frequently imitated since, for increasing the population. He obtained a grant from the British government of £10,000 to enable him to transport to this country nearly three thousand impoverished laborers from the Palatinate in Germany. These people, called Palatinates, were brought over under a contract to work for Governor Hunter on a fixed rate until the cost of their transportation was defrayed, and they were settled on both sides of the Hudson "about a hundred miles up." They were expected to produce tar and turpentine. The governor contracted with Livingston, on whose land some of them were located, to furnish them all with bread and beer. The men soon began to complain that money promised them was not paid and that the land was so barren that it would not afford them a living. They refused to do the work and demanded the right to move to other land. Their demands were refused, whereupon they organized a strike, which the governor put down with troops. This was in 1712. Eventually the Palatinates escaped from the governor's personal rule. The Indians offered them fertile lands in Schenectady on easy terms, and many of them settled in the Mohawk valley, where Palatine bridge, German flats and Stone Arabia still preserve the memory of the original immigrants, who, having gained access to good land, became thrifty. Many of their descendants have since become conspicuous in the history of the state, among them being General Horatio revolutionary fame.

Governor Cosby, who arrived in 1732, seems to have promptly plunged into land speculation. He destroyed deeds which fell into his hands for land in Albany, and made a grab for lands on Long island. The Mohawks came to him with a complaint that a valuable part of their domain which they had decided to be held in trust for them had been granted to private persons, in defiance of this trust. They submitted the deed to the governor in proof of their assertion. He obtained possession of the paper by deceit, and threw it into the fire. The advantage was a second gain by this act of violence is seen in a vast tract of land in the upper Mohawk valley, still known as Cosby's manor, and held by people who trace their title back to this thief. Cosby's secretary, Clarke, in time became governor, and of him Mr. Roberts says: "When he reached the executive chair he took every means to gather in fees and to increase his fortunes by operations in lands." The process continued under Gov. Clinton. Speaking of this time, Mr. Roberts says:

"The greed of the land speculators was bearing its natural fruit. Hendrick, a Mohawk chief adopted by the Mohawks, to appeals for his aid retorted: 'You have taken the land of the Mohicans (in New England) and driven us away; and he predicted the same result with the Mohawks.'

As the troubles with the French grew more threatening, this feeling among the Indians began to be alarming. The author says, "The Iroquois were growing restive under the pressure of the greed and fraud of the land speculators," and in 1753 they carried their reproaches to the governor and assembly, receiving but little satisfaction. When the struggle with the French came it was found difficult to hold the troops to the alliance with the English because they always had grievances over the seizure of their lands by speculators and the breach of treaties."

Again, after this war was over, we are told that "controversies over the claims to lands threatened more than once to lead to appeals to arms on the part of the original owners, and apprehension of outbreaks was constant."

The troubles continued, and a dispute over the great patent of Kayaderosseras, covering about 700,000 acres between the Hudson and the Mohawk, became the cause for a congress in 1765, which was attended by representatives of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Virginia and 3,200 Indians, at which £2,000 in money and goods were awarded to the red men in satisfaction of their claims. Throughout the colonial period land grabbing continued, and there was little if any change for the better after the colony became a state. Mr. Roberts says:

"The commonwealth treated its vast domain with reckless prodigality. In 1791 a law was passed with a view to draw in settlers, authorizing the commissioners of the land office to sell any of the public lands at their discretion. These commissioners were Governor Clinton, Louis A. Scott, Aaron Burr, Girard Barabian and Peter C. Cartwright. They sold 5,342,173 acres of land for \$1,030,433; and of this vast domain Alexander McComb owned 8,635,200 acres, for much of which only eight cents an acre was paid."

The transaction caused a scandal that led to an official investigation, but the legislature sustained the land commissioners by a vote of 35 to 20. No strong measures to stop the process until the whole unoccupied land of the state had passed into the hands of speculators, who held it in anticipation of the demands of the increasing population.

Meanwhile, trouble had come in the already thickly-settled districts through the tenure of land under the patroons, who attempted,

under the republic, to exercise the feudal powers granted them by Holland. This agitation led largely to the calling of the constitutional convention of 1846, which abolished feudal tenures and forbade leases of agricultural lands for a period longer than twelve years. The relief was not adequate, however. Mr. Roberts says:

"The vast estates secured by the patroons under the Dutch and English laws, and as to become very valuable as population grew. The grants by the English royal governors to themselves and their favorites took up much more of the choice lands. Speculation by these large landowners, and by smaller ones, for small considerations but under the name of purchase, vast tracts, which the Indians gave up without knowing the consequences. Foreign capitalists, like the Holland land company, acquired lands by thousands of acres in various parts of the commonwealth. At the close of the revolution the commonwealth owned more than seven million acres of its own soil. The waste and folly that had prevailed since the legal title to the land was sold in 1791, when, in tracts so large as to exclude fair competition, and in total quantity so much as to glut the demand, over five and a half million acres of these lands were given away gratuitously to individuals, and speculators who sought only their own gain."

This is the just and strong indictment with which the author opens his chapter giving the history of the anti-war, waged with such violence by the oppressed and outraged tenants, probably the most formidable insurrection against the constituted authorities that has ever occurred in any one state of the Union. Court houses were broken open, records burned and sheriffs' possees put to flight by organized bands of men disguised as Indians, acquired by thousands of acres in property, suppressed by military companies, but the agitation was carried into politics, and in October, 1852, the court of appeals rendered a decision against the more extravagant claims of the landlords, after which the anti-war movement ceased to seek its ends through organized resistance to the laws. It took this display of force, however, to compel the courts to look into the law and the facts and interpret both in the spirit of free constitutions. "Since the claims for service or payment in kind, or in shares of the products on alienation have been abandoned," says the court, "land tenure has become simple, and conflict over it has ceased to be threatening to society." If the author will consult some of the professional society savers of New York city, he will find that they do not concur in this opinion.

The fact that the author of this new history of New York is not identified in any way with the movement that aims to reopen the question of land tenure and to keep it open until society is relieved from the effect of the wrong and folly so clearly described in his work adds force to the evidence given in its pages that the New York land question is not a mere matter of local interest, but one of national importance, and without any claim to an equitable beginning. A more important or timely service to the cause of land restoration could not well have been rendered. The well known facts of British and Irish history have caused thousands of Americans to sympathize with the growing movement for land restoration in Ireland, Scotland, and even in England, who oppose any movement of the kind in the United States as unnecessary and communistic. Such people have always insisted that there was vastly more of natural justice in the acquisition of land by the individual owners in this country than there was in such acquisition in the British islands. Let them read in these volumes the narrative by an unprejudiced writer of the manner in which the lands of New York were filched from the "People of the Long House," and then declare if they can that existing land tenures in New York rest on more honorable or more equitable foundations than the land tenures of England have in the conquering swords of the Norman bastard and his fellow robbers.

