

THE STANDARD

NO. 187—VOL. VIII, NO. 5.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 1890.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Published Every Wednesday at
NO. 12 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

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

TERMS:

ONE YEAR \$2 50
SIX MONTHS 1 25
TWENTY WEEKS 1 00

Advertising thirty cents per agate line.
The correct filling of orders is evidence of receipt of remittance.

All letters and communications should be addressed and all checks and drafts be made payable to "The Standard."

When ordering change of address send old as well as new address.

"The Standard" is an exponent of the principles and a weekly record of important facts affecting social problems and rational politics. It especially advocates the following great reforms:

THE SINGLE TAX. This means the abolition of all taxes on labor or the products of labor, that is to say, the abolition of all taxes save one tax levied on the value of land irrespective of improvements.

FREE TRADE. Not "tariff reform," but real free trade; that is, as perfect freedom of trade with all the world as now exists between the states of our union.

BALLOT REFORM. No humbug envelope system; but the real Australian system, the first requisite of which is the exclusive use at elections of official ballots furnished by the state and prepared and cast by the voter in compulsory secrecy.

Sample copies sent free on application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL. Henry George's Letter from the South Indian Ocean—His Parting from the Australians—Watching the Porpoises Play and Speculating on the Future of the Dark Races—Preparations to Receive Mr. George in England—The Tariff Debate—A Conspiracy to Drive Out Mr. Blaine—The Western Republicans—Wise Counsel from a Conservative Paper—Better Congressmen Needed—Blaine Calls Free Trade "Friendly Barter"—Hill's Sneer at Free Traders—The Single Tax Conference to Meet September 1.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER. Henry George, Jr. SOCIETY NOTES.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

PERSONAL.

UNDER THE WHEEL. Professor Hamlin Garland's New Play.

GEORGE IN AUSTRALIA. His Farewell to New South Wales.

BALLOT REFORM. The New York Election Law—Pennsylvania Democrats Pledged to Ballot Reform—An Independent in the Way—The New System in Indiana.

THE FREE TRADE FIGHT. The McKinley Bill—The New York City Social-Political Clubs Want Better Congressmen—Coming Into Our Net; James G. Blaine's Letter to Senator Frye—The Workingman's Tariff Reform League—Three Pen Pictures; the Inconsistency of the Evening Sun—Against the McKinley Bill; a Leading Pennsylvania Republican Will Vote the Democratic Ticket This Fall—Farmers Against the Tariff—Cracking the Shell.

SINGLE TAX NEWS. The Platform—The Enrollment Committee Fix September 1 as the Date for Holding the Conference, and New York as the Place—W. J. Atkinson of Philadelphia Takes Charge of the Letter Writing Corps Bureau—The Manhattan Single Tax Club Getting Ready for the Fall Campaign—The Brooklyn, E. D., Club Elects Nine Delegates to the Conference—Billy Radcliffe Again in the Ring—He Visits McKinley's District and Talks Free Trade and the Single Tax—Franklin MacVeagh, President of the Tariff Reform League, While Saying He is a Tariff Reformer, Talks Free Trade to the Chicago Single Tax Club—L. P. Custer, Late of Indianapolis, is Now a Resident of St. Louis, from Which Place He Writes a Letter—H. C. Niles of Denver Thinks the Stereopticon Idea a Good One—The New Orleans Club Elects Two Delegates to the Conference—News from Other States.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. The Coming Conference—"Will the Senate Have to Go?"

EDITORIAL.

P. & O. STR. VALETTA, South Indian Ocean, June 21.—With the exception of the boats of the British India company, which come through the Malaysian archipelago and Torres straits, and, rounding the northwestern extremity of Australia, end their journey at Brisbane, the European mail steamers all make their Australian terminus at Sydney, and, starting from there and rounding the southwestern point of the continent, call at Melbourne, Adelaide and Albany, as they run to the eastward along its southern coast. Our steamer left Sydney on June 2, the day before we did, and we went on board of her at Melbourne on the Saturday following, June 7. Or rather, to speak more exactly, we went on board of her at Williamstown, on Hobson's bay, a few miles below Melbourne—for though vessels of considerable size come up the Yarra to the Melbourne wharfs, the largest steamers do not. A large number of our Melbourne friends went down with us on the 11 o'clock train, and after many hearty good-byes and fervent good wishes, our steamer put off from the wharf shortly after twelve, and soon faces, and then even waving handkerchiefs, began to grow indistinct as she headed into Port Phillip, and for the narrow passage forty miles off, which affords egress from the magnificent sheet of water into the Southern ocean.

In the streets of Melbourne I could find little or nothing to recall the town as I first saw it in the early days of the gold era; but only that there were fewer ships in the harbor, and that the grim line of convict hulks had disappeared, Sandridge, and Williamstown, and Hobson's bay seemed as before, and the bright green waters of Port Phillip laughed in the sunlight as when I first sailed over them. But on the low ridges that wall the larger bay from the ocean the thick growth of eucalyptus trees have given away to villas and hotels and pleasure resorts.

Yet the sight which pleased me most on that bright Saturday afternoon was from the extreme point of the bow to see two great porpoises disporting themselves beneath, as we neared the heads. It is always a pretty sight to look down from above upon porpoises playing about the bows of a moving ship, but these two seemed bent on giving an exhibition somewhat beyond the ordinary. Directly beneath me, and just ahead of the cutwater cleaving after them at the rate of twelve or thirteen miles an hour, they held their way through water so clear and glassy that, instead of concealing, it seemed the better to reveal every detail of form and movement. They seemed not to swim, any more than the albatross can be said to fly; but glided along under the surface as though by mere volition and without the slightest indication of effort. Now they shot along, so near the surface that you could see the water parting from their snouts and slipping in thin, transparent, unbroken sheets over their heads and bodies; then sank a little deeper, so that their color darkened a shade, and the water through which they darted seemed utterly undisturbed; and then they would gracefully curve and bend, and would bring their noses above the surface for a whiff of fresh air and slip beneath again. Now they moved in parallel course; then separating on slightly diverging lines, and then draw-

ing together again, they would slip over and under one another, at one time passing a little ahead and then dropping a little back; shooting along, now on their bellies, now on their sides, and now full on their backs. As if in very derision of the speed with which the power of five thousand horses was driving man's lumbering construction, they seemed in the clear bright water to tread a stately minuet, to sing as it were a joyous cadence of motion, and then, whether shooting ahead, turning aside, or sinking beneath, it was impossible to tell, like a flash they disappeared.

One cannot but feel loath to part with such warm friends as we had left behind, but very pleasant it was to feel "homeward bound," and if not yet quite off, still on the ship that was to bear us home or almost home. For Australia, Colombo and Aden do not seem far from London; and London seems to be just across the ferry from New York.

And a most delightful passage we had on the Valetta from Melbourne to Adelaide, slipping on the most quiet and restful of Sundays over the most peaceful of southern winter seas. Not until we had dropped anchor on Monday morning early off the Semaphore, in Largs' bay, the port of Adelaide, did the wind and the rain come on. But early as it was, three of our Adelaide friends, Mr. John N. Birks, Mr. Wm. Liston and Mr. A. T. Saunders were on hand to meet us as soon as the anchor had dropped. At the landing stage, when we went ashore after breakfast, we found other friends, and running up to Adelaide in the train were soon in our old quarters in the Botanic hotel.

The two days of our last stay in the capital of South Australia passed rapidly and pleasantly—all too rapidly to permit of doing all we would have wished or to accept the many kind invitations of which we were the recipients, though we managed to attend an afternoon session of parliament. On Monday evening we were entertained at a banquet by our single tax friends. On Tuesday night I spoke for the last time in Australia to an exceedingly intelligent and earnest audience. Rev. Hugh Gilmore presided, and Rev. Frederick Hastings, whom I first met in London, moved a resolution of thanks in which he took occasion to come out flatly for the single tax. He was followed in the same strain by the Rev. Mr. Currie of Melbourne, who happened to be on a visit to Adelaide.

Our Adelaide friends were very much pleased with this concluding meeting, and so was I. The coming out of these clergymen was significant, and I was especially pleased to find Mr. Gilmore, of whom I had heard a great deal, so strong and clear. He is a man of great force and influence, and will, I think, be of much aid to the single tax cause in South Australia.

We left Adelaide on Wednesday, June 11. A big party of our friends went down to see us off. The chief of the South Australian customs, Mr. F. J. Sanderson, had placed at our disposal one of the custom house launches, and we were to have had a spin around the bay before going aboard the ship, but the sea was so rough and we had so many ladies in the party that we were glad to get on board the steamer as soon as wind and wave would let us, and to spend on her firmer decks the last hour that we were to spend together.

That soon passed, and with the warmest of good byes we saw the little steamer rolling and plunging her way to the pier, the Valetta's engines began to move, the shore to recede, and at last we were fairly off.

Across the thousand miles of the Great Australian bight the strong west wind howled in our teeth and the long, heavy seas made the Valetta shake and reel as she buffeted them, so that it was not till Sunday morning that, running behind the islands of King George's sound, we dropped anchor for a little while off Albany, in West Australia. We had hoped to have got here in time to go ashore and see some boomerang throwing by the black fellows, but as it was, there was no chance for that, and we only stopped long enough to send some passengers ashore, take on a few others and exchange mail bags, and were off again. Rounding Cape Leuwin, the southwesterly extremity of Australia, our course changed to the north, but it did not change any quicker than the wind did, and our steamer had to force her way against strong gales and heavy seas to very near the tropics. But at last came line weather, the opening of ports, the spring of flying fish, and the soft southwest trade wind filling our sails, but so diminished in force by the motion of the vessel as to hardly more than fill them.

This weather we may expect until we have somewhat passed the equator, and then, probably before we reach Colombo, in six north, or, at any rate, on leaving that port, we may expect the southeast monsoon in its strength. From Colombo to Suez is the bad part of the trip at this time of the year. First, the southwest monsoon, usually at this time a strong gale in the Arabian sea, when the ports are closed and the heat below grows stifling, and then the Red Sea, with its desert setting and overhead sun. We have comparatively few passengers, for this is said to be the worst time of the year, and the general description which one gets in Australia of the passage at this season is enough to deter all who have not some good reason for traveling. But for the present, at least, our voyage goes smoothly enough, and sufficient for the day is its evil.

One very pleasant and significant piece of news we heard before leaving Australia, by telegraph from Sydney—that John Farrell, one of the foremost and best known of the New South Wales single tax men, had been chosen editor-in-chief of the Sydney Telegraph. The Telegraph is the paper of largest circulation in New South Wales, and has been for some time the most favorable to the single tax; not that it had formally identified itself with the cause, but that it treated it with fairness and liberality, opening its columns to a full discussion of the question and giving the single tax men an opportunity, which they have well embraced, to thoroughly explain and advocate their side. All my speeches in Sydney were reported fully in the Telegraph, and just before our arrival Mr. Farrell had concluded in its columns a series of very able and comprehensive articles on "The Philosophy of the Single Tax." Some weeks before our departure Mr. Ward, the editor, had left the paper on a disagreement with the trustees and gone to California for his health. Some of our Sydney friends were afraid that this

might result in a change of policy, especially as it was understood that but a little while ago the Telegraph's trustees came within one vote of deciding to put the paper on the protective tack. The appointment of Mr. Farrell shows that all danger of this is passed, and that the policy which has won the Telegraph the grateful thanks of all single tax men is to be continued. But it also shows that the cause is so well to the front in New South Wales that the proprietors of such a paper as the Telegraph realize that there is more to be gained than to be lost, in a pecuniary sense, by giving the single tax the fairest treatment, and that they are not afraid of such identification as may result by putting in the chief position on their paper a man as thoroughly identified with the advocacy of the single tax as is Mr. Croasdale or Mr. Post.

John Farrell, one of the chief figures in the knot of young men who have in the last two or three years done so much to spread the single tax doctrine in New South Wales, is of Irish blood, but was born in Buenos Ayres, being brought to Australia, when an infant, by the removal of his parents. Growing up in the bush and then learning the trade of a brewer, at which he made his living for a number of years, the literary ability which he began to develop took him into journalism, and to him belongs the honor of starting the first paper in New South Wales to advocate the principles of the single tax, or, as it was then called in Australia, land nationalization. Mr. Farrell is a poet of no mean ability, and a strong and graceful prose writer, though he has never yet overcome his native modesty enough to make a speech. But, perhaps, the most striking characteristic of the man is the affectionate regard which he seems to inspire in all who know him.

The Valetta is one of the ships of the Peninsula and Oriental steam navigation company, which runs on its various Mediterranean, Indian, Chinese and Australian lines over fifty steamers, with an aggregate tonnage that enables it to claim the position of the largest steamship company of the world. The Valetta is not, however, one of the best of the Peninsula and Oriental boats, as both in size and speed she is excelled by the four steamers known in the Australian trade as the "jubilee boats," from their having been built in 1887, the year that the company celebrated the semi-centennial of its establishment. When over a half-century ago the company began running its vessels to the peninsula, they were of a few hundred tons and of one or two hundred horse power; now its largest vessels are of over six thousand tons and seven thousand horse power; but in size and speed not even the best of their vessels equal the steamers which (thanks to the "protection of American industry") are carrying the American trade under the British flag across the Atlantic.

The Peninsula and Oriental company run fortnightly steamers to and from Sydney as a terminal port, calling at Melbourne, Adelaide and Albany. The Orient company, a younger but powerful corporation, also runs fortnightly steamers, and as they sail alternately the two companies combined give a weekly mail. The French Messageries and the Nord-deutscher Lloyd also run monthly steamers.

While not one of the latest and largest boats of the Peninsula and Oriental company, the Valetta has a good reputation for comfort. She was built at Greenock in 1884, the same year in which the Mariposa, with which I naturally compare her, was built in Philadelphia, but is considerably larger, being of 4,900 tons

against the Mariposa's 3,000, and fitted with compound engines of 5,000 horse power. But the Mariposa, though so much smaller, is the faster vessel, nor is there any point of build or fitting in which the American ship does not seem, to say the least, the equal of the British ship. Give them but free trade and the ship builders of the Delaware could hold their own, and more than hold their own, with the builders of the Clyde.

The Peninsula and Oriental steamers have a great reputation for style and luxury, but if I can judge by the Valetta, and she is doubtless a fair sample, they are in many respects of appointment and service behind the Atlantic steamers, and behind the American steamers of the Spreckles line. The Valetta's saloons are lined with marble, and punkas are kept going in warm weather over the tables, but one cannot get a cold drink, and though they do carry some ice, for you may occasionally see a piece as big as a walnut, and they occasionally have at table similar samples of ice cream or water ices—their use of ice is mainly for the purpose of keeping provisions. Yet in this they doubtless conform to the taste and habits of their passengers, for the Australians know hardly if any more of the uses of ice than the English, regarding it as dyspepsia producing luxury. One notes in Australia, how much in little things we have learned from the German and other elements with which in the United States the British stock has been mixed, for it must be mainly to this cause that the greater variety in American cookery and diet is to be attributed. In a climate where all our American vegetables will grow like weeds, and where the greater warmth and dryness would seem to prompt to a lighter diet, the Australian yet sticks to the heavy and monotonous food and cooking of the British islands, and consumes its heavy beers. He will learn better by and by, but the process would be much quicker if there were a greater admixture in the population.

The American travel across the Atlantic has unquestionably in many things developed and improved the foreign steamers that carry it; but had not our stupid "protection" policy driven our flag from the high seas, the competition of American builders and American companies must have led to far greater improvements in steamers and steam navigation. We have hurt Great Britain and the rest of the world by our protective policy by injuring ourselves, just as one who would cut off his own nose would make it uncomfortable for all who associated with him.

But though the Valetta might be faster and might be improved in minor matters of appointment and service, without surpassing what is already done, she is a good sea boat and an extremely comfortable ship—said by some of her passengers who have traveled in both, to be really superior to the newer and more pretentious ships. Like all these Australian ships, she carries a brass band of eight pieces, that plays for an hour every morning and for two hours every evening. They rig up no tank bath on deck as is done on the Mariposa, but her bath rooms are ample and fitted with marble tubs, steam and showers. The Peninsula and Oriental are very weak on ice; but they carry very few Americans; and they are very strong on awnings. Fair weather or foul the after deck is roofed in by double awnings, and now that we are in warm weather so well is the whole deck roofed in and walled in from the sun that it is hard to get into the sunshine if you want to, and you must often hunt a place to get a good look at the sea. In the sea-

son on these steamers elaborate masquerade balls and entertainments are gotten up, and there is as much dressing as in a fashionable sea-side resort; and the Valetta, like the other steamers, carries a movable stage which can be erected in the saloon when needed for theatrical representations. But our passage is at a time when nobody travels by preference, and our passengers are fewer in number and more sedate in disposition than in pleasanter seasons, so that we have had only one ball and one play, and there are only one or two ladies who deck themselves in "full dress," and only some swallow tails at dinner, which it takes an hour to serve by taps of bell.

The captain of the Valetta holds rank in the British naval reserve, as the blue ensign which she flies indicates. Though hardly fifty he has commanded a Peninsula and Oriental steamer for sixteen years. The first officer seems hardly thirty, and the other five are younger still. The first officer of the Mariposa, on the other hand, though a most thorough and accomplished seaman, fit to command any ship that floats, is fifty-four. But for "protection to American industry" he, too, might have commanded his ship long ago.

This must be a pleasant service for the officers. They have three watches, and so in fine weather have plenty of leisure. Instead of messing by themselves, they take their meals in the saloon, and do a good deal of playing cricket, etc., and of dancing, singing and promenading with the ladies. Not that they are the less attentive to their duties on this account, for everything on the Valetta seems to go quietly, easily and properly. The chief engineer, the doctor, and the purser—who reads the service of the Church of England on Sundays—are also important factors in our little floating world. As for the four assistant engineers—they mess by themselves, and we see little or nothing of them.

But the most striking thing about these ships is their Indian crews with their red turbans and picturesque costumes. Our sailors and firemen are lascars from the west coast of India. Our coal passers are "Seedey boys" (I am not sure of the spelling)—coal black negroes from Zanzibar originally, though they ship from Bombay. They are all Mohammedans, and if you loiter about the bow, especially toward sunset, you may see now and again one of them spread out a little carpet or cloth and go through his prayers and prostrations. They live, at sea, on rice with some sort of curry, but will not eat meat unless they kill it themselves. In Sydney on every voyage so many sheep are dealt out to them. They cut off the heads of these, invoking the name of "God the most merciful," and have a carnivorous feast for a week or two. The "Seedey boys," who, as they come up from the stoke hole, sit and chatter together, on one side of the deck, without turbans or other peculiarity of eastern dress, look so much like American citizens of African descent that it requires an effort at first to realize that they are not fellow countrymen, are as good Mohammedans as the others, except that they are reputed to be rather "weak sisters" on the temperance part of the Prophet's injunctions when they get a chance.

In addition to these black and brown Mohammedans, we have as sweepers, bath men, galley men, etc., a number of Indian Christians—Portuguese, so called, from Goa or its vicinity, descendants of St. Francis Xavier's converts, with perhaps a shade or shadow of Portuguese blood.

On fine Sundays all hands dress in their cleanest and best, and are called for re-

view. And a pretty sight it is, as the captain with his medals on his breast and his principal officers behind him marches down the lines, made gay and picturesque with red turbans and bright waist handkerchiefs and gaudy vests.

There is a growing objection on the part of the Australian trades unions to the employment of these eastern crews, and there is likely ere long to be a struggle about it, whether by direct action of the maritime unions, or by the exertion of their political influence in the matter of mail contracts—in which way the Chinese firemen were driven off the steamers of the San Francisco line.

It requires, of course, far more of these men to do the work than it would Europeans, but they manage to do it, working in their own way and under their own officers. The sailors have a serang and four tindals, answering to a boatswain and boatswain's mates, through whom orders are given, and the men in the engineer's department have a serang and three tindals. In the engineer's department they have three watches, but the sailors have no watch, except for such stations as lookouts, etc., all hands being on deck during the day and being called at night if anything is to be done. This is their style of doing things—the style to which they were accustomed in the quaint native sailing craft in which they learned their trade, and it well enough suits a steamer which depends little on her sails.

A strange thing about these Indians is the way in which they stick to their flimsy clothing in cool or even cold weather—mainly, I suppose, because the clothes to which we are accustomed are to those unaccustomed to them insufferably embarrassing, but partly, possibly, that we do not at once feel the full effect of a climate we are not used to.

These people are interesting to me, and most interesting are the questions and the speculations that their presence here suggests—the contact of our race with the dark skinned races of strong, and in their own countries of stronger vitality, the impact of the western civilization upon the eastern, just beginning now to be felt. The part which Asia and Africa are to play ere long in the world's history who can predict? But, for good or evil, it must be very great. Take even India alone. There are in India over 270,000,000 human beings under England's imperial sway. Of these there are from 50,000,000 to 100,000,000 of fighting races who can be drawn on to face any foe, so long as England's arm is strong and her prestige unbroken. But England tends every day to a democratic republic. India can only be held together as an empire! The relation is incongruous. Similar empires were conquered and held by republican Rome, but to the death of the republic.

But this mighty question of white and black, of the west and east, of Temperate zone and tropic, of the religion of action, and the religion of introspection and fatalism, is too great to enter into now, though sailing these seas, in such a ship as this, one must needs think of it.

And we have on the Valetta representatives of the conquering and ruling race of India, as well as of the subjects—a major-general of the Indian army, Assam tea planters, a railway superintendent and an irrigation superintendent, as well as other Anglo-Indians. And some of these I have found most interesting, in the glimpses they are able to give of a great world of existence and thought which it is hard for us of the west to realize and comprehend.

But since I began this letter our ship has sped along, over a placid ocean, until now—it is very hard to write at sea—the

coast of Ceylon, "the pearl of the Indies," is in sight, and ere the morning we will be in Colombo.

HENRY GEORGE.