The history of landlordism in New York as it is found in Mr. Roberts' pages, is simply the story of a crime, the crime of the land grabbers to these shores down to the present day. The land grabber has been a ruthless oppressor of the poor, a dangerous disturber of the public peace and absolutely useless to society. In the early days his greed corrupted public officials, disgraced Christian ministers and imperiled the very existence of the state by robbing, cheating and exasperating the natives of the soil. The blazing cabins of peaceful settlers, the war cry and scalping-knife of the savage marked the advance of the land thief into the wilderness. Fifty years ago the wealth of the rich was the result of the expropriation of the claims to baronial powers that provoked the oppressed to rebellion and precipitated civil war and anarchy in parts of this state. Yet these claims were upheld by the "saviors of society" in that day as among the most sacred and inviolable rights of property, and they were only overturned by the fear occasioned by armed force. To-day the power of individuals, through titles traced directly back to these initial crimes, is exercised remorselessly to strangle enterprise by taxing both labor and capital for exercising the right to add to the riches of the commonwealth. Landlordism is to-day essentially the same that it was in the times of the early Dutch governors. It seizes natural opportunities, not to use them, but to demand blackmail from those who would use them. It checks enterprise and natural growth to-day just as it did in the time of Governor Hunter. Now, as then, an unwise policy brings into our state poor men from abroad, and by withholding from them access to natural opportunities makes them a burden instead of a help to society. To-day landlordism is as unparliamentary in its greed as it was two centuries ago. Then it denounced the Indian while provoking him by constant wrongs to that wholesale massacre which threatened the colony with extinction. To-day it is eager to denounce the anarchist and the revolutionist, while, by its greed, it forces families into the crowded precincts of great cities, and actually breeds the modern vandrals who fill its coward heart with terror. Nor does the parallel stop here. After the death of Leisler, the aristocratic party of New York sided with the English, and was branded as seditious the demands of the people who sought by peaceful means to overthrow a system that curtailed their liberties and threatened the state with destruction. When the common people of New York now seek by peaceful means to right the wrongs under which they suffer, and to put a stop to the breeding of the only savages who can destroy a modern state, those same cries of sedition and lawlessness are raised against them by the landlords and their senseless allies.

Yet the history under review shows that the march of the people to power has, on the whole, been peaceful; that the tendency of the privileged classes to violence has been impotent to stay the slow, but sure, sapping of their privileges, and hence, that there is good ground to hope that the last and greatest struggle for freedom, that for the emancipation of industry from the grasp of that modern "robber" landlord, will be a peaceful one. That the power, the exercised springs from land made by English aristocrats and Dutch burghers no one denies. No particle of that power was better fortified or more sacred in the eyes of its possessors than that granted to the patroons. The law conferring that power was set aside by the people, and those unjust and improvidently granted privileges were extinguished. No law made by Englishman or Dutchman, or by any dead generation of men can hold good for a moment in this state against a later law "enacted by the people of the state of New York represented in senate and assembly." The law which the law has given, the law can take away.

Mr. Roberts has contributed something by this work toward the peaceable righting of the wrong he describes so well. He is gravely mistaken, however, in supposing that the dis-

pute concerning land tenures was settled by a decision of the court of appeals in 1852. That decision was no more final than were numerous other legal decisions made about that time sustaining the right of the white man to hold the black man in bondage. The dispute concerning the tenure of land is entering on that stage which precedes action. It will go on until the system that makes paupers of industrious freemen in a fertile land is overthrown. It will go on until the impudent claim of private individuals to exclusive ownership in the free bounty of their Creator to all men is effectually denied by law. It will never end until we cease to make a mockery of the charter of our liberties by denying to men that most fundamental of all rights—the right to the earth—without which not merely liberty, but the pursuit of happiness, but life itself cannot be accounted as among man's inalienable rights.

W. T. CHAOSDALE.

THE SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY.

The President of the Association Tells the Story of the Movement.

NEW YORK, April 25.—The Saturday half holiday movement was inaugurated in the spring of 1885 by the formation of a committee of representative men from the retail stores throughout the city, having in view the single object of obtaining a half holiday on each Saturday throughout the entire year for all clerks and salespeople. The committee waited on the proprietors of the principal stores for the purpose of obtaining an expression of opinion as to the feasibility of securing this half holiday. The idea was generally received with favor, many of the merchants expressing themselves as being perfectly willing to close their stores at noon on Saturdays provided the custom became general and that it caused no inconvenience to their customers. There were a number, however, who emphatically refused to entertain the proposition, because Saturday, being the regular pay day, it is convenient for working people to make their purchases on the day they receive their wages. Finding it impossible to gain the unanimous consent of the storekeepers, the committee decided to appeal to the public and urge them to make all purchases during the first five days of the week or on Saturday morning.

Circulars containing this appeal were sent to all the clergymen of New York and Brooklyn, and to all the prominent clergymen in the leading cities of the Union, asking for co-operation and for an address from the pulpit in support of the half holiday. An immediate and most gratifying response was the result. The chairman received assurances from over three hundred clergymen of their hearty endorsement of the movement and promises to do as requested. Twenty bishops pledged themselves to give the movement in their dioceses an unqualified support. All communications without exception urged the work, and several in their corporate capacity endorsed the reform, promising continuous support until the desired object was secured. The press was equally zealous in the cause, and with a singular unanimity used its influence to educate public opinion and bring it into harmony with the new movement.

The result was satisfactory beyond expectation. According to a careful census made by the New York Herald and published on July 19, 1886, over 115,000 persons in New York and Brooklyn obtained the half holiday for some portion of the summer of that year. The difficulty arose, however, in the presentation of an insurmountable obstacle to the continuance of the half holiday. Merchants complained that so long as the banks remained open it would not be safe to close their stores. Many had their notes protested and others had to keep their finance department open while the remainder of the house was closed. Suggestions came from many quarters that we should secure the passage of a law making Saturday from 12 m. a legal half holiday. In 1886 this was attempted. Mr. Husted introduced a bill in the assembly with this object in view, and it was passed and determined opposition of the clearing house committee, and was finally defeated by the country members.

The association, however, grew in numbers and strength every hour, and with a fixed determination never to relax its efforts till the half holiday should be accomplished, proceeded steadily with its work.

In the early part of the present session Senator Reilly introduced a bill into the senate similar to Gen. Husted's bill of last year, and this bill, after a three months' struggle with the banks in the judiciary committee, was, through the untiring efforts of Mr. Reilly, passed by the senate and immediately presented to the assembly by Mr. McKenna. Through the personal exertions of Speaker Husted it was passed in the assembly by a two-thirds vote, and with the governor's signature becomes a law. With the assistance of this law the association will go forward with renewed energy to complete its work, and in doing so it calls for the support of every man and woman interested in the cause of humanity. The association intends to make a systematic effort to influence the public mind as to the merits of the reform, and to persuade employers and contractors to change the pay day to some other day of the week than Saturday. To secure this end we expect the support and co-operation of all labor organizations, as the principle on which we stand is this: that any movement which has for its object the shortening of the hours of work without reduction in wages is a movement in the interests of labor.

EDWARD JOHNSTON.

Cardinal Manning on Labor.

What is the cause of all this enormous development of wealth? Some may say it is capital. I say there is something before skill—there is labor; and we trace it to labor strictly. The first agency and factor of this great commercial wealth, and therefore of the greatness of our country in this respect, is labor.

"In the dim morning of society labor was up and stirring before capital was awake." There is no doubt of this, and therefore I maintain that labor is the origin of all our greatness. I am speaking, as you will remember, strictly upon that one point, am I not now speaking on the more exalted of labor, though I may touch that hereafter slightly, but I speak of labor as a political economist would speak. I will not try to define labor, but I will describe it to be the honest exertions of our mind and of our body for the good of our own good and for the good of our neighbor. I say honest, for I do not account any labor which is not honest—which is superficial, tricky and untrustworthy as worthy of the name of labor. I do not account exertion, because unless a man puts forth his powers, and puts them forth to the full, it is not worthy of the name of labor. Unless he puts forth his powers honestly for his own good, I call it his destruction; and if he does not put forth those powers for his own good and also for the good of his neighbor, I call it selfishness. I think, therefore, that my description is a just one; it is the honest exertion of our mind and of our body for the good of our own good and for the good of our neighbor. And here I must put in a plea in passing for the exertions of the powers of the mind, and I feel confident that in the Mechanics' Institute of Lowell I shall be able to say that those who exert the powers of the mind and of the brain are true laborers. They may never have wielded an ax, they may never have guided a locomotive, and they may never have driven a spade into the ground; but I will maintain they are true laborers, worthy of the name.

God Speed the Anti-Poverty Society.

The Rev. C. M. Morse telegraphs from Newcastle, Pa.: "God speed the Anti Poverty association. Count me in. Proverbs 11, 27, 28."

BRITISH REGENERATION.

H. M. HYNDMAN ON THE COURSE OF EVENTS.

The Division of Political Forces—Shams and Humberg Above and Social Democracy Below—Preparations for the Great Social Drama—Tyranny in Ireland and Agitation in England.

Special to the Standard.

LONDON, April 12.—The storm which I spoke of in my last letter has gathered and broken even sooner than I expected. We are now in the full blast of an anti-coercion agitation, and I am happy to say it seems likely to be more formidable than I anticipated. Of all the meetings and the protests and the debates you will have heard, but the main issue is of permanent interest. We are learning the lesson—which, by all accounts, you in America will have to learn, too—that with genuinely democratic institutions it is impossible that the dominant wealthy class, be they landlords or capitalists, should long be allowed to use the public forces and the public power to put down combinations against them. That the difficulty with Ireland is primarily economical has been shown time after time, and is admitted freely now even by the agents of the Tory government. But the landlords and big capitalists in Great Britain see clearly that the success of the National League in Ireland, quite apart from the mere nationality question, means an overwhelming victory for the masses over the classes, and betokens an early repetition of a similar struggle, with the same result to the monopolists of land and capital on this side of St. George's channel. That is why Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain are now, practically, all in the forefront of the Tory, and are, I think, hardly shall they that have riches, stick to any real revolutionary movement! Just think, Mr. Editor, of friend Joseph of Birmingham—him of the doctrine of "reason," who held up Toulon's head, so to say, as a warning to the unscrupulous landlords—just imagine, I say, the man Joseph Chamberlain humbly repeating his creed of coercion after the marquis of Salisbury and the marquis of Hartington! Verily, verily, it is as if John Bull, of danger and dynamite fame, turned lobbyist-in-chief to the Standard oil company. However, so it is, and now Irish, English and Scotch landlords and big capitalists and the monopolists of land and capital are making common cause against as unholly an alliance as any that has ever disgraced our political annals.

Of course, as one who fought vigorously against Mr. Gladstone's own coercive and crimes acts, I know that there is a vast deal of humbug in all this outcry. There are plenty of men to-day on the anti-coercionist platform who would support tyranny to-morrow, if that were the party ruse. Lord Spencer, Lord Rosebery, Lord Kimberley, Lord Granville, Lord Wolvorton, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Campbell Bannerman, Mr. Mundella, etc.—it is absurd to suppose that these menish being placed in the same array with Parnell, T. P. O'Connor and Healy, to say nothing of the real fanatics and chiefs of the movement, Davitt, Dillon and O'Brien. No, no; remove Mr. Gladstone and the party ties, and you would see all those worthies over in the enemy's camp to-morrow. For my part, I wish it were so. Office seeking whigs of the meanest type, like those mentioned above, are elogs and hindrances to any popular movement, whether in favor of Ireland or of Great Britain. Lord Granville, for instance, is a large colliery owner, who has suffered a great deal in his income owing to the depression. On the formation of Mr. Gladstone's last short-lived administration he said plainly that he must be a secretary of state, or a sort—he didn't care a d—n which it was; £5,000 a year he must have, £2,000 wouldn't do. And these £5,000 a year men still cling on in the hope that Mr. Gladstone, who is assuredly no radical in home politics, whatever he may be in relation to Ireland, will vault them into office and power again on the top of a fine popular agitation, as he did before. But for the moment all differences are sunk, and radicals combine with the Tories and liberals to put an end once for all to this monstrous coercion system.