A London dispatch to the United Press says that Henry George will arrive in England on August 8, and on the next day will address a meeting to be held in his honor at Epping forest. The dispatch says, "The gathering is expected to be an immense one, as nearly all the reform societies and labor organizations are taking an active part in the preparations for the event."

The tariff debate in the senate continues to be a series of speeches by democrats against the McKinley bill, the republicans refusing to take part and generally absenting themselves from the chamber. The speeches have been excellent as a rule, and by the time that the country has been flooded with them the republicans may begin to doubt the "smartness" of their "policy of silence." There has been but one blunder on the democratic side, and that was made by Senator McPherson of New Jersey, who, through the force of ancient and evil habit, indulged in some of the now discredited chatter about the percentage of tariff required for the protection of American labor. It is time that men calling themselves democrats had ceased to talk this wretched "rot."

The New York Times' Washington correspondent sends that paper a story of a conspiracy by Reed, McKinley and Cannon, the republican triumvirate in the house, to drive Secretary Blaine out of the cabinet and out of the party, as a punishment for his interference with the programme of the conspirators who are trying to pay back the money contributed by protected manufacturers for the purchase of the control of the government. These men do not fear that Blaine can control many votes in the senate, but they find that his unconcealed opposition to the McKinley bill is encouraging republican opponents of the bill to speak out as they would not have dared to do but for Blaine's utterances. This infuriates Dictator Reed, who hoped that he had whipped the whole party into an obedience as abject as that of the republicans in the house. His rage is increased by a rumor that Mr. Blaine is quietly opposing the passage of the force bill and freely criticising the shameful tactics of Reed and his henchmen in the house.

That the western republicans are not fully in accord with the revolutionary programme of the conspirators was rather significantly shown last week in Minnesota and Nebraska, in their respective republican conventions. Both bodies echoed the old demand for revision of the tariff without saying a word for the McKinley bill, and in neither body was there a single word said about the force bill. The senate seems to have been affected somewhat by this and other evidences of hostility to that monstrous measure. The senate committee on elections has proposed numerous modifications in the bill, intended to make it less obnoxious; but the most cheering sign is the utter failure to secure the general attendance of republican senators at any caucus at which the bill is likely to be considered. It does begin to look as if the measure might be defeated, but there is still danger of its passage, and protests should continue to be made by all who believe in popular government instead of plutocratic rule. We are glad to see that Mr. Powderly has denounced the infamous measure as it deserves to be denounced and asked the Knights of Labor to protest against it. The country is evidently waking up

to the threat to its liberties involved in this force bill.

The Philadelphia Ledger advises congress to pass the necessary appropriation bill's, "drop the dangerous election bill and the very dubious McKinley bill—and go home." This is good advice from a sincere friend. The Ledger, though an independent paper, is an avowed advocate of the "protection" policy and therefore in sympathy with the republican party. It doubtless sees that under the mad and wicked leadership of Speaker Reed the republican party and the protectionist cause are both receiving dangerous blows, and it therefore offers the advice quoted. Such an utterance shows that there is among conservative protectionists a clear apprehension of the good work the republican majority in the house is doing for free trade.

BETTER CONGRESSMEN NEEDED.

We print in this issue a report of the preliminary meeting of committees appointed by various clubs in this city that seek to influence the nomination for congress of capable men, well equipped for the discussion of the tariff question and thoroughly committed to hostility to the so-called protective system—a system that has not only inflicted great injury on this city, but which, through the McKinley bill, threatens a most disastrous blow at the remaining commerce of this port. The movement comes none too soon, and it ought to command the sympathy and support not only of all free traders and tariff reformers, but of all merely partisan democrats who care anything for the reputation and influence of the greatest democratic city on the continent.

The men immediately engaged in this movement do not stand alone in their belief that a change is necessary. The World of last Sunday said editorially:

New York's influence in congress is not at all commensurate with the character of the state. * * * The trouble is with our nominating conventions, where availability, "claims" or an open purse is the controlling consideration and low standards of intellectual ability prevail. It is not too early to begin a campaign for reform in congressional nominations. The Fifty-second congress will have work of vital importance to do, needing for its doing the best intelligence and the most commanding character. If New York is to contribute her share to that work, an earnest effort must be made now to secure the nomination of the strongest men to be had in all the districts. That is a present and pressing reform work.

The Commercial Advertiser last week had an editorial article commending the recent nomination of strong and capable men for congress in Chicago, and urging New York to imitate the example thus set. It said:

In all European governments the cities have quite generally been depended upon to choose as their parliamentary representatives practical men of high character and of much capacity for usefulness. The same was formerly true of our own politics. But, since our affairs fell so much into the hands of bosses and managers, it has seemed desirable to these individuals to reward their petty helpers by sending them to congress. As a result of this, there has scarcely been a notable speech by a member of congress from a large city during the past ten years, about the only exceptions being those made by the late S. S. Cox. * * * Of the entire delegation of thirteen members sent from New York and Brooklyn there are only two that rise above the commonplace. Messrs. Fitch and Flower are creditable to their districts and their city. Every other member is either a representative of some boss, or hall or local organization, or has distinguished himself as a political manager in his quarter of the city. If the people of New York had the choice of a delegation to present their claims before any tribunal not one of these eleven exceptions would be thought of. And yet, in the most serious concerns, not only of the city, but of national legislation, these men are intrusted with authority to represent this great commercial center.

There is less reason for the continuance of this policy now, because of the fact that, under the new ballot law, political organizations will be deprived of a good deal of their power in the making of nominations. A general movement ought, therefore, to be inaugurated looking to the choice of some

really fit men for representatives in congress from this city.

A hopeful movement has begun which can readily be made a general movement through the aid of such papers as the World, the Commercial Advertiser and the others that doubtless agree fully with the sentiments above quoted. There is a crying need for a change and we cannot but believe that in this crisis, men of character and ability will consent to serve in congress if there is a determined effort made to secure the nomination and election of such men.

It will be well for the bosses of the various machines to bear in mind the fact that the new election law makes it easy to run independent candidates, and to also remember that a refusal to grant so reasonable a demand as that under discussion will cost their local ticket thousands of votes by men who will see in such action a new reason for a determined effort to smash the halls and machines.

BLAINE CALLS FREE TRADE "FRIENDLY BARTER."

Mr. Blaine's second letter to Senator Frye shows that the secretary of state has no thought of abandoning his opposition to the McKinley bill. He adroitly manages to put the responsibility for that measure just where it belongs. Senator Frye is not the only republican who has shown a disposition to accept Mr. Blaine's arguments as sound, while putting them aside on the plea that they come too late. Mr. Blaine takes care to show that this is not his fault, since he sought an interview with the eight republican members of the house committee on ways and means more than five months ago, and endeavored to impress upon them the views contained in his letter to Senator Frye.

Though Mr. Blaine insists that he is a good protectionist, it is plainly evident that he and Mr. McKinley do not mean the same thing when they use the word "protection." After saying that "the value of the sugar that we annually consume is enormous," Mr. Blaine goes on to ask: "Shall we pay for it all in cash or shall we seek a reciprocal arrangement by which a large part of it may be paid for in pork and beef and flour, in lumber and salt and iron, in shoes and calico and furniture, and a thousand other things?" He evidently thinks there can be but one reasonable answer to this question, and boldly declares that obtaining what we need by friendly barter is "the highest form of protection and the best way to promote trade." Just so, and the truth stated is just as plain, though Mr. Blaine prefers to use the term "friendly barter" in place of the more familiar and expressive phrase "free trade."

Mr. Blaine has evidently got far enough along to freely use the word "trade" and to regard trade as a great thing. He not only wants to "promote" it with Cuba, but compliments Mr. Frye on the "active and most intelligent" interest that he has taken "in the increase of our trade with South America." He compliments Mr. Frye's shipping subsidy bill, and asks him if he does not think "that a line of ships generously aided by government will have a better prospect for profit and for permanence if we can give them outward cargoes from the United States." This is a characteristically clever "dig," and it can hardly fail to give Mr. Blaine's friends a most gratifying assurance that their leader has recovered his health and is "feeling good" again. Nevertheless, every free trader has been saying the same thing about the preposterous scheme to build up shipping by subsidies, while maintaining a tariff system that prevents the building up of any trade to give employment to ships. In fact Mr. Blaine's whole letter is simply a free trade argument, since no

argument can be made in favor of friendly barter with peoples on this side of the Atlantic that does not apply with equal force to free trade with all other peoples. Of course Mr. Blaine's talk about paying money for sugar is nonsense. If we had tried such a thing we should have spent all our money long ago. We pay for sugar with raw materials that we ship to other countries, and these countries ship manufactured goods to Cuba, Porto Rico and South America, thereby cancelling their debt to us and our debt to the Latin American countries. Trade will go on despite our tariff. All that does is to confine us to the least profitable form of trade.

But while all free traders must rejoice over the form that the controversy between Mr. Blaine and Speaker Reed's subservient house has taken, they will decline to accept the reciprocity programme as a solution of the tariff problem. Reciprocity will not lead the people of the West Indies, or those of other countries in the two Americas, to buy our lumber, salt, iron, shoes, calico and the "thousand other things" that Mr. Blaine speaks of. It may divert to these countries some of the agricultural products that we now send to Europe in a round-about exchange for sugar, coffee, hides, rubber, etc., but it will not open up a market for our manufactured goods. The reason that people do not buy our goods is because we charge more for them than is charged by European manufacturers. The tariff on all goods, not particularly on South American goods, causes this excessive charge, and the partial removal of that tariff here and there by reciprocity treaties cannot meet the case. The only way to help trade is to make it free. The one effective thing that Blaine, Reed, McKinley or any other "statesman" can do for trade and industry is to keep their hands off and permit the men who understand trade and industry to attend to their own business without interference by the government, whether such interference shall take the form of tariff taxes or subsidies. Reciprocity is a good enough dummy for illustrating how free trade will work with some countries, but the only salvation for American commerce and manufactures, and especially the only hope of prosperity for American agriculture, lies not in reciprocity, not in tariff reform, but in free trade. Mr. Blaine's arguments will help men to see this, and so far they are useful.

HILL'S SNEER AT FREE TRADERS.

It appears that Governor Hill in his recent Indianapolis speech went out of his way to declare that democrats are not free traders. The Indianapolis Sentinel took him to task for this, whereupon the Washington Post reminded the Sentinel that, during the last presidential campaign, it had constantly declared that tariff reform is not free trade. The Sentinel admits the charge, and says the statement is absolutely true, and thus continues:

But there is a marked distinction between such an assertion and the entirely unnecessary and wholly superfluous averment, which Governor Hill and some others like him feel called upon to make upon all occasions, that "democrats are not free traders." This sort of thing is really not good politics, although politics is Governor Hill's profession. There are different shades of opinion among democrats on the tariff question. All democrats are not free traders; but hundreds, and thousands, and tens of thousands of them are, and the remainder—we are speaking of genuine democrats—are tariff reformers.

So far as the Sentinel itself is concerned, it declares that Mr. Michael D. Harter's recent denunciation of "protection" (recently printed in THE STANDARD) represents its sentiments and the sentiments of an overwhelming majority of the democrats of the country.

The Sentinel is one of the leading democratic papers of the west, and this

utterance demonstrates a decided advance in public sentiment on the tariff question. It is of course true that tariff reform does not necessarily mean free trade. It in many cases means a tariff for revenue only, and such a reform is worth striving for since it would relieve our people of a considerable proportion of the burdens now imposed upon them for the specific purpose of enriching "protected" monopolists. There is no reason why the most ardent free trader should not sympathize with and aid the effort for mere tariff reform.

There has been in the past, however, a disposition on the part of mere tariff reformers to disclaim with some pretence of horror any alliance with free traders. We have no doubt that it was with a view to conciliating those making this pretence that the Sentinel during the last campaign took pains to emphasize the truth that tariff reform does not necessarily mean free trade. The march of events has, however, demonstrated such a growth of absolute free trade sentiment that the Sentinel is not only encouraged to avow its own hostility to the "protective" system, but to rebuke Governor Hill for his utterance which by implication is intended to declare that free traders are not democrats. As our Indianapolis contemporary remarks, "this sort of thing is really not good politics." On the contrary, it is very bad politics—the peanut politics of a sharp trickster with a narrow vision and evil advisers, who imagines he strengthens himself by insulting men without whose votes the democratic party could have no hope of success.

Free traders can afford to laugh at Hill's repudiation of them in view of the rejoicing declaration by party organs that "thousands and tens of thousands" of democrats are free traders.

THE SINGLE TAX CONFERENCE TO MEET SEPTEMBER 1.

A cable dispatch received last Wednesday, after THE STANDARD had been issued, announced that Henry George will return home on September 1. On June 24, at the request of numerous clubs in all parts of the country, the single tax enrolment committee issued a call for a single tax conference to meet in the city of New York at the time of Mr. George's return. That date is now fixed and the call for a conference to meet in this city on Monday, September 1, appears elsewhere.

This conference has been called at the request of single tax organizations and the single tax men of the country should spare no effort, and hesitate at no sacrifice, in order to make it a really representative gathering. Since our movement took its present name and entered on its present plan of campaign, there has been no general gathering of its advocates, though many persons have expressed a desire for such a gathering. It was at the suggestion of others, and not of its own motion, that the enrolment committee, took the initiative in ascertaining the opinion of the various clubs. A large majority of the principal organizations voted for a conference and the call was issued accordingly. It now rests with the organizations to make it a success. The enrolment committee will attend to such details as the hiring of a hall, obtaining special railway rates, etc., and as these things involve expense, it is desirable that special subscriptions toward meeting the expenses of the convention shall promptly be sent to G. St. J. Leavens, secretary of the committee, at 12 Union square.

It is not necessary for us to dwell at length on the many reasons for holding a conference at this time. They are fully stated in the call. The all important thing now is to make the gathering a grand success. We have already received

notice that delegations will be present from New Orleans, Memphis, St. Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston and several other places, and as the original call requested responses by August 1, there will doubtless be many other similar notices before the next issue of THE STANDARD. There should be no delay in sending such notices, as the railway rates will depend somewhat on the number likely to come.

Some isolated workers have written that they desire to attend, but that they belong to no organization, there being none near them. In most places an organization can easily be formed, and where that is not the case, known single tax men need not stay away on that account. The gathering will be a conference and not a convention, and the only object in asking that delegates shall be elected is to give the conference some guarantee that those claiming seats are entitled to them. In the case of known workers the conference will doubtless accept the evidence of the enrolment committee as to the eligibility of isolated people. Let no sincere single tax man who is in accord with the purposes set forth in the call remain away. We need the presence and counsel of as many faithful workers as can be gotten together.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

PROBABILITY THAT THE FEDERAL ELECTION BILL WILL NOT PASS THE SENATE—MR. BLAINE'S RECIPROCITY, FREE TRADE IDEA STRENGTHENING—SENTIMENTS OF REPUBLICANS IN THE NORTHWEST AND WEST—SENATOR VANCE'S GRAPHIC PICTURE—REVELATIONS OF THE CENSUS—MORTGAGES BEGINNING TO TELL THEIR FEARFUL TALE—A FEW INSTANCES FROM ILLINOIS—WHAT BOOMS HAVE DONE—INCREDIBLE RATES OF INTEREST—PEOPLE IN THE SOUTH LIVING ON THE FUTURE—LIENS ON CROPS—PITIFUL TALES OF POVERTY—CUTTING OFF ALL HOPE OF REDEMPTION—THE HARVEST OF FACTS THE ELEVENTH CENSUS PROMISES—STRONG HOPES FOR PATTERSON AND BLACK IN PENNSYLVANIA—CHAIRMAN KERR ON THE SITUATION.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 28.—The impression steadily gathers ground that the federal election bill will not pass the senate, or, at least, that any bill containing the essential features of the Lodge bill will not. Republican opposition, both public and private, appears to be growing so general that senators who were from the beginning against it are more than ever determined, and the weak and timid ones have less resolution for it. The talk of a reapportionment of congressional districts, based on the new census, amounts only to talk, as the census cannot by any possibility be completed in time to admit of such a contingency. As the federal election bill comes to be less and less talked about the tariff question comes to the front and discussion renews with fresh vigor. The situation is simply this: That the sentiment with regard to free trade has so far and so quickly advanced in the ranks of the grand old party that Mr. Blaine, leading a large and increasing wing, proposes to force free trade with us upon all the American nations; while others, fully aware of the danger of adhering to the old time exclusive policy "right on the eve of the next presidential election," are greatly solicitous to at once break down some of our protective wall—to repeal the duty on sugar—without waiting to see what can be done to destroy or modify other nations' tariffs. The latter proposition is, says Mr. Blaine, sarcastically, "to open our ports free to everybody's sugar, and to do it with such rapidity that we are not to have a moment's time to see if we cannot make a better trade—a trade by which we may pay for at least a part of the sugar in the products of American farms and shops. Our change of opinion has certainly been remarkable in so brief a period."

"We wish now to cheapen sugar by removing the duty," cries Mr. Blaine, and at the same time the echoes of Mr. McKinley's words come back: "We wish to cheapen production by increasing duties!" Without stopping to notice the

incongruity of these utterances it should be observed that the McKinley policy is meeting with more open opposition in the republican party every day. Senator Manderson of Nebraska voiced the sentiment of his people in the northwest when he told me that they believed "in protection, but not in prohibition." On the other hand, the Pierce amendment is gathering strength. This is based on the Blaine idea—repealing the duty on sugar, but authorizing the president, in a year's time, to reimpose it as against any country failing to enter into reciprocal relations with us. Senator Pierce is said to have received many assurances from representatives from northwestern and Pacific coast states that they have received numerous letters from constituents, "chiefly officials of farmers' alliances," urging the adoption of his amendment.

While Mr. Blaine and his friends are agitating their party fellows in the council chamber, the democrats are waxing more courageous, and are hammering loudly at the gates. Here is the picture which Senator Vance of North Carolina draws of the senate finance committee:

That council chamber is filled with a clamorous crowd, with papers each one in his hands, containing his "demands." One by one they are heard to utter these demands. They are invariably demands for the levying of taxes, taxes, more taxes, to increase the price of their own products. They travel, every one, in the same unvarying groove. The statement begins with a detail of the amount of capital which they have invested. They tell the committee the amount of their product, the number of hands they employ, and the amount they pay them. Proceeding with their harrowing story, they tell how impudent foreigners actually compete with them in the sale of their products, and often undersell them by villainy and false swearing in the valuation of their product, and by means also of the pauper labor which these foreigners employ. By statements of their own they then proceed to show the committee how much more they pay their workmen than is paid to these European paupers by their conscienceless and Godless employers, and they close by an earnest appeal to the committee to increase their profits, not for the sake of their own pockets, God forbid, but for the sake of the poor American workman, whose guardians and trustees they are, and for whom alone they take all this trouble. The interest of the government or of the consumer is not even thought of, much less mentioned. They put it all on the ground of the workingman, and notwithstanding the fact that, in many cases, they are at that moment enjoying the benefit of a duty which exceeds the whole cost of labor in the article which they produce, notwithstanding that its falsity and hypocrisy has been exposed a thousand times in every conceivable and unanswerable way, each one after the other will rise before that committee and jog along through that well-ridden and stereotyped lie with the complacency of a well fed deacon, who is at peace with all the world, on his way to church on a Sunday morning.

While the population returns in the census investigation are bringing great surprises as to the growth of cities during the last decade, and especially of mushroom upshootings in the west, information is not yet full enough from any one quarter to show to what extent this piling up of people in spots is to the detriment of the expansive rural districts; and such information will not be ready for a while to come. But other important facts are beginning to come to hand. The information relative to real estate mortgages reveals an extent of indebtedness in this country which is appalling. Mr. George K. Holmes has charge of this division of the census work and shows an energy and intelligence in his investigations that promises a most fruitful issue. He seems bent on making a fair presentation of the state of affairs, let consequences be what they may, and talks freely and with the utmost candor of results thus far obtained.

Mr. Holmes thinks the returns will show about seven millions of mortgages in this country in the ten years since 1880. Slips containing six millions have come in. Work on New England is very nearly finished, and the New York state work will very soon be. Of the 28,000 counties in the United States about a fourth are insignificant, as they have but scant population and little business. One county in point, in Texas, reports the absence of a single mortgage in ten years. One hundred and seven counties, representing types of conditions, in different parts of the country, have been picked

out for special investigation. For instance: In the state of New York, Richmond (Staten island) has been chosen as a county in which a large number of the residents are known to be in easy, if not, indeed, in affluent circumstances; Fulton county, because there the inhabitants, with but small capital, can engage in manufacturing gloves; Allegany county, because its population is known to have scarcely increased in ten years; Livingston county, because it is given to agriculture and is said to be in a flourishing condition; and Dutchess, because it is reputed to be stricken with poverty.

The general indications are that if mortgages have not increased in New York and New England, they have at least kept pace with those of the preceding decade. The great increases are in the west and south. Chicago, Mr. Holmes says, is plastered over with them, and is in a far worse condition than New York. Indeed, mortgages are thick throughout the state of Illinois, and, from a hasty glance, seem to have greatly increased in the last years of the decade. Cumberland county, starting with three mortgages in 1880, recorded 217 in 1889. It is only fair to say, however, that few of the counties present such a startling increase as this, and, moreover, that the true importance of even this statement cannot be seen until the population returns are published, as the change will not be relatively so great as appears if the inhabitants of this country are shown to have largely increased during this period. The figures for Cumberland county, as they have been received, are as follows:

CUMBERLAND COUNTY, ILLINOIS.			
Year.	No. of Mortgages.	No. Canceled.	
1880	3	0	
1881	12	1	
1882	12	2	
1883	25	4	
1884	31		
1885	96		
1886	247		
1887	296		
1888	216		
1889	217		

Total for ten years 1,155

Mr. Holmes observes, from a cursory glance, that the highest point for mortgages seemed to be reached in 1886 and 1887, though that point may prove of later date on closer examination. Two of the heaviest mortgaged counties in Illinois are subjoined, both seeming to countenance the latter observation. Only four years of cancellations have yet been received.