And yet the present bill will pass. But even so, the agitation and the effects of the agitation will remain. Nay, the passing of such an act, depriving Irishmen of the admitted rights of citizenship and putting them at the mercy of soldiers, armed police and corrupt stipendiary magistrates would of itself do much to secure Ireland self-government and rouse Englishmen and Scotchmen to consider their own business. Few of the workers can now understand fully what is being done in the name of England in Ireland any more than they comprehend the full economical infamy of our rule in India. That is the great good which Gladstone has done by turning round upon his own old policy of force suppression. What ever mistakes he may have made, he has compelled a great faction to abandon domination in the mere interest of a class. That is a great service to his country and the world. Formerly I never was one of his admirers, and I am not one of them now. There is too much of the commercial statesman and the money manipulator about him to influence me. But that a man of nearly eighty should deliberately abandon the policy of a lifetime and drive fully half the whigs, of all people, before him with the phrase of the masses against the classes, is a feat altogether unprecedented in history. Old men have done great things in literature and art, but this marvelous adaptability, this extraordinary capacity for grasping a situation and turning the facts to account has never been exhibited by one of his years in politics before.

And the result is very curious. Here is Lord Randolph Churchill, with all his American experience and so-called democratic tendencies, making a complete fool of himself and injuring his party by hopeless reactionary blatherdash; while, on the other hand, the hope of the Tory party ten years before Lord Randolph was born, is showing the way to the men of progress in the liberal ranks. The contrast is curious—the notion that Lord Randolph thinks himself the man of the immediate future and has no scruples whatever in throwing over old Tory notions or, indeed, any notions which happen to be inconvenient to him at the moment. But there is another contrast, not less singular, arising out of the events themselves. The liberal party has not only broken up into two sections, but the greater section which follows Gladstone is itself between two stools. The liberals and radicals who are now working so vigorously against coercion throughout Great Britain have adopted for Ireland a genuine revolutionary programme and are in league with an out-and-out revolutionary party in that country. But in this island they have literally no programme at all. Afraid of losing the support of their angrier men if they were to adopt genuinely advanced proposals, they pitter on with their silly, worn out twaddle until the workers are getting heartily sick of the whole political business. It is almost incredible, but it is the fact, that there is not a single motion or resolution on the notice book of the house of commons at this moment which, if put in practice, would benefit the mass of working Englishmen. No liberal or radical M. P., however energetic he may be as an anti-coercionist, ever says a word about the sufferings of the unemployed, and not a syllable is uttered in parliament about nationalization or municipalization of land; no restrictions upon the great railways or other monopolies are so much as suggested, to

say nothing of their expropriation. The report of successive royal commissions and committees on the housing of the law remain unconsidered and their recommendations are utterly neglected; nay, even such a small boon as free education finds no parliamentary champion, while the abolition of the house of lords—to pass from social to political poisons—and manhood suffrage has not yet come within the range of "practical politics" for our middle class tribunes of the people. Thus it is that if "Ireland for the Irish" is the only liberal cry, there is great likelihood that, notwithstanding the growing feeling against coercion, the home rule party will lose at the next general election. No doubt it is short-sighted, foolish and wrong of the voters to be indifferent to this issue. But even all politics are for the mass of mankind, a matter of mere selfishness or prejudice. Only in periods of serious excitement, such as that we are now entering upon do high ideal influence the people at large. If it were possible, and I for one believe it is, to combine the fullest justice to Ireland with a complete outlet for the aspirations of the democracy of Great Britain we should witness, and that soon, an outburst of enthusiasm which would make a clean sweep of oppression, economic, social and political, in every form. It is another singular fact, that at this very time, when home rule for Ireland is the question of the day, a conference of our ruled colonies should be sitting, and the whole capitalist press should be talking with pride of the wealth of these communities which contribute so largely to the income of the rich here in England, and still are rich themselves. Strange, isn't it, that even from their own point of view, which certainly is not mine, the Tories don't try the same policy with Ireland?

As I was writing my friend, Mr. Dadathal Nairaj came in from India. He, too, was full of home rule for that unhappy country, and gave me a most interesting account of the great congress of which he was president at Calcutta. There 400 delegates met from all parts of India, of many and diverse races, languages and creeds, all, however, speaking and discussing in English. Such a congress had never been seen in India before. This congress practically asked for home rule, too. No wonder. As we have ruined Ireland by landlordism, so we have ruined India by capitalism. On all sides we are reaping the fruits of our miserable economical mismanagement in the steady impoverishment of the peoples under our rule.

And meanwhile, what, with brutes at fist-cuts on the terrace, constant use of bad language in the lobbies, half drunken Tory rough in evening dress making their appearance late to carry on organized interruption, and persistent imputations on the speaker's good faith, the mother of parliaments is descending to the level of a disputations mob at the door of a gin palace. "Parliament is played out" is now quite a common expression, even among those who formerly refused to imagine the slightest deterioration in the nobility. So we may hope that the new forms will spring up from below. Government by groups, consisting of sections of the privileged classes can never be good government, and the class antagonism manifests itself beneath them all. The apathy of the workers is being stirred as it has never been since 1848, and England, which then was a conservative, will now be like Russia, which then showed her conservatism a revolutionary force. Social democracy in one form or another makes way so fast among the people that you may almost trace its progress in the articles of our magazines, and the plots of our novels. That thing should move so fast, and be so indebted to the Irish, who, stirred by economic and social injustice, and helped by their friends across the Atlantic, have given impetus to a movement which will take even themselves further than they think. J. H. HYNDMAN.

Simple Joe.

Joseph Smith was a sturdy man. Though his wife was somewhat slow, and neighbors laughed in kindly way. As they called him "Simple Joe." They said that however weak of head, he was ever in the right of the road, and for a comrade in distress he'd take a manly part.

Not a lazy bone, his neighbors said, Could in the man be found, And all rejoiced when Joe saved up And bought a bit of ground. He built a little shanty there, And when he was in need, And daily delved to make more rich The hard and barren soil.

The town into a city grew, As towns are apt to do, And Peter Price came hungry eyes On land of Simple Joe. For Peter had bought a farm Surrounding Joseph's place, And great additions to the town Were promised in his place.

Then all men said it was a shame That one half-witted man, Shook with his shanty block the way Of Peter's noble plan. So when he last the streets declared Poor Joe no title had, And Peter Price had got the land, Then all the town was glad.

When Joe asked men what it all meant They told him of a "law." He said the house, at least, was his, And when he was in need, The old man wandered slowly forth, A homeless beggar man.

While Peter Price was daily praised From Beersheba to Dan, One day a bleeding, dying man Was taken to the town. Wounded, doctor physicians said, A preacher had been caught. Before the suicide he stood, With stern, unyielding face, Telling poor Joe his only hope Was God's amazing grace.

"Against the laws of God and man You've raised your wicked hand, Prey God for mercy on your soul, Else you'll before Him stand." With look of trouble on his face, And dazed look in his eyes, "I didn't know 'twas 'gin the law," The dying man replied.

"You see since Peter tore down my house That nocheres to do, And there didn't seem to be no place On earth for Simple Joe. And so I thought I'd best get out, Not knowin' 'twas a sin, Nor doubtin' that the God above Would let a fellow in."

There was no place for me on earth," Murmured the dying Joe, "I'd now if heaven shuns its gates, Where, then, oh Lord, I go. There must be some place for my man," And glancing round the cell, Joe gasped out, "Preacher do you think They'll let me into hell?"

OSCAR DALL.

Propagating His Faith in Scotland. There flourishes in Glasgow, Scotland, an association known as "The Henry George Institute," organized to "spread the principles of political economy as taught by Henry George and others of that school," by means of a free public meeting every Sunday evening, a weekly class for the study of political economy, the establishment of a library and reading room, the dissemination of literature, and any other means as from time to time present themselves. The association is composed of a lot of bright, young men who are working hard to propagate the faith.

GATHERING AS IT ROLLS.

THE LABOR PARTY'S STEADY GROWTH
ASTONISHES THE POLITICIANS.

Organizing Politically and Socially—Even
Forming Baseball Clubs—Fifteen Clubs
With Permanent Headquarters—The
"Sun" Admits a Probability of Future
Success.

For the last five weeks THE STANDARD has been visiting the various district organizations of the united labor party, to see for itself how the party was progressing. The result is highly satisfactory. As a rule the clubs are in a flourishing condition, and fifteen of them have permanent headquarters, which are open every evening, where members and friends can meet to talk or read the papers and standard labor literature. The movement partakes more of the character of a crusade against a wrong of which the members of the new party have been victims. The politicians of the old parties do not seem to be able to understand it. They cannot understand how it is, with no election pending, with-in their opinion—nothing going on out of the ordinary, that men can be brought together night after night to talk "politics." These men who lead in the old political organizations have not yet discovered that the politics they mean and the politics the united labor party mean are discussing are two different kinds of politics. And the probabilities are that they will not discover the difference until it is too late—for them. But, briefly stated, the difference is this: The old politics is politics for revenue and place, and the new politics is politics for principle.

The united labor party organization of the country, as stated above, is in a highly satisfactory condition. There is more to confirm this statement than the mere word of the Standard. The city papers are discovering it. The World is noticing it; the Herald has considerable to say about it, even going to the extent of appealing to the members of the new party to be what that paper calls "true to themselves" and to strengthen the hands of the president whom the democrats elected to the White House. The Sun of last Sunday has a column article pointing out what the future of the united labor party will probably be in this country, and showing, even from its own biased standpoint, that the party is becoming stronger every day. The only consolation it has for its old friend, Tammany hall—and it is a consolation that will need extra blankets to keep it warm—is the "McGlynn episode," which the Sun thinks "has stamped, for the most part, the Irish and Irish-Americans back to the Tammany fold, where they will stay." . . . "whatever the affirmations of the labor people might be." But, in considering the Sun article as a whole, one will conclude that its editor would not bet many dollars on the "stampede." It is not necessary to bring the case of the doctor into this article further than to say that he has more friends in the party now than when the "episode" occurred.

The following district clubs have permanent headquarters: The Second, 32 New Bowerly; Third, 42 Great Jones street (in partnership with the Tailors' league, whose members also belong to the united labor party); Fourth, 68 East Broadway; Sixth, 412 Grand (to open May 1); Seventh, South Fifth avenue and West Fourth street; Tenth, 197 East Fourth street; Twelfth, 642 East Fifth street; Fourteenth, 187 First avenue; Fifteenth, 475 Ninth avenue; Seventeenth, 57 Ninth avenue; Eighteenth, 161 East Thirty-third street; Nineteenth, Duane's hall, corner St. Nicholas and Eighth avenues; Twentieth, 1008 Second avenue; Twenty-third, 1897 Third avenue; Twenty-fourth, 151st street and Third avenue.

The state of organization of the districts may be summarized as follows: First, fair; Second, good; Third, fair; Fourth, good; Fifth, needs help; Sixth, fair, but needs a little oil on the troubled waters; Seventh, good, but has a disturbing element in its Eighth, good, but needs work below Grand street; Ninth, good; Tenth, No. 1; Eleventh, needs looking after; Twelfth, good; Thirteenth, good; Fourteenth, No. 1; Fifteenth, No. 1; Sixteenth, No. 1; Seventeenth, No. 1; Eighteenth, No. 1; Nineteenth, No. 1; Twentieth, No. 1 (will be carried); Twenty-first, good; Twenty-second, No. 1 (will be carried); Twenty-third, good (the members are exerting themselves to the utmost in organization, and will endeavor to overcome the majority against them next fall); Twenty-fourth, fair. A thing which has been a tower of strength to the new party has been the social feature. It appears strange to our practical political opponents to see a man going to a meeting of a political club in company with his wife and family, or, if he has no family, with his sweet-heart. It has not been the custom in the old parties for the members of clubs to take their families with them; in fact, quite the reverse, even to the point of not taking along any decent person, male and female. Some politicians sneer at this new idea, and some are alarmed. But it is a point in favor of the new party that wife and sweet-heart take enough interest in it to go to the meetings.

From outside the city the reports are very encouraging. No estimate can be made of what the strength of the party is in the state, further than the random remark of an alleged experienced politician that of the votes cast in the last election in favor of calling a constitutional convention, over three-fifths would, when needed, wheel into line with the united labor party. That would mean that the new party has, without complete state organization, over three hundred thousand voting friends. More will be known on that point, however, when the state convention of the party meets. It would be well to call the attention of our friends to one circumstance: With the exception of Philadelphia, since the election in New York, wherever the labor party has put up a ticket, it has won, or else has cast about one-third the total vote polled. If that can be repeated in this state we will cast about five hundred thousand votes in the next election for state office.

The outlook for the success of the principles of the united labor party is very gratifying. All that is necessary is hard work and harmony. Let it be determined, once for all, that those who are not with the party are against it; that the first are wanted and the second are not.