VERMILION COUNTY, ILLINOIS.			
Year.	No. of Mortgages.	No. Canceled.	
1880	754	604	
1881	1,028	749	
1882	1,126	841	
1883	1,188	787	
1884	1,039		
1885	1,162		
1886	1,172		
1887	1,170		
1888	1,124		
1889	1,489		

Total for ten years 11,252 2,931

KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.			
Year.	No. of Mortgages.	No. Canceled.	
1880	633	461	
1881	865	575	
1882	1,092	653	
1883	1,203	606	
1884	1,122		
1885	1,102		
1886	1,156		
1887	1,370		
1888	1,339		
1889	1,610		

Total for ten years 11,492 2,295

I found such lists as the foregoing from Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, and I am informed by Mr. Holmes that they are almost as thick in many other states. In Wichita, Kan., there were an immense number of mortgages, and, in fact, they are to be found in plenty in the track of every land boom. Birmingham, Ala., and Chattanooga and Knoxville, Tenn., have since their booms and boasted prosperity been covered with mortgages. Everybody who could has bought land in such towns, and money lenders, seized by the same frenzy of speculation as the borrowers, have taken for security land at inflated prices. Where booms have

burst there has followed a most fearful shrinkage of land values, and Mr. Holmes says, from the information he receives many of the large western Kansas mortgage companies must sustain enormous losses, since the lands on which they have foreclosed mortgages will now bring not half of what they lent on them.

As to the question of interest, contrary to his expectations, Mr. Holmes is experiencing much difficulty. Nothing, he had thought, would be easier to get at; but he finds all manner of ruses are resorted to to cover up the illegal and excessive rates, which seem to be not the exception, but the rule. The general rate in Nebraska and the Dakotas for first-class, safe loans is 10 or 12 per cent. The rate goes up as insecurity increases, and insecurity is seen to be everywhere, as the average interest charges are much higher than this, and at times are almost incredible. The census agent at South Dakota reports: "There is a great scarcity of money throughout the state. On short-time loans the interest, commission and bonus oftentimes runs as high as from 40 to 75 per cent, and sometimes higher. Prior to the last four or five years it was not an uncommon thing to add to the amount to be lent about 25 per cent, and make the mortgage cover it. Uniformly during the years 1881-84 the broker had whatever commission he saw fit to demand, but since then, where the security was real estate, the customary rate is 9 or 10 per cent, this covering commission of local and eastern brokers." In Alabama no interest is named in the instrument because it runs from 10 to 20, 25 and 40 per cent. In the south mortgages are generally due to pecuniary straits; in the west a large proportion of them are thought to arise in getting purchase money and making improvements.

"Large masses in the south are literally living on the future," said Mr. Holmes. "Everywhere are found liens on the crops. These charges are held for the most part by the small grocers. So poor are the people that the farmers are compelled to give mortgages on their crops before they have put seed into the ground in order to obtain the meagerest supplies for their families. When the crops are harvested and sold, and the mortgages paid, little or nothing is left with which to continue the support of the families, and so liens have to be taken on the next crops." In this way the people are never out of debt, and if they have mortgages on their lands, though they may struggle along under the exorbitant interest, and perhaps get the term extended, they can seldom hope to pay off the principal, and must succumb to the foreclosure and become tenants on next to starvation terms.

Some cases are coming to light which tell a more fearful story of the general destitution than figures can. In 1888 a widow in Tennessee gave a mortgage on her little home for \$13 to pay the funeral expenses of her husband. There were \$6.75 yet unpaid on the 1st of last January. In North Carolina is a man struggling against a mortgage he has of late years given on his land to pay for slaves purchased by his father before the war.

Another portentous class of facts to which Mr. Holmes draws attention is the tendency away from the old timesage to recover lands after foreclosure. There exists in common law what is known as the equity of redemption privilege, by which the borrower may redeem his land within three years after foreclosure, upon payment of the principal, interest and legal costs, as prescribed by statute. But all manner of schemes have been invented to circumvent this right. In the eastern states there is in common use what is known as the "power of sale" mortgage, or colloquially, as the "snap" mortgage, which operates in default of one cent, and which cuts off a second mortgage and everything else except taxes. In Virginia the device takes the name of a "deed of trust." If you ask a farmer if he has a mortgage he will indignantly answer, no; but he may confess that he has a "trust." In Pennsylvania, and also in Virginia, the borrower makes a confession of judgment, which completely cuts off right of defense and

equity of redemption, and gives a claim against all his real and personal estate which does not expire for five years. In Chicago and California a contract is made whereby the title to land is not transferred until full payment is made, the buyer meanwhile having only the privilege of use and occupancy. If he defaults, he is ejected, and in a great many instances, being poor and helpless, he loses all the money he has paid. In Georgia and Alabama, and, in fact, pretty much all through the south, the borrower gives an iron-clad deed that permits the lender to turn him out of house and home. Mr. Holmes says the southern courts construe these contracts very strictly, deciding all points of the least doubt in favor of the borrower.

It is apparent that too much importance cannot be attributed to such facts, showing as they do a poverty so general and so persistent as in most cases to compel the unfortunate to add inexpressibly to the misery of their state by rejecting the immemorial and most precious privilege of rehabilitation. The rule in these mortgage cases is fast coming to be, if indeed it has not already come, that once a man gets down he can scarcely hope to rise again, and his life becomes a horrible grind. "There is not any such thing as the free hired laborer being fixed to that condition for life," said Abraham Lincoln in 1861, yet, with such facts as these as forerunners, what will this census investigation not reveal?

This work being conducted by Mr. Holmes relates to mortgages on all real estate. He will next undertake what may, perhaps, be considered a more important work—the gathering of facts as to the proportion of homes and farms owned by their occupants, and as to the extent of indebtedness upon them. The first step in this direction has been taken by inserting in the population schedule, now being circulated, four questions, as follows:

26. Is the home you live in hired, or is it owned by the head or by a member of the family?
27. If owned by head or member of family, is the home free from mortgage incumbrance?
28. If the head of family is a farmer, is the farm which he cultivates hired, or is it owned by him or by a member of his family?
29. If owned by head or member of family, is the farm free from mortgage incumbrance?

When the population schedules are returned those persons found to own the homes or farms they occupy will be sent a special schedule by mail, with a notification that they are liable to a fine of \$100 if they do not make answer. In cases where this schedule brings no reply or where the reply is unintelligible, a special agent will be set to work. The expectation is that there will be from three and a half to five millions of such special cases to investigate.

Congressman Kerr, chairman of the Pennsylvania democratic state committee, is hard at work in his spare moments from congressional duties at correspondence arising from the gubernatorial struggle in the Keystone state. Mr. Kerr says that, despite republican assertions, there is much hope for democratic success, that there is a widespread revolt of respectable republicans against Quay methods, and that while such republicans may not be expected to join the democracy, yet, if they can be emboldened to come out, and he is confident they can, they will certainly vote for the democratic candidates, Pattison and Black, whose fitness for office is denied by few. If the voting could be had at once, Mr. Kerr has no doubt that it would result in democratic favor; the danger of delay is the organized use of money. Although he was a Wallace man in the convention and thought Wallace would make the best candidate, Mr. Kerr says he has since been surprised to find what strength Pattison and Black have. Innumerable assurances have come to him, by word and mail, and through reports from reliable and cool-headed lieutenants, of open declarations of republicans to bolt their ticket and vote for the democrats. The two main issues of the democratic party will be pure administration of the state government and ballot reform—the

adoption of the Australian system through a constitutional convention. Every effort will be made to keep these principles to the fore and to keep personalities out. The Knights of Labor and the grangers are anxious for a constitutional convention, and are expected to throw their weight in that direction. Mr. Kerr tells me, moreover, that there has been a great deal of quiet changing on the tariff question. Large numbers of the farmers who but a few months ago signed the petition to the ways and means committee to have farm products protected have come to realize that "protection," as far as they are concerned, is a sham, and are disposed to try the other principle which proposes to break down walls, give them a foreign market for their products and permit them to buy cheaper everything they consume. Mr. Powderly's example in denouncing the protective idea, Mr. Kerr says, has been very important. Its great effect would be apparent if there was in Pennsylvania a secret ballot, under which men need have no fear of persecution and the conditions that foster bribery would be destroyed, but even under the present defective system Mr. Kerr is of belief that dissatisfaction will, despite all difficulties, make itself felt and secure the election of Pattison and Black.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Mrs. Ellen Platt, wife of ex-Senator Thomas C. Platt, has large hopes for the future of the cat. She is of the opinion that the Tabby and Thomases have been shamefully and cruelly neglected, and that if given half a chance they would distinguish themselves. One of her pets is a big, beautiful Tom, Julius by name, who has been trained to do a number of things, and gives evidence of possessing superior ability. Julius eats at first table, occupying a chair at the left of his gracious mistress. He has his own napkin, with a bit of silk garter and a silver clasp to hold it about his neck, and whenever a morsel is handed to him he makes acknowledgment by a profound and respectful inclination of the head. He has never been known to drop a crumb on the floor, or capsize a dish. He drinks bouillon, and eats ice cream, finger rolls, mint and any game or fish in season. Julius travels with a colored maid.—[New York World.]

Victor de Bules, said to be the son of a distinguished German count, was found dying in his room at a boarding house in Philadelphia. Medical aid was hastily summoned, but the man died soon after the arrival of a physician, who pronounced the case one of undoubted suicide. De Bules came to this country about ten years ago. He was an expert chemist, and until two months ago, when he lost his position, was employed by a chemical firm here. He was about forty years of age, handsome and of striking personal appearance. A search of his clothing showed that at the time of his death he had just one cent.—[New York World.]

A big crowd of horsemen filled Auctioneer Easton's new Tattersalls yesterday to watch the sale of the Rancho del Paso yearlings. It was a buying crowd and the prices were unusually good. There were ninety-six colts and fillies sold for \$115,920, an average of \$1,207.50. Among the lively bidders were L. J. Rose, the California millionaire, who has recently gone on the running turf; Pierre Lorillard and Marcus Daly, the copper king. Although there were no sensational prices, a great many were sold for over \$3,000. Mr. Lorillard bought a full sister to Dew Drop for \$3,500. He also bought a Dabbin colt for \$4,000; the dam is Katrine, one of his old mares. It was expected that the price of the day would be given for the St. Blaise-Maud Hampton colt, the half-brother to King Fox and Ban Fox, but Mr. Daly gobbled him up for \$7,000.—[New York World.]

John Forrest, who for some time had been out of employment, and who was despondent, committed suicide at his home, No. 363 Seventeenth street, at an early hour yesterday morning. He was discovered by his wife hanging by a rope from a gas bracket in the rear basement. A physician was summoned and he said that Forrest had been dead for some time. It is presumed that he committed the deed about 1 o'clock. He was eighty-one years of age, and a number of years ago was in good financial circumstances. He owned an old fashioned inn at the corner of Boerum place and State street, but on losing his business and money commenced to sell draperies and other trimmings to tailors.—[New York World.]

Among the season's novelties there are the "dream" sunshades covered with milk-white silk over which creamy crepe lisse is shirred and caught at the top with a Prince of Wales cluster of plumes. There's the "bell" parasol made with silvered ribs capped with silver tongues and finished off with a bouquet of may-bells. The "camper" is a tint like affair to be had in canvas colors of rose and yellow, red and white, blue and white and black and crimson, finished around the edge with the scallops that are cut in window awnings and street canopies. All the Oriental shapes are made of beautiful silk, with now and then a bamboo or ivory handle representing a haughty Jap or dancing Turk.—[New York World.]

NOTES AND QUERIES.

An estimable lady of this city is going to found a refuge for homeless cats. Our homeless human beings will continue to be homeless.

* * *

The Memphis single tax club takes the first prize. The first single tax petition ever presented in the United States senate was sent to Washington by that club and was laid before the senate last Monday week by Senator Harris. It was a protest against the McKinley bill, and an appeal for lower duties.

* * *

Our increased water supply is a source of gratification to the tens of thousands of us who live in houses which have no water tanks on the roofs. For the last two weeks it has been possible to take a bath on the second floor day or night, where once we could not bathe at all; water has poured into the stationary wash stands, enabling us to put aside the wash bowl and water pitcher. The dreaded task of "carrying water upstairs" has been taken off our shoulders. And we are correspondingly happy. That is one side of the picture. Now look at the other side. The abundance of water for bathing has injured the barber shop industry to that extent. The water running into the stationary basins will decrease the sale of pitchers and wash basins, and thus reduce the number of working people necessary in that industry. As the water carries itself upstairs, those previously supporting themselves by that work will be compelled to look for other employment. So that while the increase in the water supply has been a blessing, it has not been an unmixed one. But so far we have heard of no movement looking to the destruction of the aqueduct on the ground that it interferes with labor. Yet the protectors of our American laborers ought, if they are consistent, to proclaim against this thing. We are being literally deluged with cheap water—that is to say, we are getting more of it for our money than we ever did before. Still nobody is objecting, not even our protection friends; and yet it is a condition of things in direct hostility to their theory. Our ear is fastened to the ground, where we listen for the faintest sound from them.

* * *

The Boston typographical union has established the Saturday half-holiday in all the offices under its jurisdiction—excepting one, the Rand-Avery supply company. This firm has refused to grant it, and their printing office has been declared "unfair and under the ban of the union." There was considerable correspondence before this extreme step was taken, the principal point made by the firm being that it was conducted on business principles, and not by those "who neither pay the company's employees wages nor assume its responsibilities." To this the committee of the union answered in a way to make some employers think, even if the Rand-Avery company won't. They said:

As to this, there are different opinions arising and growing every day. In fact, there are those who boldly assert that no one man employs another—that in our complex industrial conditions the producer and consumer are more dependent upon each other than in the primeval stages; but at the present day those who have the managing of affairs display a disposition to assume a patronizing air and arrogantly assert themselves as the mind, soul and body of production. This phenomenon has, no doubt, grown out of the mistaken view that wages are drawn from capital. On this point an eminent writer has this to say: "It is from the product of labor, not from the advances of capital, that wages come. Labor always precedes wages. * * * Paid by the day, week or month, or by the piece, the payment of wages by an employer always implies the previous rendering of labor. * * * As the laborer who works for an employer does not get his wages until he has performed the work, his case is similar to that of the depositor in a bank who cannot draw money out until he has put money in. * * * The value of the partly completed work stands in place of the value paid out in wages. During the time the laborer works for the employer he is advancing capital to the employer, but at no time, unless wages are paid before the work is done, does the employer advance capital to the laborer. * * * The disaster which prevents the employer from reaping

benefit also prevents him from paying wages."

The issuance of this circular by the Boston printers would indicate that the action ordered has gone into effect and that the office is under the ban. It is a strange thing this, that one of the most profitable printing companies in Boston should refuse to grant the small favor of a Saturday half-holiday to its employes, especially when all the other firms in the same line have conceded it.

* * *

Last Sunday week the Herald printed a long article descriptive of the Watt's \$3,000,000 chicken farm, situated at the upper end of Manhattan island. A day or two after "Chanticleer" wrote a note to the Herald, putting another side to the picture, which seems to hit the advocates of chicken occupancy of land a hard blow. He said:

Without doubt the Messrs. Watt have a perfect and unquestionable right to put to such an absurd use such valuable property if "they alone" suffer from their indulgence of such whims and caprices. But if their neighbors (persons interested in abutting property) must suffer pecuniarily, then, I beg to say, the Messrs. Watt are committing an injustice. My family are holders of a plot of lots (a good slice of a block) in close juxtaposition to the Watt farm. The Watt farm lies across about seven streets, say about 138th street to about 145th street. It is like a great log, so to speak, rolled across the doors to our property. We are subject, and have been for years, to heavy taxes and assessments, and are estopped from improving or properly marketing our property, because the Watts must keep half a dozen New York city streets closed so that they may raise chickens there. In the name of common sense and justice ought not the streets to be cut through the Watt farm, even if the Watts are obliged to move their chickens to land not worth \$3,000,000?

* * *

Our friend Billy Radcliffe of Youngstown, Ohio, is again on the road, selling his wares and giving away free trade and single tax tracts and logic. When Billy is traveling he leaves a long trail behind him. He sets the people talking and the newspaper men writing. Billy was in Beaver Falls the other day, selling medicine and talking to the people. He must have made an impression, for the Journal went to the extent of lampooning him in order to offset the work he had done for free trade and the single tax, in this fashion:

During the past two night Billy Radcliffe of Youngstown has been entertaining a crowd on Sixth street by vocal and instrumental music. Radcliffe came here ostensibly to sell medicine. But the dose that he tried to administer last night won't go down in a manufacturing town like Beaver Falls. Radcliffe is a rank free trader, destitute of argument, and evidently in the employ of the democrats of New York, or their allies over the briny deep—judging from the way he handed out the documentary evidence to the crowd. Radcliffe, like others of his kind, has lost influence where he is best known. He attempted by fallaciously placing figures on a blackboard, to show the ruinous effects of a tariff, and knavishly omitted to once mention its benefits in the matter of protection against foreign competition. His arguments, stripped of their occasional humor, were illogical, and as thin as his once famous soup.

* * *

All of which is very sad. Billy may not have used arguments satisfactory to the Journal, which is a protection paper, but, evidently they struck the News-Democrat of Beaver Falls as being to the point, for it had this to say concerning the same speech:

If an officer should every day enter every house in this city and order the inmates, men, women and children, to hand over to him directly, a sum of money equal in amount to the tariff tax, which they now pay indirectly on every article bought during the day, people would learn how they are being robbed, and such a revolution would ensue, that all the power of the United States government could not enforce such a demand. But under the plausible name "protection," no special officers are required (except at the customs houses, where people are plundered outright), since every dry goods merchant, grocery man, clothier, etc., becomes a tax collector, and the sneaking thief goes on without the knowledge of the ignorant and thoughtless. In his speech on the square, Wednesday evening, Billy Radcliffe gave an illustration of the operation of the system, which, if homely, was so apt and true, that there was no mistaking the evidence his audience gave of understanding and appreciation. Mr. Harrison, said Billy, is on record in one of his ante-election utterances, as having declared that "our tariff taxes are taken so subtly and indirectly that plain peo-

ple scarcely know that they pay them." Now, said Billy, suppose I am obliged to be absent from my hotel at Youngstown and wish to leave some one in charge. I say: Jim, you go behind the counter and attend to business until I return. I will pay you ten dollars a week and your board and washing. All right, says Jim. But Jim gets a salary of twenty dollars a week. How then? Because in addition to the ten dollars he receives directly, he takes ten more from the cash drawer, but so "subtly and indirectly" that I do not know it. That, according to Mr. Harrison, is just what the tariff does. Who says Billy's logic is not correct?

Echo answers, "Nobody but hidebound protectionists."

* * *

Mr. Dana is still disturbed. The new election law is the cause. So far, in his anxiety to point out the iniquities of that measure, he has been on both sides of the fence, under the bars and astraddle. At one time he showed now it would disfranchise thousands of voters; at another, how it would lead to putting into the field no end of tickets. Then, in his editorial columns, he showed how the thing wouldn't work at all; the next day he printed in his news columns a report of a successful election held under the new system by a society in Albany, where 500 votes were polled in three hours, using but three booths. When the Australian system became law in Rhode Island, Mr. Dana predicted a democratic disaster as a result, because of the thousands of voters of that belief who would be disfranchised; yet the result was the election, for the first time in many years, of a democratic governor. It is not long since Mr. Dana proved conclusively that the new system would not make any perceptible difference in the expenses of candidates; yet last week he said that we would be flooded with candidates because a man or set of men can run for office now at small expense. As a case in point, he tells how the prohibitionists have estimated that they can carry on their campaign for \$500; whereas in former years they have found it necessary to have thousands of dollars, and even then could not get their tickets into the hands of voters. "Why," said Mr. Dana, evidently thinking of last year's election, "five hundred dollars is not enough to send a paster to each registered voter." He even admits that his friends, the socialists, who were as active as he in opposition to the new law, "will find it easy to have their tickets distributed this year." But what seems to trouble him the most is that any three hundred men can come together, and by complying with the law, put a full ticket in the field. In his last article, Mr. Dana predicts that there will be at least ten tickets in the field.

* * *

The Republican at Black Rock, Ark., has just begun printing the matter furnished by the Memphis single tax club. It thus alludes to its new departure:

The single tax idea is rapidly gaining ground. Perhaps many of our readers have never had an opportunity to study it. We will give you two or more columns for a short time so that you can see what there is in it and judge as to its merits. If you like it after reading and examining it, please let us know.

* * *

Mr. F. S. Billings of Chicago says that Western Resources, a live stock journal published at Lincoln, Neb., is disposed to welcome good free trade articles, and not entirely averse to allowing some space to the discussion of the single tax.

* * *

Mr. Edgar Farrell of Pawtucket, R. I., asks if any of THE STANDARD's readers know of a good stereopticon firm that is likely to have on hand pictures suitable for such a stereopticon campaign in behalf of free trade or single tax as was recently suggested in a communication to THE STANDARD.

* * *

The cloakmakers' strike was settled (for the present, at least) last Thursday evening. There was a small eruption on the following day, because one firm refused to discharge twenty American girls that were employed while the strike was in progress; but that seemed to have been settled. Meantime, the employers are grumbling, and the cloakmakers are, so

the papers say, "carrying things with a high hand." A little moderation on both sides will do considerable toward keeping down bad blood.

* * *

The New York Sun makes fun of Senator Voorhees in "Hiawatha" meter. In that paper's opinion there seems to be something ludicrous in the senator's latter day espousal of free trade. But we live and learn; that is, some of us do. The editor of the Sun may be an exception to the rule.