THURSDAY, April 21.—The Fifth district club met at Warren hall. Routine business. The Eighteenth held their second meeting at their new headquarters, 161 Thirty-third street. Though the only business was hearing reports from the election districts, the attendance was large, showing what an attractive feature a permanent headquarters is. Frank Daley was elected second vice-chairman, and Thomas Doyle vice-chairman, in place of John P. Mitchell, resigned. Ten new members were enrolled. The membership is now nearly 800. Rooms open every night for friends and visitors.

Professor Molina's class in political economy held their usual weekly meeting, and discussed the labor question scientifically. The professor is, without doubt, one of the ablest scientific debaters on political economy in the ranks of the united labor party.

system of nominating candidates was read and laid on the table.

At the meeting of the Ninth the principal business was performing arrangements for the club's picnic, which will take place August 8, at Atlantic garden, 155th street and Eighth avenue.

The Twelfth district club met at 642 East Fifth street. William P. O'Meara, of the general executive committee, was present and presented the charges preferred against the district organization at the last meeting of the general committee. The club appointed a committee to appear before the executive committee on organization when the club comes up. The signers of the charges will be cited to appear also. The difference, being only a matter as to where the club should hold its meetings, will be easily settled. The club is very strong, and the probabilities are that in the next election, if good generalship prevails and the stumbling blocks are pushed aside, it will overcome the united democratic vote by which they lost the district in the last election.

SATURDAY, April 23.—The Second district has changed its time of meeting. Hereafter it will meet on the second and fourth Tuesdays for business and on the first and third for debates, lectures, etc. The headquarters of the club are open every evening, and the young men especially are working to take the district out of the hands of the corrupt politicians who have so long controlled it. This district has long been known as the most corrupt in the city, but the vote of the united labor party in the last election—1,682—astonished all good men and paralyzed the old party leaders. This was the banner district for the "saviors." Shrewd calculators expect to see the united labor party of the district poll at least 2,500 votes next November.

The Fourth district met at their headquarters, 68 East Broadway. The committee's report showed that the club had realized very handsomely from their lecture at the Windsor theater. Mr. George received a vote of thanks for his lecture; Mr. Frank B. Murtha for the use of his theater; the Balle musical club for volunteering their musical services, and E. D. Farrell for chairs loaned by him at the lecture. The agitation committee were instructed to call a mass meeting. The district is being thoroughly and successfully organized in the election districts. The members of the club talk about having a picnic during the summer. A pleasant feature of THE STANDARD's visit to the club was the meeting of the reporter with Hugh Greenan, one of the old wheelhorses of the labor movement in this city, but who appears to be now, whether voluntarily or not, occupying a back seat in the councils of the united labor party. It is to be hoped that he will forgo the front again, for his experience and advice are too valuable to be lost. Hugh glories in the fact that in the last election his election district was carried for the labor candidate—by a majority of one. And yet five years ago he stood on the same polling place during the whole day, and when the polls closed he took his position as watcher, and saw one vote—his own—recorded for the Central labor union candidate for the assembly. The change in public sentiment seems to please Hugh greatly.

The Twenty-third district Progress and Poverty club held their usual weekly meeting, with Mr. Lynch in the chair. Mr. Eastlake read the chapter on trade from "Protection or Free Trade," and a debate followed. It has been the custom heretofore for an advocate of the "George" theory to close the debate, and an opponent to open the next. The will in the future be reversed, giving the opponents of the "George" idea the last say. The meeting was very largely attended, the headquarters being taxed to their utmost for accommodation of members and their friends.

The social feature of the day was the ball of the Roslyn benevolent association at Harmony hall, Essex street. A large majority of these who were present are active members of the united labor party in the Tenth, Twelfth and Fourteenth assembly districts; but numerous visitors were prominent democratic and republican politicians. The result was there was as much political talk around the tables as there was dancing on the floor. The "po' los' sheep" that at present prefer to be penned up in the two party sheepfolds were informed that the lamp still held out to burn, even for the vilest sinner. The officers of the Roslyn are: P. C. Bamberger, president; Theo. Kollen, vice-president; Fred J. Etzel, financial secretary; Andrew Sieben, corresponding secretary; John Klackner, treasurer; Frank Gerner, sergeant-at-arms; John Burkey was the floor manager, and led the grand march with his wife, assisted by Floor Manager John Scholl and wife. Among those who followed were P. C. Bamberger, wife and child; John Klackner, chairman of the reception committee, and wife; Mr. Herman and wife, Theo. Koller and wife, John Hemmeller and lady, Joseph McCloskey and lady, Charles Kill and sister, John Williams and lady, John Marion and lady and Wallace Norwacky and lady. A handsome horseshoe of flowers, presented by G. Mendel, was drawn for by the ladies present, and won by Annie Camp of Brooklyn. Among the non-dancers present were M. J. Murray, chairman, and William McCabe, secretary, of the Fourteenth district club of the Tenth; Henry Anketill, the sweet poet of THE STANDARD; Joseph A. Soder, of No. 6 and the Tenth district; Charles Steckler and George Francis Roesch and others of Tammany hall. It was a noticeable fact that a large proportion of the male dancers on the floor were among the most active workers of the united labor party around the polls in the last election, and as the vote polled in the Tenth, Twelfth and Fourteenth districts showed, they were as good political workers as they were dancers.

SUNDAY, April 24.—The Second district club gave a concert at their hall, 32 New Bowerly, consisting of vocal and instrumental music. During the evening Prof. P. J. Nelson revealed some of the mysteries of mesmerism. "Doc, the Wizard," performed some very interesting tricks with cards. Master Jeremiah O'Hara excellently rendered a beautiful song, Thomas Monahan recited "Spartacus the Gladiator," Wm. O'Neill sang one of Moore's melodies, James Degnan recited "The Irish Famine."

MONDAY, April 25.—The Fourteenth district club met at 257 East Tenth street and heard reports from the election districts. The club has at last secured permanent headquarters. They are at 157 First avenue, immediately opposite the Tammany headquarters. The lease will be for one year from May 1, and a house warming will be had probably on the following Saturday. A large transparency will be painted and put up immediately. The picnic committee are actively at work and they prophesy that the affair, which will be at Sulzer's park on Saturday, July 30, will be a success. A resolution was adopted that "it is the sense of this club that the general executive committee of the party is the servant of the general county committee, and not of the assembly district clubs." This was deemed necessary because of reports in circulation that, through the refusal of some of the members of the general executive committee to report their proceedings to the assembly district associations, the executive committee had become a star chamber body. The Fourteenth thinks that all information should come to them through the regular official channel—that is, from the delegates to the general committee.