* * *

St. Louis is in a fever of excitement over the Lodge force bill, now pending in congress. Dr. Henry Chase, our good single tax friend, has issued a circular, which is being widely distributed over that city, which reads as follows:

CITIZENS AROUSE!
THE COUNTRY IS IN DANGER!
The freedom of the
BALLOT IS IN DANGER!
The plutocrats are conspiring to
ENSLAVE THE PEOPLE.
BUILD FIRES ON THE HILL TOPS!
CALL MASS MEETINGS!
PROTEST!
Write letter to the senate!
ACT BEFORE TOO LATE,
or there may be a cry of
"TO ARMS! TO ARMS!"
And the streets be wet with blood!
Never in the history of these states has there
been greater
DANGER
to the
LIBERTIES OF THE PEOPLE,
than at this moment! Read the whole of the
"Federal Election Bill."
HENRY S. CHASE,
July, 1890. St. Louis, Mo.

A copy of this circular was telegraphed to the World last Friday, with a statement that it was generally indorsed by the citizens of St. Louis. The dispatch also said that Dr. Chase was an old and prominent citizen of that city, whose utterances and opinions were always listened to with respect.

PERSONAL.

Richard McGhee was in town again last Saturday. Since he spoke at the Manhattan single tax club he has visited Montreal, Boston, Philadelphia and Washington on the business which brought him to this country. He looked in on our "national parliament" while in Washington, and he considers it a very disorderly body. He may take steamer for England next Saturday.

E. C. Owen, Lovett house, Hollis street, Halifax, N. S., wants to know the name of the editor and paper printed at Fordham in the interests of Christian socialism. Please send answer to this office.

Editor Dana has gone to Europe for a six months' trip. He has left his knife behind.

After spending nearly two weeks in the city, Mr. James A. Herne returned to Boston last Friday. The Boston Herald of July 21 contains a letter from him on the discussion on the single tax between Henry George and Mr. Atkinson in the July Century. In concluding his letter he says: "Permit me to say that 'man can be reconstructed;' that, under free conditions, 'human nature, as it is now constituted, would not exist;' that Mr. George does not propose to 'entirely abolish poverty,' but to emancipate industry, and thereby abolish involuntary poverty. This, he claims, and with justice, the single tax will do."

C. F. Perry of Quincy, Ill., has a letter in the current issue of the Journal of the Knights of Labor, in which he points out the evils that would result from state socialism. "Capital," he says, "is the child, not the parent, of Labor," and in the holding of the opposite idea lies, in his opinion, the error of the state socialists.

RESTORE THE LAND.

Boston Post.

Among matters of graver political moment in England the crofter question still holds a place. A select committee of the house of commons has been hearing testimony and have got at some serviceable facts. The emigration scheme is not popular with the crofters; it is stated, nor is there any reason why it should be, since their troubles are not due to over-population. Indeed, the number of inhabitants in many of the Scottish islands has diminished in late years. There would be land enough for them to cultivate and live upon comfortably were it not for the fact that wealthy landlords have used it for deer forests, driving the crofters to the towns in which there is no market for their labor. The disorders on the Lewis, which attracted a good deal of attention a year or two ago, were largely due to the extension of such a pleasure ground. The remedy, therefore, is obviously to restore the land to its original and proper use.

UNDER THE WHEEL.

HAMLIN GARLAND'S NEW PLAY—THE SINGLE TAX IDEA IN THE DRAMA.

In the July number of the Arena Mr. Hamlin Garland's new play, "Under the Wheel," is printed in full. It is a play with a purpose, and that purpose is the demonstration that under existing economic conditions there is no escape for the honest toiler from grinding poverty.

The play opens with a scene in a Boston tenement house, where Jason Edwards, his wife and two daughters have their home. Edwards is a man who, having learned his trade and married, began life with the hope of securing a modest competence. His eldest daughter, Allie, evidently received a good education, and at the time the play opens is studying music with a view to becoming a singer. A second daughter, Linnie, much younger than her sister, appears from her talk not to have had Allie's educational advantages, but she is an important figure in the drama. Allie is introduced to us as already engaged to a young newspaper man named Reeves, and the first glimpse we have of the social problem is in a conversation between these two in scene I. Mrs. Edwards invites the young man to stay to supper and the following colloquy takes place:

Reeves—"No, thank you, I've got a little work at the office, and then I've got to go out and report an anti-poverty meeting at the Temple. Special job."

Alice—"What kind of a meeting is that, for pity's sake?"

Reeves (preparing to go)—"Oh, a cranky kind. Henry George started it. Some absurd idea about abolishing poverty."

Alice (with a profound sigh)—"I wish it wasn't so absurd. I don't see why poverty is so persistent in this age of invention."

Reeves (as if struck by her words)—"Come to think of it, it is more absurd to think the abolition of poverty absurd. Why shouldn't it be abolished? What's the good of progress if it don't." (He muses with bent head.) "I don't see where the laugh comes in writing. Do you know, I've been thinking and writing on these things of late? I don't know why; it's in the air, I guess. Everybody's got some cure." (Leans his elbow on a chair, speaks in slow, deep, musing voice.) "I stood on the Brooklyn bridge the other day and looked down on New York. Over me spread and sung those stupendous cables, the marvel of man's skill, etched on the sky, delicate as a spider's web. I stood there looking down at the sea of grimy roofs, a lava-like, hideous flood of brick and mortar, cracked and seamed, and monstrous for its lack of line or touch of beauty—a modern city. I saw men running to and fro, like ants, lost in the tumult of life and death struggle. I saw pale girls sewing there in dens reeking with pestilence. I saw myriads of homes where the children could play only in the street or on the sooty roof, colonies of hopeless settlers sixty feet from their mother earth. And over me soared the bridge to testify to the inventive genius of man. And I said then what I say now, that men have invented a thousand ways of producing wealth, but not one for properly distributing it. I don't know where the trouble is. If we once knew the trouble, somebody'd find a cure. Abolition of poverty." (He muses a moment, then starts.) "Well, good-by, I'll write this up in a leader." (With a return to his cheerful manner, takes her hand, makes an elaborate obeisance.) "I await your pleasure. Farewell, my queen." (Goes out without looking back.)

Alice—(Looks after him smilingly. As she comes back the smile fades from her face.) "Isn't it terrible to be poor, mother?"

Mrs. E. (with quiet pathos)—"Yes, dear; but I've kind o' got used to it. I don't look f'r anything else now. I don't care s'much f'r myself, but I'd like t' see my children safe from it."

Alice (seated with bent head)—"Oh, how sweet it must be to be free from the fear of poverty! To feel that you don't need to scrimp and pinch, and turn dresses and dye feathers, and wear old shoes; to feel that food will come when you need it; to have the soul set free for art." (Leaping up, her face aglow.) "But I'll win yet, mother; I feel in my soul that I have the gift. I'll take you out of this—"

Presently Edwards returns, who, after some chaff with Linnie, remarks to his wife that it seems very hot and that it is absolutely worse than the shop. The conversation between them gives an idea of the financial condition of the family and the rooms in which they are compelled to live, and incidentally introduces some other characters, ending with the resolution on the part of Edwards and his family to go west.

Edwards—"Why don't you open the door?"

Mrs. E.—"I can't stand the noise and smell 'nigh, my head aches. Sometimes it seems 's if I couldn't bear it but I think o' people who don't have as much as we do, an' so I keep a-going."

Edwards (walking about)—"That's about the only way, I'll be patient. It makes me wild sometimes." (Goes to lounge and drops heavily upon it. Alice takes a fan from the wall and fans him, stoops and kisses him.)

Alice—"Poor papa—it's dreadful to see you come home so tired." (Brushes the hair back from his forehead.)

Edwards (bitterly)—"It's just one eternal grind, not a day off. I'm glad I don't believe in another world—I wouldn't be sure o' rest after I got there."

Mrs. E. (shocked)—"Why, Jason, what are you sayin'? You must've had a hard day in the shop. It's dretful hot f'r the first week in June."

Edwards (raising to his elbow)—"First week a June! Why, mother, it's just thirty-two years next week since we was married. D' you remember how old Derry looked that day? Flowers, and berries, and daisies, an' birds (rising)—why, mother, that was heaven an' we didn't know it! Down here in this cussed alley we don't know anything about June, only it makes our tenements hotter and sicklier. I s'pose the cows up there are knee deep in the grass, and the wind smellin' like the front door o' heaven. We didn't look f'r this kind o' thing when we left Derry, did we? We didn't look forward to a tenement!"

Mrs. E.—"No, Jason—but set up an' eat sumptin'."

Linnie—"Poppa, I wish we could go up in the real country this summer—you know you promised—"

Alice—"Sh, Linnie; papa will do his best." Edwards (going to the table) "I'll try, little one, but I'm afraid there ain't no vacation for us. The fight gets harder every year. Oh, I'm too tired to eat, Jennie. Well, Allie, how'd y' come out with your recital t' day?"

Alice (putting her hand in his)—"Very well, father, only I wished you there."

Edwards—"I wisht I could, but I can't. I got to keep goin'. Rent an' taxes go on when I picnic, but wages don't." (Shoves back from the table and sits dejectedly.)

Linnie (starting up)—"O poppa, a man put a bill under our door that said *Rent* on it. I'll get it." (Brings it from the corner, reads it slowly.)

Linnie (reading):

Dear Sir: At the expiration of your lease, July 1, your rent will be increased five dollars per month. Please notify us if you intend to remain. JOHN NORCROSS, Agent.

Edwards—"Good God! and my wages cut down last week. Hain't they got no mercy, these human wolves? Hain't I got all I can stand now! Look at it!" (Looking at the walls.) "Look at this tenement! Hotter, rottener, shabbier, but rent but must go up. Jennie! Children! I don't know what I'm goin' t' do. I don't see any way out; I can see we're bein' crushed—"

Linnie (going to him)—"Don't cry, poppa, don't mind him."

(As Edwards sits thus with bowed head, Julian Berg, a pale, student-like German, enters at the door. He is accompanied by a full-bearded, sinister-looking man, who stands in the doorway, stolidly smoking a long pipe. Berg holds a rent bill.)

Berg—"Aha! Vat say you now? Is it nodd dime doo protest! Our vages is reduced dwice already in four years—te rendt haff been raist four dimes. How? It is hell, is it nodd! Vat you do?"

Edwards (without looking up)—"I don't know."

Berg (darkly, looking at Alice)—"I know vat I do. I magke protest so I shall pe heardt. It is nodd do be born wit. I giff in my name to-night." (He starts toward the door.)

Alice (stopping him)—"Don't do that. Keep away from those anarchists, Mr. Berg. They will hurt you. They don't belong here. Such meetings are wrong in a free country—"

Berg (turning)—"Free! Free do pay rendt in. Ifly from de tyrants of my native landt, I reach a free landt! Bah! I am only slave under anodder name, dat is all. De march of feudalism is here even. I say there is no free blace left. Ledt dem tage care, I shall fight. I am a volf ad bay. If I fall now, I trag someding wit me." (He starts to go.)

Alice (stopping him)—"Don't go with those men. You're not yourself to-night. Stay with your mother."

Berg (moved by her words and hand on his arm)—"For your sake, I vill stay. I am nodd vell. It is true."

Alice (recoiling)—"No, no; not for my sake, but for your mother's sake."

Berg—"For you half ask me I stay." (He turns to the figure at the door.) "You hear, I go nodd out." (Figure at the door goes.) "I wish to talk mit you—I haff—"

(Alice stands speaking in a low voice to Berg. At last he nods.) "I promise—ant I vill come again soon!" (Exit.)

Alice (turning to her father)—"Can't something be done—can't you strike?"

Edwards (spiritlessly)—"No, we can't strike—at least, it wouldn't do any good."

Alice—"Why not?"

Edwards—"What can men do strikin' with families as I have needin' every dollar they c'n earn? Rents due an' no money t' pay it with. I don't know which way t' turn."

Mrs. E.—"Don't give up, Jason. We'll git along some way. We can move into a cheaper tenement—"

Edwards (indignantly)—"I don't want y' to do that, Jennie. You're low enough; I've been hopin' t' move into a better one."

Alice (resolutely)—"I'll give up my course at the conservatory and go to teaching. I'll do my part."

Edwards—"It wouldn't save us, m' girl, for next year the rents would be higher an'

wages lower. It ain't the present that scares me, it's the future! I could pull through for a year or two if 'twant for the terrible uncertainty of the future. If I should be laid up f'r a month—I'm gettin' old an' liable t' be—I don't know what we'd all do. John jest about makes a livin' for his family—he can't help us. Linnie must go t' school an' Alice ought to go on with her music—"

Alice (firmly)—"No, father, I'll give up the conservatory. I'll find something to do; I'll be a help."

Linnie—"So'll I."

Edwards (putting his arms around them)—"You're a help to me now, Allie; nothin' cheered me more all day long than the thought o' your havin' a good time with your musical friends."

(Alice has a thoughtful look on her face. She is thinking of Reeves, and his question and her answer.)

Mrs. E. (with a sigh)—"What's the world comin' to, Jason, when hard workin' people can't make a decent livin'?"

Edwards (in the same gloomy tone)—"I don't know, Jennie. I tell ye I've done a pile o' thinkin' lately. I've looked at the whole matter fore and aft, and they hain't no other way to it. It's a plain case o' rents goin' up an' wages goin' down. Ten men f'r every job—me gettin' old." (A long pause.)

Mrs. Edwards (hesitatingly)—"We couldn't go back to Derry an' go to farmin' agin, could we? They say they's deserted farms there that can be bought—"

Edwards (bitterly)—"Why are they deserted? B'cause people couldn't make a livin' off 'em. Can we do any better? If I was a young man—if you was young and the girls didn't need schoolin', they'd be jest one way out—the way out f'r so many b'fore us—I mean go west an' get free land and start agin."

Alice (feeling her way)—"Why don't you go west now? We'd go with you. I'm sorry we're not boys, we'd be of more use." (With growing conviction.) "Of course that's the way out! Why didn't we think of that before, mother? Everybody is happy and successful that goes west—it's the refuge for all like us. Let's go this very summer! Maybe I can find a place to teach music out there."

Edwards (rising and going to his coat)—"Wal, now you've said s' much, Allie, I'll own up I've ben thinkin' a good deal of it f'r some time. I've jest about wore these maps out lookin' at 'em. (He spreads some railway maps out on the table, and they all look at them. He grows enthusiastic.)

Edwards (pointing)—"Now here's Boston, an' there's Chicago, an' you follow that black line away out there an' that's Boomtown an' free land. D'ye hear, mother? free land! The place we're all dreamin' about!"

Linnie—"What d' you mean by free land, poppa?"

Edwards (raising his head)—"Where there ain't no landlords an' no rents. Where there ain't no rich n'r no poor. Where people don't live in holes like this. Where they raise such ears o' corn as that, and have farms like that!" (holds up two gay-colored posters, "with cows, an' pigs, an' clover, an' brooks near by, full o' trout. Mother, I've been hungry f'r a farm all my life; let's try it agen, eh?"

Mrs. E.—"Very well, Jason, if you think best."

Linnie (dancing about)—"Oh, yes, let's! I'm tired of this old city, ain't you, Alice?" (Alice remains strangely silent now.)

Edwards (in growing enthusiasm)—"Wal, now, this is a way out of it. I didn't dare t' say anything about it f'r fear you'd all say no. We'll git a piece o' that free land—Ed. Rubie is out there an' his father—you remember old Sam Rubie, Jennie—an' they crack the country up great! Of course we won't expect much the first year or two—we'll be satisfied with a log house. We'll build near a river somewhere—"

Alice (coming out of her reverie)—"Oh, won't it be delicious to get back to the birds and bees, and trees and clouds?"

Mrs. E. (catching the spirit)—"Yes, if our house ain't very much it'll be ours. We can't never hope to have a home of our own here—but it'll take money t' git out there, an' we ain't got much t' spare, Jason."

Edwards—"We'll manage somehow, now we've made up our minds. We'll have t' sell off our furniture; t' won't pay t' ship 'em way out there."

Alice (recoiling)—"Must we do that, father? It'll seem horribble to sell our dear old things. They ain't worth much in money. Can't we store them and—"

Edwards—"It's going to take every cent we c'n rake an' scrape t' git out there and git started, Allie."

Mrs. E.—"Of course there ain't no other way—don't bother your father, Allie. That ol' blue chiny set th't Captain Bascom give gran'mother 'il bring a hundred dollars—that man from Dawley's offered s' much."

Edwards (pondering the map)—"There's the road leading to the west, to wealth, health and freedom—hey, mother! Good-by to work in a shop! Good-by to rent! Good-by to the filth and noise of the tenement! We'll go west, where my girl (seizing Linnie) will grow up strong, and sweet as a wild rosebush. I feel as if a pile-driver had rolled off my neck."

Alice (smiling)—"You look it, father. I haven't seen you so jolly in years—have you, mother?"

The scene is now suddenly transferred to a western prairie where Reeves, Alice's lover, arrives at a boom town and finds that

Edwards is the victim of land speculation and is simply working for the barest kind of a living, all he can get over and above that going to pay for interest on his mortgage. When Reeves arrives at the Edwards farm, Alice, of course, rushes to his arms, and in the conversation that follows gives him a brief history of their miserable struggle:

Reeves—"What's this? Crying? Why, I thought you'd laugh when you saw me." (Raises her face to his.) "It's your guilty conscience. Little woman, that face shows care—life out here is killing you."

Alice (smiling again)—"I'm only crying because—I've longed to see you—I've watched the road oh, so many hours, Walter. It was too much to expect, but I thought you'd come. It's so lonesome here." (Exit Linnie.)

Walter (quizzically, looking down at her)—"Your letters didn't read that way, I can tell you that; they were cold and formal enough."

Alice—"I didn't dare write what I felt."

Reeves—"Why not?"

Alice—"Oh, because I was afraid!"

Reeves—"Afraid I'd come and get you, eh?"

Alice (evading him)—"Don't ask me now. Let me enjoy your visit without thinking—tell me about dear old Boston. Sit here while I get you a drink. You must be thirsty."

Reeves (tenderly, smiling)—"Yes, thirsty for the sight of you." (Alice goes into the house. Reeves walks about, glancing keenly at all points of the plain.) "So this is the reality of the emigrant's dream! The homestead in the free west, the house beside the river embowered in trees!"

A wide dun land where the fierce suns smite, And the wind is a furnace breath; Where the beautiful sky has a sinister light, And the earth lies dread and dry as death: Where the sod lies scorching, and the wan grass sighs, And the hot, red morning has no birds—

My God! what a place for my beautiful girl—for anybody's girl—a wide-walled grave."

(Alice enters with a glass, which she fills and hands to him. He drinks, saying: "In a land like this the gift of water must mean as it does with the Arabs, the highest hospitality.")

Alice—"I can't say how much I—we—shall—"

Reeves (putting his arm about her)—"Don't try. If I had only known your real feelings—but how could I from those letters?" (Looking off left.) "What in the world is that girl doing? She's unhitching my team! I'll stop her." (Ex. 1, talking.)

Alice (walking about)—"How can I let him go again! Have I the strength? But I must, I must! I can't leave father now, at the height of his terrible struggle. I must stay."

Walter (re enters with Linnie, holding her by the hands)—"I suppose this is Linnie—anyhow the little witch was unhitching my team; another minute and she might have had a runaway."

Linnie (scornfully)—"Runaway nothing! What do you take me for? Allie and I hitch up the horses and go out in the fields—we plow, and drive the harvester—and we help shock the wheat—don't we, Allie?"

Reeves (surprised)—"Do you do that? With this hand, that I used to love to watch on the piano? O horror!" (Strokes it.) "Poor bruised little hand." (Kisses it.)

Linnie (goes off in mock disgust)—"Girls like me don't count. My hand can get well itself f'r all you care. Wal'n so it goes." (Goes into house.)

Reeves—"And you live there?" (pointing at house.)

Alice—"Yes, with my people."

Reeves—"Through your horrible winters?"

Alice (quietly)—"Yes, and there are days when that hut, poor as it is, seems like a palace. Last winter it seemed as if the snow would never tire of sliding to and fro on the plains. Days and days we were shut up here."

Reeves (deeply affected)—"Heavens, what a prison! And yet I saw dozens not so good as I came along."

Alice (quietly)—"We lived in that sod shanty a year."

Reeves (lifting his head)—"And this is the free and glorious west! Oh, it makes me wild to think of you living there—it's worse than the tenement house."

Alice (firmly but sweetly)—"There was no other way. They couldn't have lived without me. My little teaching has kept us in groceries, and beside, there have been days when father was too lame to work and I have worked in the fields, and taken care of the cattle in the barn—"

Reeves (seizing her hands)—"Don't tell me any more—I'll rage—I'll swear."

Alice—"We must bear it."

Reeves (savagely)—"Bear it! I won't bear it. I'll expose the whole infernal matter in a four column leader. I'll smash the next bonner that says free land to me. Free land! if this is free land, what the devil!"

Alice (stopping him)—"Hush, hush!"

Reeves (freeing himself)—"I say, if this is free land what in the devil would you call high-priced land? The settler pays for his free land all that makes life worth living; these families have purchased their bare and miserable acres with blood and sweat and tears. Free land! bah! For a century there has been no free land in America."

Alice (trying to be calm)—"I know it, but it only makes it worse to think of it."

Reeves (quickly)—"Forget it then, for I've

come to take you out of it. Hush, now! Not a word. I've let you spoil five of the best years of my life. You shan't say a word—I must be heard now."

Then follows a struggle between Alice and her lover, in which she refuses to leave her parents and go with him to the east, at the end of which he retires, angered at her obstinacy.

The fourth scene describes the terrible drought that is destroying the crops and reducing Edwards to despair, since another failure will insure the foreclosure of his mortgage and leave him without even this miserable home. The storm ends with a terrible tornado, accompanied by hail, which absolutely destroys the crops and wrecks the buildings, Edwards himself receiving severe injuries from which he barely escapes with his life to find himself, in the end, paralyzed. Walter Reeves, who has not left the country, returns and successfully presses his suit, and the final solution of the problem is that he takes the broken old man east and cares for his family, charity having to be called in at last, since there is no possibility of finding a place where a man by mere industry can make way against such obstacles as have beset Edwards. The play ends with Edwards's surrender and his discovery that he is paralyzed, and closes as follows:

Edwards (after a long pause)—"I surrender. I'm beat. I give up, but it hurts, it hurts! I'm like an old broken scythe, hung up, t' rust in the rain; I ain't no use to y' now, Jennie! Here's my hand, young man; Walter, my son, take her back t' Boston where she ought t' be, an' take me back t' Derry. I sha'n't be a burden to y' long. I don't s'pose I'm wuth the trouble, but I'd kindo like t' be buried back there. I hate t' die out on this hot prairie with no tree t' be buried under; seems 's if I couldn't rest, an' rest is the sweetest thing in the world f'r a man like me, the only thing left—I can't lose that."