The Twenty-first held their usual monthly meeting. The entertainment held the previous meeting had been a success. A special meeting to hear the final report of the committee who had charge of the entertainment will be held next Sunday at 4 o'clock at 705 Seventh avenue. Miss Lizzie Deady sold the most

tickets for the affair, and received a gold watch; the second prize, an accordion, was carried off by Miss Duhanob. The second money in May has been sent apart by the club for a McGlynn mass meeting.

The Twenty-second met at their rooms, 1422 Second avenue. The committee on permanent headquarters reported on several halls in the neighborhood which they had in view. The probabilities are the organization will locate on Third avenue. The election districts are being organized. The club has engaged Brommer's union park for a picnic on July 9. It is likely that the baseball players of the Twenty-third will get a reply to their challenge from the Twenty-second, inasmuch as this district is organizing a nine.

A regular meeting of the Twenty-third assembly district was held at 105th street and Third avenue. C. F. Doody, chairman of the district presided. The organization of the sixty-six election districts, which is now being pushed, was discussed, and arrangements were made for perfecting the organization of eight of the districts this and next week. Ten thousand circulars in English and German have been ordered for distribution throughout the whole district. Battle reported that the Bulletin of the district had cleared, over all expenses, \$40, which would go to the organization. As regards the picnic to be held in June, at Brommer's place, Harlem, it was decided to sell tickets to outside organizations at forty per cent discount, so that these organizations could make a fair profit in selling them to members and friends. Four prizes of considerable value have been offered as premiums for the sale of the largest number of tickets. It was resolved that the district had full confidence in its member of the county executive committee, and would not require of him a "detailed report" of all the proceedings of the committee, but would leave it to his judgment to "make a report of such portions of the proceedings as he may deem proper." The land and labor base ball club of the district challenges the clubs of other districts to play them. One match will be played at the picnic, for which a medal will be given to the victorious club. During the summer the club is desirous of playing as often as possible.

TUESDAY, April 26.—The Second district club met at 32 New Bowerly, and the Third at 42 Great Jones street. Only routine business was transacted.

Paulus Thomas presided at the meeting of the Fifteenth district, at 475 Ninth avenue. Reports were heard from the election districts, and a number of new members were proposed and admitted. Some of the club's best orators addressed the members on the principles of the party.

The Sixteenth district met at 350 First avenue. Arrangements were completed for the McGlynn mass meeting at Clarendon hall on May 4.

WEDNESDAY, April 27.—The First district club met at 28 Beach street. The principal subject was how to raise money to open permanent headquarters. The method adopted was a picnic. After the close of business, addresses on the state of the party were delivered by James Degnan of the Second and T. L. Murphy, Thomas Moran, Jeremiah Murphy and other members of the club. T. L. Murphy was elected corresponding secretary. The Sixth met at 412 Grand. They will occupy their new headquarters next Monday. The election districts are doing well.

The Tenth held their regular meeting at 197 East Fourth. Routine business. The meeting of the Thirteenth assembly district was very fully attended, many ladies being present. Messrs. Mullen, Frey, Lynch, Young and Swain were appointed a committee to arrange for a literary and musical entertainment in the near future. A sum sufficient to cover the entire expense was subscribed on the spot. The committee will report at the next meeting. Several new members were proposed. The new party is pretty firmly established in the Thirteenth, and will make a show of votes when the time comes that will astonish the regular politicians.

The meetings for the coming week are: Friday, April 28.—Eighteenth, 136 Forsyth; Ninth, lecture by Ernest Potter at Cooper union. Saturday, April 29.—Fourth, 68 East Broadway; Twenty-third, 1897 Third avenue, lecture. Monday May 2.—Twentieth, 1058 Second avenue; Twenty-third, 1897 Third avenue. Tuesday, May 3.—Twenty-fourth, 151st street and Third avenue; Thirtieth, 42 Great Jones street; Second, 32 New Bowerly. Wednesday, May 4.—State committee, Cooper union; First, 26 Beach street; Sixth, 412 Grand. Thursday, May 5.—General committee, Clarendon hall; Fifth, Warren hall, corner Spring and Clark streets; Eighteenth, 101 East Thirtieth-second.

A land and labor club has been organized at Buffalo, N. Y., under charter from the central committee. Mr. C. M. Kinski of 51 Delaware street having been chosen president, and Mr. J. W. Neil of 1304 Jefferson street secretary. The regular meetings of the club will be held fortnightly at the rooms of the Central labor union. Local clubs are forming for the different wards.

The full list of officers of the united labor party recently instituted at Binghamton by J. J. Bealin is: President, J. H. Blakeney; vice-president, John Doyle; secretary, E. W. Dundon; treasurer, Thomas Pymmes; executive committee, Messrs. Blakeney, Doyle, Dundon, A. C. Busselman, H. H. Freeman, Charles Evans and C. Sumard. The members are earnest and active. The meeting this week will be open to the friends of members. Good results are anticipated.

Established
1807
B. M.
Cowperthwait
& Co.
Stoves, Bedding,
FURNITURE,
Refrigerators, Crockery,
CARPETS,
Pictures, Curtains.
Everything for Housekeeping
153, 155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 165
Chatham Street,
193, 195, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205
Park Row,
Bet. City Hall & Chatham Square Elevated
R. R. Stations,
NEW YORK.
Credit or Cash Discount.
Goods sent everywhere. Price lists mailed
on application.
COWPERTHWAIT.
HELP WANTED—FEMALES.
COOKS, HOUSEWORKERS AND OTHER
good servants guaranteed a situation in 48 hours
if the money returned. Mrs. STAYES Bureau,
37 West 26th st.

MEMBERS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS and others wishing to canvass for subscribers to this paper on a liberal commission are invited to send their names and addresses to the publishers of THE STANDARD, 25 Ann street, New York.

CHICKERING HALL,

SUNDAY EVENING, MAY 1,
at 8 o'clock,
FIRST PUBLIC MEETING

of the
ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Addresses by
REV. EDWARD M'GLYNN, D.D.,
and
MR. HENRY GEORGE.

Chorus by
MISS AGATHA MUNIER.

Admission free.

"THE NEW CRUSADERS."

"I care not who write the laws of a country so long as I can write the people's songs."
We want to re-write some of the laws of our country. Let us begin the work by writing and singing the new songs of the people.

MISS AGATHA MUNIER,
known so well, not only as the former leader of the Choir of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic church, but for her earnest sympathy and active endeavors in behalf of the Labor Movement in this city, has decided to organize and instruct several Great Chorus of Male and Female voices, enlisted from the ranks of the people themselves. It is Miss Munier's hope to drill these united voices for active work in the Political Campaign of the coming fall, when by concert for the benefit of the Labor fund, and by free music at lectures and public meetings, the voice of the people may be heard in the songs of labor.