Linnie (throws herself on his knees)—"Oh, poppa, poppa, you make my heart ache so."

Edwards (stroking her hair)—"I hope you won't have t' suffer as Allie has, little girl."

Reeves (with deepest earnestness)—"I say you are fallen, but the column has passed on, the battle will yet be won. Courage; you will yet live to see the outposts of the enemy carried, and Linnie will live to see a larger and grander abolition cause carried to a bloodless Appomattox—the abolition of industrial slavery."

Linnie (lifts her face).

Alice—"Do you think so? Is there hope, Walter?"

Reeves—"There is great hope."

Edwards—"If I could believe that I'd feel easier. If I could feel that my children and my children's children could have a better chance than I've had—I mean without your help or anybody's help—all I ask is a fair chance—"

Reeves—"That's what I mean. A fair chance for every man—it's coming!"

Alice—"Do you think so?"

Reeves (expanding with enthusiasm)—"I know it. Just as I know spring will come again."

Edwards—"If I could believe that."

Reeves (in the same tone)—"You can't help believing it, as you live the next five years; the air is already electrical with inquiry. Over us the shadow still hangs, but far in the west a faint, ever widening crescent of light tells of clear skies beyond. Live for that time, it's worth living for. Strike hands with me. Let me carry your knapsack. Believe in the future—"

Edwards—"I'll try." (They clasp hands.)

Alice—"How much you are to us, Walter! You have given us all new life."

Reeves—"I've only begun to be something to you. Now we are ready to begin life together, and they shall rest easy—"

Mrs. Edwards—"Here's y'r tea, Jason."

Edwards (trying to rise)—"Help me up."

Mrs. Edwards—"Wait a minute. Linnie, bring some water and a towel; Allie, bring that bowl o' broth. Don't try to get up, Jason, till I get some more pillows. (The women go out.)

(Edwards struggles to rise, Reeves puts his arm about his shoulders; as he does so a look of horror passes over the old man's face. He stares at Reeves, at last whispers)—"My God, I can't move my feet!"

Reeves (comprehending)—"No, no! Great God, man, that would be too horrible. It's only temporary numbness—"

(Edwards makes another desperate effort and falls back on his pillow with set, despairing face; a groan bursts from his lips.)

"No, no—it's true—I'm paralyzed!"

Alice (re-entering, hears, stands for an instant appalled—rushes to his side)—"Oh, it can't be true—I—"

Edwards (on impulse to shield)—"Sh! Don't tell—them—mother—baby—"

(As Alice and Reeves stand horrified, gazing into each other's eyes, Linnie enters, dancing, whistling.)

Linnie—"And now we'll go back to Boston, won't we, Allie?"

A HINT FROM OUR FAT FRYERS.

Louisville Courier-Journal.

The Turks collect taxes from the Armenians by building fires under them. Did they get the hint from our American fat-frying campaign of '88?

GEORGE IN AUSTRALIA.

HIS FAREWELL TO NEW SOUTH WALES.

HE TALKS OF THE FALLACY OF PROTECTION, AND SHOWS THAT REAL FREE TRADE IS A NECESSITY—A GREAT GATHERING.

Sydney Daily Telegraph of June 2.

At the Protestant hall on Saturday evening Mr. Henry George delivered his farewell lecture to a New South Wales audience, when he took for his subject: "The Fallacy of Protection." Mr. G. H. Reid, M. P., presided, and among those who occupied seats on the platform were Mr. R. J. Black, M. P.; Mr. Hawthorne, M. P.; Mr. C. L. Garland, M. P. (president of the Single tax league); Mr. Wheeler, Messrs. E. W. Foxall, F. Cotton, J. A. Dobbie and F. Walsh (vice-presidents of the Single tax league), John Farrell, A. Riddle, J. Beveridge, J. Eve, J. Ryan, R. Teece and J. Williamson. The body of the hall was filled and the galleries were densely packed. There were several members of parliament in the audience and a great many ladies.

A FEW WORDS BY A POPULAR FREE TRADER.

Mr. Reid, who was loudly cheered, said—Ladies and Gentlemen: I have here a very large number of letters from influential colonists expressing their regret that they are unable to be present, but I am glad to see upon this crowded platform a number of members of the legislative assembly. (Cheers.) Speaking for myself, ladies and gentlemen, I shall always look back with pleasure at the honor and privilege of presiding over this great assemblage. (Cheers.) You need not be told that the man whose rare eloquence and deep sympathy will soon entrance your attention has a perfect horror of flattery. Indeed, so sensitive is our friend—and I am sure he will allow us all to call him so (cheers)—that I believe, while he would face the heaviest broadside of his opponents with a smile, he would run away, if he could, from the compliments of a friend. Still, I don't think we should allow him to make this farewell address to us without the assurance that his name, famous in so many lands, has now become in Australia a household word. (Cheers.) The teachings of his wonderful books have already created a host of enthusiastic disciples to welcome him to these shores (cheers), and even I, who in some respects cannot call myself one of his disciples, can fully understand that enthusiasm. (Cheers.) He has thrice earned it. He has earned it as a thinker, he has earned it as a writer and he has earned it as an orator. (Cheers.) And I venture to say—and these are the concluding words in which, on behalf of this great meeting, I bid him farewell—that he may and probably will be regarded by posterity as one of those leaders of men who rise above the sordid level of things as they are, who seek to revive the spirit and the power of Christianity, who seek to enrich the human intellect with humane and generous ideas, who create in the minds of all noble ambition—new spheres of philanthropy and justice—quickening the world's great weary heart with the throbbings and gladness of the time to come when the curse of toil shall cease from troubling, banished for ever by the universal dignity and happiness of labor. Prolonged cheering.)

Mr. George, upon rising, was accorded a most enthusiastic reception and it was some little time before he was able to commence his address. The applause having eventually terminated, he said—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I am announced to-night to speak on the fallacies of protection. I hardly know where to begin. (Laughter.) The whole thing is a fallacy from beginning to end (cheers), and I have never yet known of a protectionist argument that did not involve the most preposterous fallacy. (Cheers.)

THE PLAIN ENGLISH OF PROTECTION.

Take it from the very first—that protection can increase prosperity; that protection can stimulate industry. How?—merely ask yourselves that. By giving to some industries—or, rather, to the capitalists engaged in those industries—by giving to them more than they would otherwise get. That, in plain English, is the whole mode and method. (Cheers.) A protective duty that affords no encouragement—that is to say, does not give to someone more than he would otherwise get—is not protection at all. Now, what is involved in that giving to someone more than he would otherwise get? Does it not necessarily involve the taking away from someone else what he would otherwise have? (Cheers.) We encourage an industry—we can encourage an industry or several industries, or, maybe, a good many industries—by means of tariff duties which raise the prices of the things produced; but though we can in that way encourage some industries, it must necessarily be by discouraging others. What can we do in the way of encouragement by protective duty that could not be done more easily, cheaper and more certainly by a bounty? If we took money out of the treasury to pay people who engaged in particular industries we would be accomplishing directly and certainly what is the aim of our protective duties. Can we imagine that industry would be encouraged by the bounty system? One or two, or a few industries

might be, but where is the bounty to come from? I think, as a matter of pure, simple justice, every rational protectionist—I mean, everyone who is rational as to other things (applause and laughter)—will agree with me that legislation which favors individuals or classes is unjust; and whatever a government does, or any people do in their collective capacity, ought to favor or to bear upon all alike. (Applause.) You can't apply that principle by means of a protective tariff.

PROTECTING INDUSTRIES.

You may encourage the sawmill man by putting a duty on imported lumber; you may encourage the iron miner or the iron roller or the iron merchant by putting a duty on imported iron, or the glass maker by putting a duty upon glass; but can anyone tell me of a protective tariff that will encourage the bricklayer? (Cheers.) You may encourage the industry of cutting down trees and cutting them up into boards, but how can you encourage the industry of the carpenter who puts those boards together? How can you encourage the industry of the railway man who conveys the timber to market, the industry of the cab driver, the industry of the teamster? How, by a protective duty, can you encourage the business of the newspaper man, of the minister, of the doctor, of the lawyer? In any country, if you come to examine the facts, you will find that those industries which no protective tariff can touch far, far exceed, in the numbers engaged in them, the number of those industries that protective duties can encourage. (Cheers.) Now, there are numberless advantages in the bounty system if we want to encourage an industry.

HOW TO PROTECT EVERYBODY.

But the great advantage which ought to commend it to any lover of equal rights is this: That while it is not possible to encourage everybody's industry by the protective system, it is possible to encourage everybody's industry by the bounty system. (Hear, hear.) That is, you could give a bounty to everybody. (Cheers and laughter.) Now, what would be the effect of giving a bounty to everybody—the bricklayer, the carpenter, the cab driver, the railway man, the doctor, the lawyer, the minister?

A voice—Pauperism. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. George—Pauperism, the gentleman says. It would be simply this: We should all get full of it. (Hear, hear.) But what purse has any government but the purse of its people? From what fund must come all the taxes and payments? It comes from the one created by labor. (Hear, hear.) And if such a system could be fairly adjusted, and everybody were paid a bounty from the sums raised by taxes, does it not follow that everybody would be poorer? For when the government scoops money out of the people's pockets and carries it to the treasury and then takes it back again, the ladle always leaks a little. (Hear, hear and laughter.) You could be certain that we should get less back than we had to pay if it were fairly done. If it were unfairly done then some would get a little more than they otherwise would get, but others must necessarily get a great deal less. And who, in the very nature of things, would those be who would get their share and a little more than their share? And who would be those who would get less than their share and a great deal less than that?

A voice—The workers. (Cheers.)

Mr. George: The workers all the time. (Renewed cheers.) The strong would get the most and the others would be all the more quickly crushed to the wall.

THE INFANT INDUSTRIES ARGUMENT.

It is also sometimes said that in the beginning, at least, in such countries as the United States and in such countries as the Australian colonies—always in the beginning—it is argued not that protection is to encourage industries, but that it is to encourage infant industries—(laughter)—the little industries—(renewed laughter)—that cannot take care of themselves. (Laughter.) It is to encourage the development of these little infant industries. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It is to diversify the industries, so that we shall not be all doing the same thing. Does it do so? Why, how can it? We know that in the case of children, if you want a child to walk you must let him try for himself, you must let him walk and take his tumblings, so that when he grows up he will be sturdy and strong, and able to stand on his own feet. (Hear, hear.)

A voice—It is not a fair comparison. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. George—It is a fair comparison. (Cheers.) You always provide the boy with an arrangement with wheels upon it and keep it there and let him continually use it, and he will grow up to manhood and imagine that he cannot walk without it. (Hear, hear.) A fair comparison! It is a perfectly fair comparison! (Cheers.) It is not merely proved theoretically, it is proved by experience. In the United States we began nearly one hundred years ago to encourage infant industries. Why, even when I was born that plea was still kept up, and I am far from being one hundred years old. (Laughter.) "Protect our infant industries for only a few years," said Henry Clay; "give us little duties that will protect these industries from the pauper labor of Great Britain, from foreign competition a little while, and in a few years they will be able to stand on their own feet." (Laughter.) The country has grown from 3,000,000 people in the beginning till

we are now 65,000,000 of people, but our infant industries, though they have waxed great and strong, are one and all to-day in their demands for protection more infantile than they ever were before. (Cheers and laughter.) Where they wanted 10 per cent or 15 per cent, or at most 20 per cent a generation ago, they want 50 per cent and 75 per cent and 100 per cent now, and are clamoring more and more for diversifying our industries. (Hear, hear.) How do industries naturally diversify themselves?

NATIONAL DIVERSIFICATION OF INDUSTRIES.

Any man who has witnessed the progress of a new country understands that as population increases industries naturally diversify of themselves. As soon as you get a number of men who like to have their clothes to fit it leads to the establishment of a tailor's business. (Hear, hear.)

A voice—Made by sweating.

Mr. George—Sweaters' wages we will come to by-and-by. The last thing I heard about sweaters' wages was from the highly protected colony of Victoria. (Great laughter.) Protection, it seems, does not prevent sweating. (Cheers.) However, as I said, we will come to that by-and-by. (Hear, hear.) Just let me go along for a little while. Protection, I have said, cannot diversify industries. Here is a proof. If you require protection to diversify industry, if protection is necessary for building up industries or manufactures to-day, our industries in the United States would be confined to the narrow fringe around the Atlantic just where they existed when we began. (Hear, hear.) But under a system of perfect free trade—for between state and state in the American Union there can be no tariff—(cheers)—under a system of perfectly free exchange, without any protection, manufactures have steadily made their way westward, and there are great manufacturing cities to-day where, when I was a boy, the buffaloes were roaming. (Hear, hear.) And as a nation what are our exports to-day? Products of the higher branches of industry? No, but crude, raw material for the most part, such as wheat, corn, meat, oil, the products of our fields and our mines, not manufactured goods.

EFFECTS OF PROTECTION IN AMERICA.

And why? Simply that this thing that we call protection is a constricting ring round the great republic—(hear, hear)—throttling our industries, depriving us of our natural market, building up rings and monopolies, not industries. (Cheers.) Why, you know it. I called attention when I spoke before in this city to the fact that to-day in your ports the American flag is rarely seen. The ships of the American navy have been almost driven off the seas, and if this thing called protection goes on for ten years more there will not be an American vessel save in our own coasting trade. Why? Not that our shipwrights have lost their cunning, but simply that all the things that enter into the construction of ships—and in the building of a ship you can draw not on one country alone, but on pretty nearly the whole world—but because in the construction and the maintenance of ships all the articles necessary for the purpose have been made abnormally high in cost by this thing that we call protection. (Cheers.) So it is with everything else. We should to-day be sending you more and more things but for this matter of protection that has strangled our industries all over. The shipbuilding is not the only one that we can see. Everyone who lives near a seaport can see it is the same way with our woollen industry.

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Why, we had a woollen industry. When we were colonies we were manufacturing wool. It has been simply strangled by high protection. The wool mills in California have been shut up, the mills all over the eastern states are shut up, and the only mills I know of are one or two in the east and some Oregon, where, having magnificent water power, they can run them for almost nothing. What is the reason of this? We have protected American sheep against Australian sheep, and big country as we are, covering the temperate zone of a large continent—we are not the whole world—(great laughter)—you can grow better wool than we can grow it (hear, hear), and your wool has become necessary to mix with our wool. And so it is right through. Now consider who must necessarily benefit by this system of protection.

A voice—The worker.

Mr. George—The worker! How does he benefit? He benefits because his employer benefits. (Cheers.) Protection does not give anything to the worker directly. (Hear, hear.)

THE WORKER ONLY BENEFITS BY BENEVOLENCE.

In the first place, what protection does is to give higher prices to some kinds of employment—not to all employees, but to some kinds of employees. If the worker benefits it must be because these employers, getting higher profits, volunteer to the worker higher wages. (Hear, hear.) I have never seen or heard of many employers of that kind. (Laughter.) There may possibly be some, but they must necessarily be few, because in the competition which goes on between the employee and employer in most businesses it would not take a man of such benevolent instincts very long to fail, and he would be driven out by somebody not so benevolent. (Laughter.)

THE EMPLOYER AS AN EMPLOYER DOES NOT BENEFIT.

Now, before coming to the worker I want to call your attention to the fact that the employer as an employer cannot benefit by protection, save possibly in some few cases, and for a very little time. Now, just let us see. Subsidies are perhaps the simplest form of protection. Suppose you give subsidies for sugar growth or wheat raising, what would be the consequence? For the first year, and may be for the second year, the proprietors might make more, but the effect of that subsidy would be to send more people into that particular line, and in a very short time, by the essential law of competition, profits in that business would be no higher than in any other unsubsidized business. (Cheers.) In the same way if you were to pay directly, not to the employer but to the workman, by grant from government so much in aid of wages, how long would the workers in these particular industries receive higher wages? Why, the influx and competition of labor would very soon reduce the wages in those occupations—that is the wages plus the bonus—to the level of other wages. (Hear, hear.) That is not mere theory; it is demonstrated fact; it is the experience throughout the world. Not the employer or capitalist as such can get any benefit from protection, whether in the form of a bounty or a duty, still less may the laborer do so.

WHO GETS THE PROFIT?

The man who can get any benefit for a time under the system is that man who, having a monopoly, can fence off domestic competition. Just as in Queensland they have a duty on timber, so in the United States. Does it benefit the man engaged in felling the trees or working in the saw mills? Not a bit. The wages are in many cases miserably poor. (Hear, hear.) Does it benefit the saw mill owners or the master employing those men? Not at all. The profits in the industry leave no greater margin anywhere else. The only men who can ultimately get any benefit from it are the land owners. (Applause.) For instance, there is Andrew Carnegie, of whom you have heard, with his "Triumphant Democracy." Triumphant protection in his case. (Laughter.) He was one of the men who had the duty placed upon steel because they had the Bessemer process in the United States. (Shame.) No shame to Andrew Carnegie if the Americans are fools enough to allow it. I do not blame that Scotchman for taking advantage of the occasion. So it runs; though if you analyze it, the whole thing is embedded in fallacy. (Cheers.)

THE FOREIGNER DOES NOT PAY THE DUTY.

Here is another fallacy. It is often said that the foreigner pays the tax which is collected through the custom house. Now in an audience like this it would not be worth while dwelling upon that; you all know a good deal better. In Queensland the other day I met a New South Wales commercial man traveling up there selling goods. I asked him about the tariff. He replied, "Oh, the tariffs do not bother us. We always sell our goods just at their price and leave the people here to pay the duty." I said, "Does it bother them," to which he answered, "Not much, because they add it to their prices and get it from the consumer." That is so. You all know that clothes are cheaper here than in Melbourne, so much so that a government official in Melbourne told me when I was there a few weeks ago that if a man wanted two or three suits of clothes at once he generally paid the railway fare and hotel bill and came to Sydney for them. (Hear, hear.) So in a small way there is always smuggling going on over the Murray river and on the northern border of Queensland. Victorians and South Australians when coming to Sydney from San Francisco always stop here for a little time to do their shopping before going home. (Laughter.) Why in the very nature of things how can the government of one country put a tax on the people of another country? How could they? It is a mighty good thing they cannot do so! (Laughter.) That is a transparent fallacy which everyone knows, not merely by theory but by actual observation, has no foundation. (Hear, hear.)

FREE TRADE ITS OWN REWARD.

The notion that it is the foreigner who pays these taxes lies at the bottom of another fallacy which is much oftener advanced. It is that free trade would be a good thing if all the world would adopt it, but that so long as other nations maintain protective tariffs another must do so. That argument is used here. It is said you ought to have a protective tariff because Victoria, Queensland and South Australia are keeping your goods from going into their markets, and therefore, to protect yourselves you ought to prevent their goods from coming into your markets. That is a very common suggestion, and it rests on the idea that it is the other people who would bear the tax. For New South Wales to act in this way would be cutting off her nose to spite her face. (Cheers and laughter.) We are here in a world in which, both as individuals and as nations, our own conduct and our own doing does have an effect upon all those around us and upon those with whom we have intercourse. No nation can hurt itself without, to some extent at least, hurting other nations, but the hurt that it does to itself will be far greater than the hurt it inflicts upon other people. (Hear, hear.)

THE UNITED STATES FURNISHES AN EXAMPLE.

Take the United States. Our protection grew up very largely on that account. When the thirteen colonies formed themselves into a federation after the distressful war of Independence they sent commissioners to the British court to negotiate a treaty of peace, and these commissioners were instructed to get an article inserted in the treaty that would make free trade perpetual between the old nation and the new country. England had been up to that time—and was right into the forties—a protective country, and the cry in the United States had been that because she was shutting out our goods we ought to exclude hers. Naturally, by doing so we should do England some injury. Trade naturally benefits all parties, and if it were not for that the people would not trade. Trade implies free will; it does not imply force on either side, and the motive of trade is that each party profits by it, because in each exchange the parties secure what is more useful and more profitable in their hands. (Hear, hear.) We have to some extent injured Great Britain by our protective tariff. We have restricted trades within our own borders and our source of wealth, and therefore we cannot trade with England as we should do. But while we have done some little injury to her we have done far more to ourselves. Our restrictions, while they have, perhaps, to some extent hurt Great Britain, relatively they have given her the opportunity which she has embraced of becoming the first commercial nation on the globe. (Cheers.) They have given her the commerce which we ourselves ought to have and have made her the great center of commercial exchange. So is it always. Because other nations adopt protective tariffs that is no reason why you should do so. Why, let all the other colonies build their protective tariff walls as high as they please and let New South Wales go on and abolish the tariff she has. (Cheers.) Then just imagine to yourselves what a magnificent smuggling business would be done from New South Wales. (Cheers and laughter.)

THE GREAT FALLACY.