Applicants for admission to these classes may address or call on MISS MUNIER, at 221 East Thirti-second street.

TO TRADE UNIONISTS, K. OF L. AND OTHERS.—Wanted immediately, active and intelligent gentlemen in every ward and town, to take subscriptions for the great work edited by Geo. E. McGlynn of Boston, "THE LABOR MOVEMENT." A masterly book, magnificently illustrated, written by the greatest living authorities on labor questions, including Henry George, Rev. Heber Newton, T. V. Powderly, Dr. Edmund J. Davis, John J. Gavett, Congressmen Stone and O'Sullivan, &c. &c. Selling rapidly. Call or write at once to secure valuable territory. L. V. LEE, CLAY, Manager M. W. HAZIN CO., 61 and 63 West 28th st., New York.

FURNITURE.

COOGAN BROS.,
CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS,
COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

TO THE IRON AND STEEL WORKERS OF THE UNITED STATES.—Local Assembly No. 505, K. of L., located at Harrisonburg, Pa., has issued a call for a convention to be held in National Hall, Fourth and State streets, Harrisburg, Pa., on Saturday, June 4, 1887, for the purpose of forming a National Trade District of Iron and Steel Workers of the United States. All assemblies, local unions, and individuals are requested to send delegates to said convention. All delegates must come with credentials properly signed and having the seal of the Local to which they belong. For further information address JOHN CONKLING, Chairman, 1083 Montgomery st.

THOMAS J. RODGERS,
GEORGE B. MILLER,
Committee.

CO-OPERATIVE COLONY.

PERSONS DESIRING HOMESTEAD OR seeking investments should join or subscribe to the Co-operative Colony Association now organizing for the purpose of securing and locating of a sufficient tract of available land in the Rio Grande Valley for the carrying on of the business of agriculture and stock raising on the co-operative plan.

For information and map of New Mexico, address SECY CO-OPERATIVE COLONY, P. O. Box 214, Pueblo, Col.

GARDEN SEEDS.

RELIABLE GARDEN SEEDS.

ASK YOUR STOREKEEPER FOR THE

A. B. CLEVELAND

FOR SALE EVERYWHERE.

TAILORS.

WHO WOULDN'T BE DRESSED WELL

PRINCE ALBERT COAT AND VEST, SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, \$18.00

TROUSERS TO MEASURE, FROM 4.00

BUSINESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 16.00

DRESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 20.00

BLUE, BLACK OR BROWN COR-SCREW CUTAWAY COAT & VEST TO MEASURE, FROM 12.00

OVERCOATS, QUILTED SILK OR SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, FROM 20.00

ALWAYS FRESH AND RELIABLE.

FOR SALE EVERYWHERE.

TAILORS.

WHO WOULDN'T BE DRESSED WELL

PRINCE ALBERT COAT AND VEST, SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, \$18.00

TROUSERS TO MEASURE, FROM 4.00

BUSINESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 16.00

DRESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 20.00

BLUE, BLACK OR BROWN COR-SCREW CUTAWAY COAT & VEST TO MEASURE, FROM 12.00

OVERCOATS, QUILTED SILK OR SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, FROM 20.00

ALWAYS FRESH AND RELIABLE.

FOR SALE EVERYWHERE.

TAILORS.

WHO WOULDN'T BE DRESSED WELL

PRINCE ALBERT COAT AND VEST, SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, \$18.00

TROUSERS TO MEASURE, FROM 4.00

BUSINESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 16.00

DRESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 20.00

BLUE, BLACK OR BROWN COR-SCREW CUTAWAY COAT & VEST TO MEASURE, FROM 12.00

CIGARS.

ALWAYS THE SAME.

STRAITON & STORM'S CIGARS.

THE UNITY CIGARETTES.

A union label has been granted for these cigarettes by the Jackson Association.

ORGANIZED LABOR SHOULD USE NO OTHER BRAND.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

GERMAN EDITION OF "PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

FORTSCHRITT UND ARMUTH.

By HENRY GEORGE.

Price \$2.00.

Address F. GUTSCHOW,

812 California street, San Francisco, Cal.

FOUR NEW NOVELS FOR 15 CENTS.

FOUR NEW NOVELS.

All complete in the May number of the FAMILY LIBRARY MONTHLY.

Only 15 cents. Of all newsdealers, or THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS CO., New York.

NOW READY—THE MAY PART OF THE YOUNG LADIES' JOURNAL.

Containing all the latest Paris Fashions.

PRICE, 25 CENTS.

Of all newsdealers, who will also take subscriptions for two or three months, or for any part of a year, at 30 cents per single monthly part. THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS CO., New York.

HENRY GEORGE'S SOLUTION OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

WHY I PREACHED ON IT.

By HUGH O. PENTECOST.

Minister to the Belleville Avenue Congregational Church in Newark, N. J.

A sixteen-page pamphlet. Price 5 cents.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. Address as above.

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 cents.

Social Problems, 12mo. cloth. 1.00

" " paper. 50 cents.

Property in Land, paper. 15

The Land Question, paper. 10

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price.

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

By Louis F. Post and Fred C. Leubuscher.

1 vol., paper covers. Price, 20 cents.

CONTENTS:

CHAPTER I: History of George's nomination.—His offer 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.

CHAPTER VI: Hewitt's miscellaneous speeches.

CHAPTER VII: George's meetings and speeches.

CHAPTER VIII: Father McGlynn.—The O'Donohue-Preston correspondence.—Archbishop Corrigan's pastoral.—George's reply.

CHAPTER IX: The parade.

CHAPTER X: The election.—Official canvass of the vote by election districts.—George's midnight speech.

CHAPTER XI: Permanent organization.

CHAPTER XII: A review of the principles advocated by Henry George.

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

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 have 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.

25 Ann street, New York.

THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

We are now publishing under the title of "The Land and Labor Library" a series of short tracts on various phases of the social problem. These pamphlets contain facts, figures and arguments expressed in concise, vigorous language easily understood. As a means of propaganda we recommend them to all who desire to help on the movement for social reform. Those who wish to have these tracts placed where they will do good but who are unable personally to attend to their distribution, can remit the price to us, as we have every facility for sending them where they are needed and will be read.

The following have already appeared:

No. 1. "First Principles." By Henry George. 4 pages.</