Now, there is a fallacy that I find in this country that is even more widespread than that, and that is the fallacy that has done so much for protection in the United States. That is the idea that protection is necessary for a country where the wages are necessarily high in order to prevent wages falling to the level of other countries where they are relatively low, or, in other words, that the importation of cheap goods means the importation of cheap labor—that to import tea from China amounts to the same thing as importing the Chinese. (Laughter.) Now, does it? (A voice, "This is misrepresentation.") No; I think that gives the thing in its essence. It is merely putting the idea in another form. Now, in the natural state of things, there would be no injury whatever resulting from the importation of any amount of cheap labor, for if wages were high cheap labor, when it came, would rapidly become dear labor. That would be the case in the natural state of things. The great argument to-day against the introduction of Chinamen is not an economic argument. It is a race argument. (Applause.) We are building up in these new countries great Anglo-Saxon communities, and the presence among us of any people that necessarily retain race distinction—the presence of any body of people forming a community by themselves—cannot be other than most injurious and most dangerous to us. (Cheers.) We know that in the United States. The black day for us was the day that the African slave trade commenced. (Cheers.) Let me say incidentally that I don't think it a good thing to be homogeneous. We can learn much from other people. In the United States there are distinct advantages derivable from the contact with the German, French and Swedish elements—advantages which I recognize by noting that they are lacking here. They teach us lots of things we did not know before, and that is one of the great advantages that always come from the mixing of people. The great reason why in such a community as this and in the community we are building up on the other side of the Pacific that the Chinese are objectionable, is that the presence of a race that won't assimilate is dangerous. But beyond that, under the conditions prevailing all over the world to-day, the introduction wage earners who would long maintain a lower standard of comfort and would therefore work for lower wages, would tend to lower the wages generally. Under the natural law it should not do so, but in the present condition of things it would. To put the matter in another form. The introduction of cheap labor acts upon the distribution of wealth while the introduction of cheap goods acts upon the production of wealth. That is the difference. The miner who puts out coal is not the only producer of coal, for the railway man who carries it along to the market assists in the production, as do also the others associated with its output and removal. Production does not end until the article gets to the final consumer. The exchange of goods from one nation to another nation is simply giving in exchange things which return a greater amount of wealth than they represented before, because that which nations export is naturally less valuable to them than what they import. Therefore, free exchange sim-

ply adds to the production of wealth. The distribution of wealth means how the wealth is divided among the different classes, and the question of wages is therefore a matter of the distribution of wealth.

TWO TIGHT LITTLE ISLANDS.

To afford an illustration, let us imagine two islands and say that there were on each a hundred people. Let it be supposed that on one island the wages were twice as high as on the other island—let me show you how that might be. We will suppose that labor produces the same in both, but that in one island each man has his piece of land and each produces say an amount to be represented by "20"—20 bags of corn or 20 bags of shellfish or 20 of anything else. That which they produced would be their wages. Well, they also produce "20" on the other island, but on that island there might be a landlord. (Laughter.) If he demands half as rent and they pay him "10," what will their wages be then? (Laughter and cheers.) Just suppose that men cannot go from one island to the other but that goods can. Don't you mean to say that the exchange of goods between these islands would increase wealth? Some things could be produced on one island better than on the other, and by each producing what they were best fitted for and exchanging with each other, both islands would get more of the things that the people wanted than they could if there were no free commerce. Commerce would go on freely, but how could that reduce the rate of wages on the first island? The idea that protection can raise wages! Now, how can it? In the long run protection is only a monopoly, but you can't prevent competition even if you put every man in a strait jacket. (Laughter and applause.)

A RALLY TO FREE TRADERS.

Fallacy on fallacy! I know of no protection argument that will stand examination. One fallacy after another fallacy, yet protection exists. (Hear, hear.) These Australian colonies are an example, settled as they are by a people who came from the country where was fought that great contest for the repeal of the corn law; populated not by English aristocrats—they were the protectionists (cheers)—the English Tories, the landed party. (Renewed cheers.) And do you suppose they advocated protection for the benefit of the English agricultural laborer? (Cheers.) The people who came to this colony, whose children you are, knew better than that. Yet protection revives here. It rose up in Victoria over the half-hearted free traders, and rushed over to South Australia and took possession in the same way by the surrender of a lot of free traders. And in Queensland it was the same. It came up in like manner in the United States, where all our impulses were for freedom, and so in Canada. It seems dominating all over the world, even here in New South Wales, though you have stood against it, and stood against it well, and I glory in New South Wales that she has done so. (Cheers.) But let me tell you, and tell you frankly, that in my opinion you free traders in New South Wales will fight a losing battle unless you make it an aggressive one—unless you go further forward. (Cheers.)

PROTECTION A MONSTROUS FALLACY.

Protection—it is a monstrous fallacy from one end to the other. (Cheers.) It is bolstered up only by fallacies. (Renewed cheering.) Protection can in only one sense make work—it can only make work as floods make work, as fire makes work, as wars make work, as Pharaoh made work when he told the children of Israel to make bricks without straw. (Cheers.) But mark you this, that we may stand up and expose the fallacies of protection one after another until kingdom come and protection will still exist. (Hear, hear.) It will still find its advocates, it will still live and there make its advances unless we go further than exposing the fallacies of protection. (Hear, hear.) What is required for the triumph of free trade all over the world is something more than the exposure of the fallacies of protection. All over the world to-day there are great masses of men who see in such things as fires and wars and floods a benefit to themselves. If outside the children of Israel making bricks there had stood a fringe of unemployed men who could find nothing to do and who looked with envy at these Israelites making bricks, why Pharaoh's act would have seemed to them like a boon. (Hear, hear.) Here are all these gifts that have come as though showered down by the beneficence of the Creator—in one man's mind the thought that harnesses steam to his service, to another man the idea that harnesses the lightning to his service, in every direction iron arms and steel fingers have arisen to make toil easier, to enable the productive powers of man to enormously increase. And what do they do toward satisfying his wants? All over the world to-day there are great masses of men who look upon labor-saving machinery as an injury and a curse. And so to them it seems. Why, it ought not to be. If we would employ protection we must answer the question why is it that with all the improvements and inventions with which our country has been prolific the words of John Stuart Mill yet stand true—that it is impossible to point to the fact that they have lightened the toil or made it easier for the masses. (Cheers.)

FREE TRADE AN IMPROVEMENT.

Free trade would be an improvement. (Hear, hear.) Strike down all tariffs and the

produce of wealth would become larger. But so had all these inventions increased the production of wealth. If they had not gone to increase the wealth of the masses how can we expect that free trade would? What is the reason? It is perfectly clear to him who will look. It is on the land that we all stand, even though it be on the pinnacle of the tallest tower, it is on the land that we must all work; it is from the land that this very flesh and blood of ours comes to us and eventually returns again. The fundamental fact everywhere is the relation between man and the land. (Hear, hear.) We may improve and improve; we may invent and invent; we may reform and reform, and as long as the masses of men are disinherited of their natural rights, as long as some men own the land the others make valuable, that long—no matter what we do, just as population increases, just as productive powers advance—must the condition of the working classes become not better, but worse. Why then do I bother myself about free trade? I presume I ought to say why. I am speaking my own sentiments—the sentiments of men like Mr. Garland and Mr. Foxall, who sit on this platform to-night. I am not speaking the sentiments of the chairman or other men who may be associated with him. They are free traders, I presume, in what has been the orthodox Cobden club meaning of the word. I am not that kind of free trader. (Cheers.) Why do I bother myself about this tariff question? I fully recognize if we were to stop with abolishing custom houses that there would be a great improvement for a little while, but ultimately things would be no better for the masses of the people. That I think can be clearly proved to demonstration. Suppose you cut this city in half as it were, just as this aisle in this hall separates the hall into two parts. Now, if on one side of Sydney you put heavy taxes and charge duties on everything that comes in—sugar, salt, iron, clothes, everything else, and on the other side you take away all these taxes, what would be the result in the price of land?

REASON FOR FIGHTING PROTECTION.

Why do I waste my time in fighting protection? For this reason, that protection is linked, and closely linked, with everything that enslaves man. (Cheers.) Because it makes no difference now, whatever differences there may be by and by, as far as I am concerned, between these men like myself and those men like our respected chairman; we are going together as far as we can. Behind those men I will stand and to them I will give a loyal support. (Cheers.) Every step they make toward free trade I will do my utmost to help them on. (Cheers.) Because the quicker we take the first step the more quickly shall we reach the end of the race. (Cheers.) I say protection is linked with everything that enslaves man. (Renewed cheers.) What has everywhere enslaved men? This theory of our socialistic friends, or so-called scientific friends, that man was at first a serf, a slave, and gradually won his freedom so far, is, in the very nature of things, wrong. (Hear, hear.) It is not trannism which is eternal, which existed in the beginning—it is freedom. (Cheers.) Man was created free. The great agency of slavery everywhere is war. War is necessarily the enslaver—even war for a just cause. (Hear, hear.) You cannot organize men into an army even to fight for freedom without endangering that personal liberty. War has always been the enslaver. What does protection do but to foster and encourage the jealousy of men (cheers), to tell them that Christ's message was a lie, to tell them that "they don't know everything down in Judee." (Laughter.) "We may," they say, "in some sort of sense and in the good time coming, but now we must keep our neighbors from getting ahead of us and must fence ourselves in with these tariffs." Mr. Trenwith in Melbourne, in spite of himself, could not help speaking of "sauerkraut Germans." (Laughter.) Go to the United States and what do you hear but references to pauper English labor? Everywhere the spirit of envy, everywhere the drawing of lines separating men more than the seas and mountains do. It is 7,000 miles across the ocean from your country to my country, and our tariff keeps us far more distant than these 7,000 miles. Protection! Why, everywhere what does it do? It involves unnecessary complexities of government, its spies search and seize, and its guards are employed to pounce on every ship that is coming in. (Hear, hear.) It is always a temptation to corruption. In Australia I do not think you fully realize that. But be warned by the examples of the American colonies.

FEDERATION, BUT NOT PROTECTION.

If you do make a federation—and I hope you will (cheers)—do not, by direction or indirect, intrust to that federal body the power of levying a protective duty. (Loud cheers.) If you do you will see it grow as we have seen it grow in the United States; you will see great interests arising and combining their special interests to make laws to tax the people, to insist on maintaining those laws, ready to enter into politics and to support those from the very beginning who will do their utmost to maintain and also to subsidize papers to bully and cajole, to log-roll and to corrupt the leaders of workingmen's societies. (Applause.)

A FALSE, A LYING AND DEGRADING PHILOSOPHY.

We should one and all consider it our duty

to break down this idea of protection, because all over the world it is leading workmen on the wrong track. It is taking them off the path where victory is to be gained. It is teaching them a false, a lying and a degrading philosophy. (Cheers.) Protection! How can any man who appreciates the dignity of labor be a protectionist? Labor? Is it that poor, weak thing that it can only be supported by custom house laws and tariff officers? Is labor so weak that it needs protection or subsidy? (Cheers.) Certainly not. Monopoly does. (Renewed cheers.) Rings and combinations may require and demand it; but the true laboring man who appreciates the dignity of labor sees that all labor needs is freedom. (Cheers.)

LABOR, AND NOT CAPITAL, THE PRODUCER OF WAGES.

What is this protective theory which has been introduced in other countries and colonies? We are constantly told that it is necessary to keep the money in the country, so that the employer class may have more to give to the employed class. (Laughter.) Now, I should like to ask, who is the producer of wages? Does the employer evolve them as the capitalist spins his web? Necessarily they come from the earnings of labor itself. (Hear, hear.) Labor is everywhere the real employer of labor. It is work that everywhere pays wages. (Cheers.) Therefore, this theory of capital, ignoring the very first principles, teaches the degradation of labor and does accomplish the degradation of labor. It would be utterly impossible for any man who holds this theory to realize what are the true rights of labor and to realize what this world might be if we were to base our institutions on the supreme law of justice, recognizing that simple maxim of Christianity which teaches us to do unto others as we would have them do unto us, and if we, instead of keeping it as a counsel to protection carried it into our individual lives—our political lives and our social lives—and made it the very foundation of the laws of the state. (Hear, hear.)

FREE TRADE IN THE FULL SENSE.

Therefore it is that we are engaged in this struggle which is but the continuation of the struggle which began in England when Richard Cobden, taking the hand of John Bright, led him from a newly-filled grave and said to him: "There are women and children dying of hunger—of hunger caused by the laws; come with me and we will not rest until we have repealed them." (Cheers.) It is not given to any one generation to accomplish all. It is seldom permitted to even the greatest of men to have more than a partial view of the truth; but if he only be faithful to it, it will lead him on and on. England is not free trade any more than New South Wales. Free trade in the full sense has yet to come (cheers), and when it comes pauperism will disappear. (Hear, hear.) Free trade is good because it involves freedom. Free trade is good because trade is a mode of production—not merely a mode but an all-important mode of production—that it brings to those who want them the things which have been made, that it cheapens those commodities which are required to pay for other commodities, that without it the powers of the human mind are restricted and cannot have free play, that production cannot go on on a large and important scale save under this system, and the freer the trade the better it will go on in all its branches. Free trade means free production; therefore the principles of free trade tend not to revenue tariffs, but to the abolition of all tariffs; and not merely that, but to the abolition of all taxes on imports, of restrictions which prevent any man from doing all he pleases to aid in producing wealth, that prevent, check, hinder or confine him against adding in any way to the sum of wealth. All such taxes must be abolished. (Applause.)

HOW TO RAISE REVENUE.

When they are abolished, how can revenue be raised? There is only one way in which any large amount of revenue can be raised consistent with those ideas, that is by taking for the community that value which attaches to land by the growth of the community, irrespective of what anybody, not working, has done to acquire it. When we achieve that, then freedom comes. Then all men living in the country that shall abolish these taxes which prevent communication resting on production and exchange, and raises its revenue by taking that value, will become citizens standing on an equal plane with regard to the principles of trade and commerce. That is what real free trade means. That is what Richard Cobden saw in the distance. The landed aristocracy who caused the protection fight were wise in their day and generation, and they surrendered before the campaign had been quite carried to its natural conclusion.

AN IMPENDING STRUGGLE.

But the struggle is coming on again. (Hear, hear.) In Ireland it is already beginning. Michael Davitt is leading it (applause) to procure the land, not for the peasant or the farmer, but for the whole Irish people, through the medium of the single tax. (Cheers.) All over England, Wales and Scotland the struggle is commencing. In the United States it is the very heart of the free trade fight, and there the single taxers have been doing all they can to convince men, not by the thousand or hundred thousand, and pull them out from the prevailing superstitions.

tion and make of them not revenue reformers but real free traders. (Cheers.)

VALEDICTORY.

It is, as I hope, to carry on that fight that I leave you to go home. This is the last time I shall speak to a New South Wales audience. (A voice, "Come again.") Possibly; no man can tell what is in the future. I hope I shall come again. (Prolonged cheering.) But there is much to do. What remains to a man of life is every day growing less. I may come again and I may not. At any rate, I leave you now. I have been here long enough, and traveled through your colony enough, and made acquaintances enough to be at home here. (Cheers.)

AUSTRALIA AHEAD OF THE WORLD.

I go away, but I shall always think of this country and of this colony as I never thought before. There are men who live in my memory wherever I have been, and I can say, I think, that I leave friends—friends whose friendship I cherish. (Cheers.) I have been enormously impressed with the future possibilities of this country. In many respects those possibilities are not appreciated. I never realized how much good land you have; I never realized fully how grand your future must be until I came here. In other respects, in many things you are ahead of us, in many things you are, I imagine, ahead of the world. You are ahead of us very far. You have no Jay Goulds, no Vanderbilts; you have no tariffs for millionaires—at least, if you have, they are on a very small scale. You are doing things every day, and are so used to them that you think nothing of them, that many of us in the United States are saying that it is impossible to do. I have traveled a good many miles in these colonies, but I have never yet traveled save in a car and over rails owned by the people. (Cheers.) In this, as in many other things—notably in your ballot system—you are ahead. Thank God, we in the United States are getting that ballot system, and with that comes the power of thousands of men who are to-day intimidated by their protectionist employers (cheers), who rule at election times, when the millions that the protected rings raise are put into a corruption fund in order to keep up the wages of the American workmen. You are a new land, you are a rich land, you are a homogeneous people, you are blessed beyond other nations in this that you have never had (and may God in his providence always avert it) a war. (Cheers.) Our republic was cradled in war. (A voice, "By free trade.") No; by protection! The reading of what might have been one people was occasioned by a crazy king (cheers)—brutal ministers (cheers)—by the selfish policy of the protective party of England (cheers)—by restrictive laws. (Prolonged cheering.) You, therefore, in these things are ahead of the other people. With opportunity comes the responsibility. The nation to whom much is given much is required from. Your very opportunities, your very blessings make it incumbent upon you to lead the world. (Cheers.)

WELL DONE, NEW SOUTH WALES.

You have done well, sturdy colony of New South Wales, in not yielding to the blandishments of protection. (Cheers.) Don't let it take you unawares, or in any case don't put it in the hands of anybody to put a protective barrier across the mouth of this beautiful harbor. (Cheers.) Do more. Step forward and abolish what duties you have and set to the world an example of free trade. (Loud cheers.) I am ready to praise all that is good in your institutions—I see much more than I can speak about just at present—but one thing must strike every American the other way—your centralized government; your want of home rule. (Cheers.) The demoralizing manner in which you ladle out subsidies to the municipalities, the unjust manner in which you rake in money from the ex-tremities and then dole it out again disproportionately. The people of the municipalities don't even plant trees on their own account; they wait to get a donation of trees from the government or a pound for pound subsidy. (Cheers and laughter.) The biggest thing you could do now would be to insist upon the passage of a local government bill. (Applause, and a voice: "What do you think of the proposed property vote?") Well, I don't think anything of the property voting. (Laughter.) That great meeting called by Mayor Burdekin showed the strength of that spirit of local self government, and I have found many municipalities demanding it. But there must be a general demand for it, because there are quite wealthy interests which may in the past have prevented the passing of such a bill and may do it again if the people do not bestir themselves. And there is a principle that ought to be included in that bill—a principle which is included in a bill now before the parliament in South Australia and certain to go through though twice before rejected—that is the principle of allowing municipalities to levy all their rates, if by voting they elect to do so, upon the unimproved value of land. (Cheers.) They will not tax the improvements; they will not put a penalty upon the man who builds a house or ornaments his grounds; they will recognize the principle that underlies the true right of property; that whatever a man does to produce wealth he ought to profit by it; that whatever a man makes by exercise of mind or hand should be his. (Cheers.) I feel, indeed, that in all these colonies you are going

to advance. Here I trust the local government bill will pass. I trust the reports I have heard that your treasurer when he brings in his financial statement will put in it, to some extent at least, the abolition of customs duties and, to some extent at least, impose a tax on land values. (Loud cheers.) No matter how little they are, they are a beginning. We must creep before we can walk. Even though we advance only by one step after another, every step that is taken brings the goal nearer. Every step you take is not merely for your own people and your children, but for all the people of the world, and most of all for us of the English speaking world; not only for your children, but for the children of all men, for those little children who are hungering and festering and dying in the slums of London; not merely for the victims of ill-paid labor like those sweated women of Melbourne and like the poor creatures, who ought to be somebody's wives, that in all centers of civilization may be found after nightfall on the streets; but for everything that is good, for everything that is true, trust freedom and follow her. (Prolonged cheering.)

THE RALLYING CRY.

"Free trade, free land, free men." That is the rallying cry of the single tax men of America. Let it be yours. (Cheers.) And I know in leaving here that the good seed has been set (cheers); that the reapers are among the corn. (Cheers.) Men like those on this platform, men such as I have found everywhere I have been in New South Wales—like Mr. Ryan of Lithgow—they are to be guarantees enough for the future. (Cheers.) The movement is everywhere, though best I think in New South Wales. But even in Victoria, where workmen have bowed down and abased themselves at the feet of protection, there is life and stir, and I am glad to know that there is established there a free trade and democratic association. (Cheers.) Aye, and it is rightly named. Free trade goes with democracy—protection: it is but a toryism! (Cheers.) Don't palter with it; don't knuckle to it—strike it wherever you go. Strike it down. Bring men like this once protectionist advocate, Mr. Caulfield, to see the beauty and the strength and the glory of free trade, and all struggle on its side. (Cheers.) Some of the so-called free traders, men who are afraid of their horses, some of the timid sort of free traders who surrendered so quickly to protection (a voice—"Dibbs" and laughter) they may desert you and become protectionists, but for every one that goes there you will gain ten. (Great cheering.)

Mr. George resumed his seat amid a perfect tornado of applause.

The chairman suggested that as it was the last meeting at which Mr. George would speak in Sydney the audience should bid him good-by by giving him three ringing cheers. The response was quickly made and the proceedings terminated.

RECRUIT SUBSCRIPTION BOOKS FOR "THE STANDARD."

For the convenience of persons wishing to send THE STANDARD on trial to their friends, we have prepared recruit subscription books. They are handsomely bound in heavy alligator paper, and sold at prices regulated by the number of blanks in each book.

These blanks are each an order on THE STANDARD to send the paper for four weeks to the person designated, and they save all trouble of remittance as they are paid for in advance. As soon as one of the blanks reaches our business office a postal card is sent to the person designated, informing him that at the request of the sender THE STANDARD will be sent to him for four weeks, beginning with the next issue, and that in case he does not wish to continue it it will be stopped at the end of that time. This attracts more attention to it than is given to a sample copy sent out directly from the office.

Every active worker for the single tax should have in his pocket a recruit subscription book, in order that he may be able to tear out the blanks and order the paper sent to anyone with whom he has been having an argument on the subject. If our friends will use the stubs in the books and keep a record of those to whom they order the paper sent they will be able to follow the matter up and probably make converts. The price of the books is as follows:

Five subscriptions	\$1 00
Twelve subscriptions	2 00
Thirty-five subscriptions	5 00

THE STANDARD,

No. 19 Union square, New York city.

THEY DEMAND A LOW TARIFF.

The Nebraska republican state convention, which met at Lincoln, July 24, has placed the following tariff plank in its platform:

We favor a revision of the tariff in the interests of the producer and laborer. The import duties on articles of common use should be placed as low as is consistent with the protection of American industries.

PLENTY, AND YET PEOPLE STARVE.

Boston Globe.

"We are rich enough to support 300,000,000 souls!" exclaimed Orator John De Witt Miller at the Chautauquan gathering at Lakeview Wednesday. All the more unfortunate is it that our imperfect industrial conditions permit about 1,000,000 hungry souls to go about constantly seeking for work and bread.

BALLOT REFORM.

THE NEW YORK ELECTION LAW.

THE CHANGES MADE NECESSARY, AND THE COST OF GETTING READY FOR THE FALL ELECTION.

Police Commissioner McClave talked with a World reporter last week about the new election law. He told the reporter that the number of election districts had been cut down from 1,019 to 947, thus saving about \$40,000 in salaries. This saving is more than counterbalanced by the increased expenditure in providing for ballots, new ballot boxes and voters' booths, which will probably reach a quarter of a million dollars. The machinery for the new order of things will involve a great outlay of money, which, of course, need not be repeated in full each year, as, for instance, the purchase of nearly six thousand booths, which may cost all the way from \$3 to \$4 each; 200 portable houses, or street booths, at \$250 each, and the 3,000 ballot boxes required, averaging a cost of about \$2 each.

Commissioner Voorhis estimates that there will be fifteen tickets in the field, and the printing of sufficient ballots for each party, to comply with the law, will cost \$45,000; cards of instruction will cost \$360 more. The rent of the proper polling places will probably be increased \$15 each, making \$12,000 for 800 places. So the total cost of the coming election will be \$307,860. It is known that the Tammany organization spent in the Fourteenth assembly district \$400 for each election district, and it was said after the election that the expenses of Tammany for election day were over \$250,000. It is reasonable to presume that the republicans and county democrats spent nearly the same amount, not to count the other tickets that were in the field. The county paid for the expenses of conducting the election about \$100,000. Therefore in the neighborhood of \$600,000 was spent in 1889, which in the end the people had to pay, and yet they had very little to say as to who should represent them. The estimates made by the police commissioners are the highest that have been seen so far; so the voters of this city may congratulate themselves that we are on the eve of cheaper elections, in which all of us can run for office on as good terms as the candidates of the machines. When the legislature makes a law that shall compel the names of all candidates for one office to be put under one heading the election law will be still more simplified, the cost of printing lessened by about \$35,000, and independent candidates will stand a better chance even than they will this fall.

PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRATS PLEDGED

THE ISSUE ON WHICH THE FIGHT WILL BE MADE THIS FALL

York, Pa., Gazette.

The leading issue to be made by the democratic party in the coming campaign will be that in favor of a constitutional convention for ballot reform. This is the straight road—in very truth, the only road—to ballot reform. The people demand it, and they will choose a democratic governor and a democratic legislature in order to get it.

Many thousands of citizens, agreeing with Mr. Powderly and the Knights of Labor, have served notice that they will be satisfied with nothing less than complete and immediate emancipation from the sway of the machine, the boss and the boss, and to that end the odious marked ballot provision must come out of the constitution. If any newspaper in the eastern part of the state is authorized to speak for Governor Pattison it is the Philadelphia Record. If any newspaper in the western part of the state is authorized to speak for him it is the Pittsburgh Post; and they have both taken the most advanced ground upon this vital subject.

"Pattison, Black and ballot reform," is the watch word along the line, which means more for the welfare of the people of this commonwealth than any political issue presented in our time. Every good citizen desires the elimination of corruption and monopoly from our politics, and the only way to secure that deliverance is by the restoration of a pure and free ballot to the hands of the people.

A secret ballot alone can be pure and free; and a secret ballot can be had here only by the proposed change in the constitution. The Scranton convention having declared for the Australian system, of which secrecy is the essence and the substance, has necessarily declared against the marked ballot provision and in favor of an immediate constitutional convention as the only means of removing it within a period of five years. It is the view of the democratic candidates and of all honest ballot reformers from the Delaware to the Ohio, and it will command an enormous majority of the honest voters of the commonwealth.

AN IMPEDIMENT IN THE WAY.

THE PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRATS FAVOR A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION TO SECURE BALLOT REFORM.

Pittsburg Post.

There is a constitutional impediment in the way of a secret ballot in this state, and that is the requirement that all ballots shall be numbered and the number recorded by the

election officers opposite the name of the voter. Of course, this destroys the absolute secrecy of the ballot. This can be changed in but two ways—by the legislature proposing a constitutional amendment or by calling a constitutional convention to submit such amendment for ratification. By the former plan ballot reform could not be accomplished before 1894 or 1895. The amendment, if approved by the legislature of 1891, would have to go to the legislature in 1893, submitted to the people and ratified, say, in the fall of that year; laws to carry out the amendment could not be adopted before the meeting of the legislature in January, 1895.

Leading democrats favor a constitutional convention which will make short work of the business. Delegates to it could be elected at the spring election of 1891, convened in the summer, and its work ratified by the people in the fall. A special session of the legislature could be convened in the winter of 1891-92 to pass the necessary laws, and the presidential election of 1892 could be held under the reform methods.

The democracy of the state are unanimously in favor of the reform. We hear of no opposition. The absolutely secret ballot as a barrier to bribery and intimidation is their only hope for better political conditions in Pennsylvania. Principle and expediency alike commend ballot reform to the democratic party. With the secret and official ballot there would be no more doubt of Robert E. Pattison's election this fall than of the recurrence of the November election day.

THE NEW SYSTEM IN INDIANA.

GOSCHEN HOLDS A SATISFACTORY ELECTION UNDER THE AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM.

New York Herald, July 22.

The Goschen Hoosier feels himself a little better than his brother Hoosiers to-day, for he has had his first practical test of the new Indiana Australian election law. An election was held upon the question of voting a subsidy of \$52,000 in aid of the Toledo and Chicago air line railroad, a road which will be built from Toledo to Chicago during the next twelve months, and which will pass through this city. The aid was carried by a majority of about four hundred.

Much interest was taken in this election, as it is the first one held in the state under the new law. There has been quite a campaign of education carried on by the friends of this law, and little trouble was experienced by the inspectors in keeping the election straight. Three booths were reserved for the voters, wherein they marked their ballots after having the poll clerk's signature on the back. About twenty ballots have been thrown out on account of not having the clerk's initials on the back.

The booths look a great deal like canvas covered bird cages and cover a man from his head down to his hips. This hood contains a board, pad and stamp for the convenience of the voter. The modus operandi is even simpler than that of the old way of voting, and the fear of various complications arising in its workings has been dispelled. It can be safely predicted that the new system will give general satisfaction.

REPUBLICAN PAPERS IN REVOLT.

New York Times.

A great many of the influential republican papers of Kansas are in a state of revolt against the McKinley bill, as, for example, the Wichita Eagle, the Salina Republican, the Topeka Journal, the Fort Scott Monitor, the Kansas City Gazette, the Sumner County Press, the Emporia Republican. The Topeka Capital, the leading republican paper of Kansas, is very earnestly opposing the McKinley bill. In a recent article upon the tariff it said: "The first tariff act passed by the American congress—and it was the first general act of any character—expressed in its preamble the object and reason of the bill—revenue and protection—revenue to support the government and pay the debts of the United States, and protection to domestic manufactures. The word is manufactures not manufacturers. It was never intended by our lawmakers that individual persons should be beneficiaries of the tariff laws to the exclusion of the general interests of the people. It was never intended to prohibit importation of needed articles."

PROTECTION AND WAGES.

Philadelphia Justice.

The theory that protected employers will divide their ill-gotten gains with their employees received a severe shock last week in this city. Messrs. Harrison and Frazier are a firm of sugar refiners who are making hundreds of thousands of dollars every year by the aid of the tariff on sugar which enables them to pay very large wages. Unfortunately for the protective theory they not only do not pay large wages, but their employees seem to have considerable difficulty in getting any wages at all. Some weeks ago about one hundred of their men became dissatisfied with the system under which they were paid, and asked that in future they be paid the fixed sum of \$45 per month. This does not seem a princely sum for men to pay who are making fortunes every year, but the request was promptly declined. One of the men then decided to quit work, but when he made application for his back wages he was told they were forfeited, because he had not given notice. He is now suing the firm, and it is to be hoped the case will be given wide publication. Such practical lessons are calculated to shake the faith of the most hide-bound protectionist.

THE FREE TRADE FIGHT.

THE MCKINLEY BILL.

The first vote was taken on the McKinley bill last Monday. It was on a motion of Senator McPherson of New Jersey that the bill be sent back to the finance committee with instructions to fix up a measure in which the average rate of duty shall not be greater than the average tariff of 1864. It was defeated by a strict party vote—republicans 29, democrats 19. The reading of the bill by paragraphs, for amendment, was begun immediately after Mr. McPherson's motion was defeated.

WANT BETTER CONGRESSMEN.

A CONFERENCE OF LEADING SOCIAL POLITICAL CLUBS DECIDE THAT NEW YORK CITY MUST BE BETTER REPRESENTED IN WASHINGTON.

The conference of clubs called by the Manhattan single tax club met at 73 Lexington avenue last Thursday evening. There were present as representatives: Messrs. Stapler and Hinman of the Reform club; Messrs. Su'berger and Mason of the Harlem democratic club; Messrs. Browne, Gilligan, Bethune, McKechnie, Breunig, McGill and Klein of the Workingmen's tariff reform league; Messrs. Deming and Beall of the Free trade club, and Messrs. McCabe, Steers, Croasdale, Woodward, Macdaniel, O'Neill and Shriver of the Manhattan single tax club. W. T. Croasdale was called to the chair and A. J. Steers was elected secretary.

The chairman stated the object for which the conference had been called (as set forth in THE STANDARD of July 23), and after some debate, a committee was appointed to draw up resolutions embodying the points on which all the delegates were agreed. They retired and when they returned submitted the following, which was unanimously adopted:

The tariff is a tax; and the interests of the whole country, north as well as south, east as well as west, demand a reform of our tariff laws by the removal of all duties upon the raw materials of our manufactures, and the removal and adjustment of the remaining duties in the interest of the consumer. And in especial, the great city of New York, the first city of the Union in population, in wealth, in intelligence, and in the magnitude of interests involved, should have as its representatives in congress men capable of fitly representing these interests, and not mere voting automata, unknown to the country at large, and whose very names are entirely unfamiliar to the vast majority of their own constituents.

Resolved, That it is the sentiment of this conference that the clubs represented should take measures to secure from the regular democratic organizations in this city the nomination as candidates for congress of intelligent, competent, fully equipped men, thoroughly committed to the reduction of tariff taxation.

Resolved, That in the event of the failure of such organizations to nominate such men, steps should be taken to place suitable candidates for congress in nomination.

Then a committee was appointed to prepare an address to the people of New York city, based on the declarations in the resolutions, to report at the next meeting. A committee on organization was also appointed, which will submit a plan at the next meeting. Each delegation was instructed to bring to the next meeting a list of its club membership, classified into congressional districts. These lists will be consolidated, and the work of enrolment actively begun.

The next meeting of the conference will be held at the same place, Monday evening, August 4.

COMING INTO OUR NET.

BLAINE'S ANSWER TO FRYE—HIS LETTER CREATES CONSTERNATION IN THE PROTECTION CAMP—IN HIS OPINION, EXCHANGING GOODS FOR GOODS "IS THE HIGHEST FORM OF PROTECTION," AND IS "THE BEST WAY TO PROMOTE TRADE."

Secretary Blaine has drawn the line between his and the Reed-McKinley protective policy in a letter to Senator Frye. It is described as a bombshell, and has created consternation in the republican ranks in congress. The New York Star says that if the McKinley bill becomes law, Blaine will resign and start an anti-McKinley-Reed-Harrison campaign within the republican party. Here is Mr. Blaine's letter:

BAR HARBOR, Me., July 22, 1890.

Dear Mr. Frye: I have your reply to my letter and am glad that the essential part of it has been given to the press. You ask me what assurance I have as to Spain's willingness to enter into reciprocal arrangements of trade with the United States. Your question surprises me, for you cannot have forgotten that only six years ago the prime minister of Spain, in his anxiety to secure free admission to our markets for the sugar of Cuba and Porto Rico, agreed to a very extensive treaty of reciprocity with Mr. John W. Foster, then our minister at Madrid. A year before—in 1883—a very admirable treaty of reciprocity was negotiated by General Grant and Mr. William H. Trescott, as United States commissioners, with the republic of Mexico—a treaty well considered in all its parts and all its details—whose results would, I believe, have proved highly advantageous to both countries.

In view of the pending discussion it is a somewhat singular circumstance that both these treaties of reciprocity failed to secure

the approval of congress, and failed for the express reason that both provided for the free admission of sugar. Congress would not then allow a single pound of sugar to come in free of duty under any circumstances whatever. And now the proposition is to open our ports free to everybody's sugar, and to do it with such rapidity that we are not to have a moment's time to see if we cannot make a better trade—a trade by which we may pay for at least a part of the sugar in the products of American farms and shops.

Our change of opinion has certainly been remarkable in so brief a period. Indeed, the only danger of our not securing advantageous treaties of reciprocity now is the possible belief on the part of those countries that we are so anxious for free sugar that by patient waiting they can secure all they desire without money and without price.

Fearing that result I sought an interview with the eight republican members of the committee on ways and means more than five months ago—to be exact, on the 10th day of last February. I endeavored to convince them that it would be expedient and wise to leave to the president, as the treaty making power, an opportunity to see what advantageous arrangements of reciprocal trade could be effected. I was unable to persuade the committee to take my view. I mention this circumstance now, because it has been charged in many quarters that the suggestion for reciprocity came too late. In fact, my effort was made before the tariff bill was reported to the house or even framed in committee.

It is, I think, a very grave mistake to oppose this reciprocal proposition touching sugar from the fear that it may conflict in some way with the policy of protection. The danger is, I think, wholly in the opposite direction. Let us see what is proposed: Our government has heretofore collected a heavy duty from sugar, amounting one year, in the aggregate, to \$58,000,000, and averaging \$50,000,000 per annum for a considerable period. We wish now to cheapen sugar by removing the duty.

The value of the sugar we annually consume is enormous. Shall we pay for it all in cash or shall we seek a reciprocal arrangement by which a large part of it may be paid for in pork and beef and flour, in lumber and salt and iron, in shoes and calico and furniture, and a thousand other things? In short, shall we pay for it all in cash or try friendly barter in part? I think the latter mode is the highest form of protection and the best way to promote trade.

I address this note to you, as I did my first, because you have taken an active and most intelligent interest in the increase of our trade with South America. When shall we enlarge our commercial intercourse with that great continent if we do not now make a beginning? If we now give away the duty on sugar (as we already have given away the duties on coffee and hides and rubber), and get nothing in exchange which shall be profitable to the farm or the factory in the United States, what shall be our justification of the policy?

You have recently received congratulations—in which I cordially join—on carrying the shipping bill through the senate. Do you not think that a line of ships generously aided by the government will have a better prospect for profit and for permanence if we can give them outward cargoes from the United States and not confine them to inward cargoes from Latin America. I am, sincerely yours, JAMES G. BLAINE.

Hon. William P. Frye, United States senate.

THE WORKINGMEN'S TARIFF REFORM LEAGUE.

The regular weekly meeting of the Workingmen's tariff reform league was held last Friday evening at 73 Lexington avenue. The delegation to the conference of clubs (which was held the night before) reported their action [which appears under another heading in this department]. The membership is increasing at a satisfactory rate, there being now nearly 500 names enrolled. An active canvass will be kept up.

There was considerable indignation manifested over the failure of the Brunner express company to deliver the printing at the Cooper union meeting, which will make itself felt in the financial department of that company. Next Friday evening the usual weekly meeting will be held; meantime members of the league will be in attendance at 73 Lexington avenue every evening and Sundays, to give information concerning the league and its objects.

THREE PEN PICTURES.

"FREE TRADE BOOKKEEPING" VS. NOTHING TO KEEP BOOKS ON.

The Evening Sun is opposed to free trade ideas, as is its parent, Old-Man-With-a-Knife-in-His-Boot, but, unlike him, it does not conceal its opposition as skillfully as does the morning organ. It struck an item in an English paper last Thursday which gave it the opportunity it long had sought, and printed it in the editorial columns, with comments, and entitled it "A Page of 'Free Trade Bookkeeping.'" Here it is:

A certain class of idiots think that this country needs free trade, and, like all idiots, have theories.

"Free trade would help the workingman,"

they say, "and make food and all necessary clothing so much cheaper that, though wages should be reduced, real comfort and happiness would be increased, all things being on a sound normal basis."

If any real workingman has been influenced by such drivellings, it may instruct him to read this extract from the London Pall Mall Gazette:

"He and his brother postmen thought the minimum pay of 18s. per week was too low, and that it was almost impossible for men to maintain themselves on such a small wage." So said the spokesman of the postmen's deputation to Mr. Raikes yesterday. How married men do manage to maintain themselves on that sum we learn from the pathetic letter which has found its way into print from a postman's wife.

First there is rent, 4s. for one large room; six loaves at 4½d., 2s. 3d.; fresh meat for Sunday, 10d.; cuttings for Wednesday to make soup, 4d.; herbs for do., 1d.; meat Saturday, 6d.; bacon during week, 4d.; vegetables, 1s.; 1 pound butter, 1s.; flour, 5d.; rice, 1½d.; treacle, 1½d.; tea, 9d.; cocoa, 3d.; milk, 3½d.; sugar, 4d.; two eggs, 1½d.; cheese, 3d.; jam, 4d.; condiments, 1½d.; coals, ½ cwt. at 1s. 2d., 10½d.; loose wool, 3d.; soap, soda, matches, hearthstone, black lead, etc., 4½d.; oil, 3d. Husband having so much walking, he wears two pairs of boots per year at 9s. per pair; repairs of same, 5s. 10d. (average 5½d. per week); myself, two pairs at 5s.; boots for two children, 10s. per year; repairs, 3s. 10d.—£1 3s. 10d., or 5½d. per week; insurance of children, 2d.; school fee for one, 2d.; Postmen's auxiliary benefit society, 3d.; Postmen's union subscription, 2d.; weekly newspaper, 1d. Clothing for self and two children cannot be reckoned at less than £2 10s. per year, or 1s. per week. Balance, ½d. This is how we have laid out our 18s., my husband keeping 1s. for himself, out of which he buys his own private clothes, including shirts and socks. He smokes a little sometimes, but happily he does not drink. When he can afford it he goes to the baths, which costs him 3d., as there is no bath room where we live. So you see, though we are not extravagant, we cannot save for old age or even for a holiday, and to buy other articles needed in the house we must do without something mentioned above.

It is probable that the average American workingman's wife, if it came to a pinch, would object to the "normal basis" which would make bookkeeping such a feature in her life and seven cents a week the family allowance for milk.

Of course this is a hard case of bookkeeping, and, if true—mind, if true—shows that the laboring classes in England have to figure closely in order to get along. However, we venture the assertion that tens of thousands of pages of "bookkeeping" could be secured right in this protected city, which would double discount the harrowing statement which appears above. Yet is it harrowing? Let us see how the items look when set out by themselves.

Rent is the first item—four shillings a week for one large room. Can a large room be got for that anywhere in the decent districts of New York city? But let that pass.

Bread, meat, meat cuttings, herbs, bacon, vegetables, butter, flour, rice, treacle, tea, cocoa, milk, sugar, eggs, cheese, jam, condiments—that is a pretty fair variety—thousands of families in this city do not fare half as well. And so the list goes on. We hope that there is no greater misery in England than appears in this "bookkeeping" account. The trouble with "bookkeeping" is the same as with statistics—both can be made to lie. Now, fortunately, we have two cases which involve no "bookkeeping," free trade or otherwise. They are frozen facts and "bookkeeping" does not enter into the case. We suppose they are true, for they are taken from the same paper in which is printed the "bookkeeping" extract above—in other words, from the Evening Sun, of date January 6, 1890. Here they are:

A woman, tall and statuesque, bearing a laughing, pale-faced child in her arms, said she had no home. You might have thought she was Mary Anderson, a little coarse featured, but nevertheless, with a contour of countenance and form that our Mary would have marvelled at. Judge Hogan murmured something about, "Too bad that a woman like that can find no home," as he signed her commitment to the care of the commissioners of charities and correction.

A tall well-built brunette with a pathetic sorrow-stricken face looking appealingly at the judge. "You are charged with soliciting a man on Madison avenue," he said.

Her lips quivered, she clutched the rail, and her black eyes filled with tears as she endeavored to speak. For a moment her voice was choked, and then, controlling her feelings as best she could, she told a story that is quite common in this city, with all its wealth and charities. A woman named Anderson committed suicide a few days ago because she couldn't obtain work and because she was too honest to lead a disreputable life. The prisoner, who gave the name of Ellen Day, was less proud, and in a moment of desperation had sought the streets as a means of livelihood.

"I couldn't get work," she said, "and I was starving. No one would help me, and last night I started out to get the money that I couldn't earn honestly. I met a man on Madison avenue and he led the way. I know I did wrong, judge, but I'm not a bad woman."

"How did you happen to arrest this woman?" said the judge, addressing the officer.

"I saw her go with the man to a house on Twenty seventh street, and just as she was going in I arrested her."

"Officer, tell your captain about this house, and make a complaint against the proprietor and let me know what steps are being taken in this matter. This arresting girls and letting proprietors escape must be stopped. In the meantime I will hold this girl for five days."

Here is another item, which appeared in the Evening Sun the day after the "bookkeeping" editorial. The incident happened here in New York. In it the "bookkeeping" shows a deficit, and that is probably the reason why no editorial mention was made of it:

The expenses of William Destell of 170 Essex street, employed as a clerk in the gentleman's furnishing store of James W. Johnstone, at 260 Grand street, have increased very much since he was married a few weeks ago, and he was often unable to meet his obligations.

When he was arraigned at Essex market court this morning for stealing \$29.50 from his employer, he said he was guilty. He had nothing else to say except that he was compelled to have the money. His expenses at home amounted to more than his salary, and he was obliged to get the money wherever he could.

Justice Duffy expressed sympathy for the young man, as did his employer, who gave him a very good reputation, but as Destell admitted the charge he was held in \$500 for trial at special sessions.

Is it necessary to make any comment? No; look at the pictures.

AGAINST THE MCKINLEY BILL.

A LEADING PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICAN ANNOUNCES THAT HE WILL VOTE AGAINST THE PARTY.

Norristown, Pa.—J. W. Barker, the well known superintendent of the Norristown carpet mills, and heretofore a staunch republican, announces himself for Pattison for governor. He said: "It is an old saying, but nevertheless true, 'Whom the gods desire to slay they first strike with blindness.' The nomination of Delamater is the covering intended for the eyes; the slaying part of the business will be performed at the ballot boxes. I think that every man that has the welfare of the country at heart will vote against the republican party at the forthcoming election on account of the McKinley tariff or tax bill, under the terms of which the rich can go to Europe and buy their clothes while the poor and middle classes must wear the shoddy made from ails and hair, because the manufacturer will not pay the price for the wool. Our carpets will be made of cotton ails and hair for the same reasons. Where will it end? Domestic goods will be viewed with contempt, and persons with means will purchase the foreign article. The manufacturing industries of the country are suffering on account of the poor demands for goods; to increase the cost will be fatal to many. I shall do all I can, and shall vote the democratic ticket."

FARMERS AGAINST THE TARIFF.

The following anti-tariff plank was adopted by the Farmers' alliance of the state of Minnesota at its recent convention:

We demand that the "war tariff," which has too long survived the object of its creation, shall be radically revised, giving very material reduction on the necessities of life, and placing raw material on the free list to the end that we may compete with the world for a market; and that such luxuries as whisky and tobacco shall in no manner be relieved from internal taxation, till the high protective tariff has been wholly divested of its extortions; and we especially denounce the McKinley bill as the crowning infamy of protection.

CRACKING THE SHELL.

There is nothing sweet for Harrison, Reed and McKinley in Blaine's letter on sugar.—[Chicago Herald.]

The decrease of Ohio sheep under a high tariff proves that the Ohio wool grower knows more about hogging than he has learned about sheeping.—[Louisville Courier-Journal.]

"Smashing" the war tariff that preys upon the poor in the interest of the rich is, in our view, an essential part of "straightout democracy."

J. W. Baker, superintendent of the Norristown carpet mill, after taking a leading part in republican politics in his ward, announces his intention of voting the democratic ticket this fall. His change of heart is due to his opposition to the McKinley bill, which he predicts in a letter to the Daily Register will, should it pass, cripple the fabric manufacturing. In the event of its passage, he says, the better grades of clothing and carpets will be purchased abroad, and the only domestic manufactures in that line will be such as the better classes will shun.—[Mauch Chunk Democrat.]

WE DON'T KNOW ABOUT THAT.

Boston Post.

The McKinley bill comes high, but it begins to look as if we must have it.

SINGLE TAX NEWS.

SINGLE TAX PLATFORM.

The single tax contemplates the abolition of all taxes upon labor or the products of labor—that is to say, the abolition of all taxes save one tax levied on the value of land, irrespective of improvements.

Since in all our states we now levy some tax on the value of land, the single tax can be instituted by the simple and easy way of abolishing, one after another, all other taxes now levied, and commensurately increasing the tax on land values, until we draw upon that one source for all expenses of government; the revenue being divided between local governments, state governments and the general government, as the revenue from direct taxes is now divided between the local and state governments, or a direct assessment being made by the general government upon the states and paid by them from revenues collected in this manner.

The single tax is not a tax on land, and therefore would not fall on the use of land and become a tax on labor.

It is a tax, not on land, but on the value of land. Thus it would not fall on all land, but only on valuable land, and on that not in proportion to the use made of it, but in proportion to its value—the premium which the user of land must pay to the owner, either in purchase money or in rent, for permission to use valuable land. It would thus be a tax, not on the use or improvement of land, but on the ownership of land, taking what would otherwise go to the owner as owner, and not as user.

In assessments under the single tax all values created by individual use or improvement would be excluded, and the only value taken into consideration would be the value attaching to the bare land by reason of neighborhood, etc. Thus the farmer would have no more taxes to pay than the speculator who held a similar piece of land idle, and the man who on a city lot erected a valuable building would be taxed no more than the man who held a similar lot vacant.

The single tax, in short, would call upon men to contribute to the public revenues not in proportion to what they produce or accumulate, but in proportion to the value of the natural opportunities they hold. It would compel them to pay just as much for holding land idle as for putting it to its fullest use.

The single tax, therefore, would—

1. Take the weight of taxation off of the agricultural districts where land has little or no value irrespective of improvements, and put it on towns and cities where bare land rises to a value of millions of dollars per acre.
2. Dispense with a multiplicity of taxes and a horde of taxgatherers, simplify government and greatly reduce its cost.
3. Do away with the fraud, corruption and gross inequality inseparable from our present methods of taxation, which allow the rich to escape while they grind the poor. Land cannot be hid or carried off, and its value can be ascertained with greater ease and certainty than any other.
4. Give us with all the world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the states of our Union, thus enabling our people to share through free exchanges in all the advantages which nature has given to other countries, or which the peculiar skill of other peoples has enabled them to attain. It would destroy the trusts, monopolies, and corruptions which are the outgrowths of the tariff. It would do away with the fines and penalties now levied on any one who improves a farm, erects a house, builds a machine, or in any way adds to the general stock of wealth. It would leave every one free to apply labor or expend capital in production or exchange without fine or restriction, and would leave to each the full product of his exertion.
5. It would, on the other hand, by taking for public uses that value which attaches to land by reason of the growth and improvement of the community, make the holding of land unprofitable to the mere owner and profitable only to the user. It would thus make it impossible for speculators and monopolists to hold natural opportunities unused or only half used, and would throw open to labor the illimitable field of employment which the earth offers to man. It would thus solve the labor problem, do away with involuntary poverty, raise wages in all occupations to the full earnings of labor, make overproduction impossible until all human wants are satisfied, render labor saving inventions a blessing to all, and cause such an enormous production and such an equitable distribution of wealth as would give to all comfort, leisure and participation in the advantages of an advancing civilization.

The ethical principles on which the single tax is based are:

1. Each man is entitled to all that his labor produces. Therefore no tax should be levied on the products of labor.
2. All men are equally entitled to what God has created and to what is gained by the general growth and improvement of the community of which they are a part. Therefore, no one should be permitted to hold natural opportunities without a fair return to all for any special privilege thus accorded to him, and that value which the growth and improvement of the community attaches to land should be taken for the use of the community.

SINGLE TAX CONFERENCE.

SINGLE TAX ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE,
12 UNION SQUARE,
NEW YORK, June 24, 1890.

To the Single Tax Organizations of the United States: At the suggestion of various clubs the single tax enrollment committee some time ago undertook to ascertain the opinion of single tax organizations as to the propriety of holding a national conference. Letters were sent to all the organizations whose names are found on the list kept by the committee, and responses have been received from fifty-nine clubs, which shows that 48 favor holding a conference, 7 oppose it, and 4 are undecided or indifferent. Of the clubs proposing the conference, 25 favor New York, 6 Niagara Falls, 2 Philadelphia, 7 Chicago, 2 Washington and 1 St. Louis, showing a clear majority in favor of holding a conference in New York. There is also a general expression of opinion that the conference should meet at about the time of Henry George's return from his visit to Australia and England.

For nearly two years the single tax enrollment committee has performed the task it voluntarily assumed of gathering signatures to a petition to congress. The petition asks the house of representatives to appoint a committee to consider the propriety of abolishing all direct and indirect taxes on the products of labor and the raising of all public revenues by a single tax on land values. The circulation of the petition has enabled the committee to prepare an enrolment of over 57,000 persons, to each of whom single tax and free trade literature has been mailed, and also a list of active workers. The committee has through the agencies thus put at its disposal rendered assistance in the formation of clubs, and it has during the past year been able to respond to all reasonable requests for the circulation of single tax literature. It has also been compelled, by circumstances, to accept duties and responsibilities not originally contemplated, and properly belonging to a national committee appointed directly by the single tax organizations of the several states. It desires that a conference shall be held, if for no other purpose than the appointment of such a committee.

There are, however, other reasons why a gathering of representative single tax men should be held at this time. Since the single tax movement has been carried on on the practical lines of seeking our ultimate object through the gradual removal of all other taxes, and especially the abrogation of the unjust and burdensome tariff taxes, we have obtained a hearing never before accorded us, and have found many allies ready to go with us at least to the extent of abolishing most of the taxes on the products of labor that now burden and restrict industry. The discussion thus brought about has also disclosed the fact that there are thousands of men who have never accepted our doctrines, who, through a simple course of economic reasoning, have reached the conclusion that a single tax on land values is the ideal method of raising all public revenues. Furthermore, the Knights of Labor have formally declared in favor of taxing land to its full rental value, and after this declaration, that powerful order has been able to form a close connection with the Farmers' alliance, which indicates that the delusion that the single tax will fall with special hardship on farmers is gradually disappearing. This rapid growth of public opinion in favor of a part of our practical programme, gives us every reason to hope for more rapid advances along the same lines in the future, and renders it desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that we shall confer together as to the best means for promoting and guiding the work so well begun.

It is, of course, apparent to all who have actively assisted in the work in which the committee has been engaged, that the newly awakened popular interest in economic questions is largely due to the fact that the tariff question has become the vital issue between the two great parties into which the vast majority of the American people are divided. The differences between these two organizations grow wider from day to day, and in the debates in congress during the present session the question has not been as to what percentage of tariff duty is necessary to the "protection of American labor," but as to whether or not a tariff should be levied for "protection" at all. This shows great and rapid progress toward the true issue—tariff taxation versus free trade. That issue must come as soon as the "protective" delusion has been destroyed, and when free trade shall once be established, the single tax will follow as a logical sequence.

It has never been the purpose of this committee, or of any of the many clubs with which it has been in active and close correspondence, to commit the single tax movement to either of the two great parties, or to pretend that either of them is consciously in accord with our views. It would, however, be the height of folly for us to shut our eyes to the fact that, for the immediate present, the republican party is engaged in a desperate struggle to prolong the protective system and to increase the burdens that inordinate and unjust tariff taxes impose on the vast body of consumers, in the interests of a comparatively small number of "protected" manufacturers and monopolizers of natural opportunities, while the democratic party, through the necessity of the situation, is being forced to attack the "protective" system on

more radical lines, and to fight with increased fervor and determination the banded monopolists who, through mere self-interest, contribute vast sums to be used as a corruption fund, to exclude it from power and perpetuate their own control over the rival party. In such a combat men cannot stand still, and each side must grow more radical in its demands. This gradual change of purpose and temper carries with it a change in the personnel of the two parties, and we already see evidence that "protectionist" democrats are drifting into the republican ranks, while free trade republicans are rapidly taking the places thus left vacant in the democratic party. To those who care more for principles than for mere names, this gives gratifying evidence that the coming contest is to be one of intelligent devotion to ideas, rather than a mere display of unreasoning prejudice. It is such contests that pave the way for the consideration of such radical reforms as the single tax, to which it is impossible to attract general attention during a mere struggle for the spoils of office or the gratification of acquired or inherited prejudice.

It is obvious that it is the part of wisdom and prudence for the advocates of the single tax to continue to take advantage of these circumstances and to use their energy and influence to assist those who are going our way rather than to seek to complicate and confuse matters by a futile third party movement. It was a recognition of this fact that caused Henry George and the great body of those who accept the principles enunciated in "Progress and Poverty" to support Grover Cleveland for the presidency in 1884, and it was out of that movement that the single tax enrollment committee, and all the existing organizations bearing the name of "single tax," arose. The wisdom of the policy then adopted has been amply vindicated by events, and now that we are more numerous and influential and encouraged by the rapid progress made, it would be a waste of time and energy to reopen a question so definitely and unanimously settled. What is needed is not idle disputation over the past, but consultation as to what we best can do to press forward the movement toward free trade by which our principles have been so greatly advanced during the past five years.

The two great parties are about to enter on a struggle for the control of the house of representatives at Washington. One of them tends to the logical demand for the absolute prohibition of importation; the other is rapidly tending to the opposing logical demand for absolute free trade. One tends to become more and more the instrument and mouthpiece of a reckless and arrogant plutocracy, determined to use governmental power for the increase of the privilege and undue wealth it already enjoys; the other necessarily tends to assert the right of the masses as against the classes. In such a contest single tax men, more, perhaps, than any others, must take a keen interest and an active part. They are not, however, identified with either of the parties to the contest, or committed to the traditions and policy of the party with which they are compelled by the logic of events to co-operate. The democratic party has not yet had the courage to officially do more than commit itself to a measure of tariff reform. It still tolerates, though with growing impatience, within its ranks, and even in its councils, men who are at heart protectionists. It dare not yet unfurl the banner of free trade bearing the inscription: "Peace on earth—good will to men." In such an organization the advocates of the single tax cannot take a place, however willing and eager they may be to encourage it to bolder measures and assist it to succeed in the measure of good it seeks. We may be with it, but not of it. To us the question of taxation, important as it undoubtedly is to a people groaning under burdens so disposed as to check industry, retard exchange, rob labor of its just reward and enrich trusts and other combinations of monopolists, is not the only or even the principal one. We hold that so long as land is treated as private property the many must work for the profit of the few, and that improvements in the processes of production, eventually inure to the benefit of those who exact tribute from labor and capital for the privilege of engaging in the production of wealth. Hence, while willing to work with those going our way for such measure of relief as they consent to offer, we must continue to hold together and press forward the greater reform that lies beyond free trade, and toward which the overthrow of the protection superstition is but the first, though necessary, step.

Therefore, the single tax enrollment committee, at the request of forty-eight single tax clubs in various parts of the United States, hereby calls a conference of delegates from single tax organizations in the several states to meet in the city of New York, on Monday, September 1, 1890, to consider the best means of securing united action in behalf of free trade in the coming congressional elections; to consult as to the best means of promoting the single tax movement in the several states; to name a single tax national committee; and to transact such other business pertinent thereto as to such conference may seem meet and proper.

This committee has received no direct instructions on the subject from the various clubs in whose behalf it issues this call, but the general expression of opinion has been in favor of an informal conference to which

each club may send as many delegates as it sees fit, with the understanding that the conclusions of the conference shall not be binding on any organization dissenting from them, and shall have only such weight and authority as the conclusions of such a body will naturally have with single tax advocates desirous of working together in unison for a common purpose. The object of urging representation is to secure the attendance of those delegates only whose loyalty to the cause can be vouched for by the single tax organizations nearest to their place of residence.

It is the earnest desire of all concerned that every club shall endeavor to be represented, and the single tax enrollment committee especially urges that each club or other organization shall promptly notify it as to the probability of its sending delegates, and that notice of the number of delegates to be present shall be given before the 1st of August in order that convention railway rates may be secured, if possible, and other necessary arrangements be made for the welfare and comfort of those attending the conference. WM. T. CROASDALE, Chairman,
GEO. ST. J. LEAVENS, Sec.,
12 Union Sq.

THE LETTER-WRITING CORPS.

THE BUREAU MOVED TO PHILADELPHIA—MR. W. J. ATKINSON WILL TAKE CHARGE OF IT.

The following letter from Mr. L. E. Siemon of Cleveland, Ohio, explains itself:

No. 7 GREENWOOD ST.,
CLEVELAND, July 25, 1890.

To the Editor of The Standard—SIR: Owing to the pressure of local work, I have felt compelled to relinquish the care of the single tax letter writing corps.

It has been decided to transfer the headquarters to Philadelphia, where the work will be supervised by Mr. W. J. Atkinson, who it will be remembered was one of its original supporters.

Mr. Atkinson has voluntarily assumed the labor of conducting this important branch of our work, and deserves the earnest, hearty support of all the old members, and the aid of a large number of new recruits.

The value of the work cannot be overestimated and I trust that each member will do his best in support of Mr. Atkinson.

The July circular was not issued for good reasons, and in order that material shall not be wanting for the next issue, I would request the members to forward to Mr. W. J. Atkinson at 913 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, anything of interest to the corps.

L. E. SIEMON.

In assuming charge of the letter writing corps, Mr. W. J. Atkinson publishes the letter of instructions below:

To every believer in the single tax: Pressure of other single tax duties has led Mr. L. E. Siemon to transfer the single tax letter writing corps, which he has conducted so successfully, to the undersigned. Its future success will more than ever depend on the active co-operation of every single taxer. The rapid growth of our movement, the increased interest everywhere manifested in social questions, have greatly enlarged our field for this work. With this increased opportunity all signs show an increased necessity for our using every means at hand to hasten the adoption of the single tax. The strikes of the New York cloak-makers, and of the London police and letter carriers; the increasing frequency in our daily press of such brief but terribly significant stories of poverty, starvation and suicide, as the "Society Notes" of THE STANDARD, all warn us that our time is short, and that to prevent a social catastrophe, to which the French revolution would afford no parallel, we must use every energy in advocating, "in season and out of season," the only possible escape from such horrors. Every man, woman and child can write one single tax letter a week, even though they can do nothing else, and joining this corps and writing that weekly letter to men who, by the same mail receive many single tax letters, will multiply greatly the effect of their efforts. Correct spelling is not necessary. Copper-plate writing is not needed. Eloquence, however appropriate on the platform, may be entirely out of place in these letters. The shorter and simpler you make them the better. Always inclose at least one single tax tract. If you need more tracts than you can afford to pay for, I will be glad to send you all the tracts you can use free. Donations to this tract fund may be sent to George St. J. Leavens, 12 Union square, N. Y., stating object intended for. Don't feel satisfied with merely writing your weekly letter, but urge every single tax acquaintance, old and young, male and female, learned and ignorant, to do the same. Every addition to our numbers multiplies our efficiency. Send in names of all you think we should write to, and give particulars and addresses. As soon as some recruits come in we will concentrate our fire on the assessors. Meanwhile, reader, please send me at once the names and addresses of your local assessors, with an abstract of the tax laws and how they are lived up to. For this week we will try:

Rev. H. L. Wainland, D. D., editor of the National Baptist, Philadelphia, Pa.—He already believes, after a fashion, that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living, and is ripe

for single tax doctrine. Inclose such tracts as "It Is the Law of Christ," "First Principles" and "Ten Thoughts for Christian Thinkers."

Thomas J. Swann, Atco, N. J.—The portions of his letter to the Philadelphia Record, which were reprinted in THE STANDARD, July 9, show him to be awake to the fact that his race have been emancipated from chattel slavery only to be more securely enslaved industrially. He is a man well worth winning to our side.

Henry Charles Lea, Philadelphia, Pa.—An advocate of the Australian system, and an independent republican whose denunciations of Quayism and the corrupt element that today rules the republican party have recently had national circulation. Inclose Mr. Post's Australian ballot tract with some of Mr. Shearman's single tax tracts, and show him that land monopoly is the source of corruption in politics. Mention that Henry George was the first to advocate the Australian system here.

Edward Atkinson, Boston, Mass.—See THE STANDARD for July 23. Also write each the United States senators from your state, urging them to vote and speak against the Force bill and the McKinley tariff bill. These bills can also be used in writing to your local papers as pegs to hang some good, solid single tax sense on.

Let us for motto paraphrase Richard Cobden's eloquent invitation to John Bright and try to live up to it: "There are in America women and children dying with hunger—with hunger made by the laws. Work with us, and we will not rest till we have repealed those laws."

W. J. ATKINSON.

P. O. box 271, Haddonfield, N. J.

THE PETITION.

SINGLE TAX ENROLMENT COMMITTEE,
12 UNION SQUARE,
NEW YORK, July 28, 1890.

The single tax enrolment committee is circulating a petition asking the United States house of representatives to appoint a special committee to make inquiry into and report upon the expediency of raising all public revenues by a single tax upon the value of land, irrespective of improvements, to the exclusion of all other taxes, whether in the form of tariffs upon imports, taxes upon internal productions or otherwise. It will send blank petitions on application to any address, and single tax men are urged to obtain petitions and obtain signatures as a most convenient and effective way of starting the discussion.

Subscriptions toward the expenses of this committee's work remain as reported last week, viz., \$3,336.55.

Cash contributions for the week ending July 28 are:

John F. Wood, Brooklyn	\$1 00
C. A. Potwin, Seneca, Mo.	5 00
C. F. Knight (add.), Frankfort Springs	1 00
Billy Radcliffe, S. T., Youngstown, O.	1 00
A. Jacquipo, New York city	45

\$8 45

Contributions previously acknowledged in THE STANDARD

798 34

Total

\$806 79

The enrolment now stands as follows:

Reported last week

86,883

Signatures received since last report

345

Total

87,228

For news budget see "Roll of States."

G. ST. J. LEAVENS, Sec.

NEW YORK CITY.

A BUSY WEEK—SENDING LIGHT TO THE HEATHEN—WILL GET READY FOR THE FALL CAMPAIGN.

Last week was a busy one at the rooms of the Manhattan single tax club. The conference of clubs to prepare for the coming congressional campaign met there on last Thursday evening, and the Workingmen's tariff reform league on Friday evening. The particulars of these meetings will be found in the Free Trade department. The work of preparing the roll of the club for the conference is being done, as is also that of the Workingmen's league.

Robert Baker, who is now in Illinois, sent a list of names of democrats who he thought should be supplied with STANDARDS, and the agitation committee immediately mailed them. The board of managers of the club meets Friday evening, August 1.

Thursday, August 7, the regular monthly meeting of the club will be held. This will be an important meeting, and all the members should attend, as the fall work will be then cut out.

BROOKLYN.

DELEGATES ELECTED TO ATTEND THE CONFERENCE.

Emily A. Deverall, Eastern District.—At the last meeting of the Eastern district single tax club it was decided to send nine delegates, possibly more, to the coming conference; and the president and secretary were authorized to give credentials to any member of the club wishing to attend.

The Rev. Mr. Sharp was enrolled a member of the club. Although we are not growing in numbers very rapidly, we are much encouraged by the interest shown in the matter by outsiders, and our members are all earnest missionaries in the cause. A year ago Mr.

Joseph McGuinness and Mr. F. J. Deverall, while speaking on the single tax before the Bush literary union, found numerous opposers; but last week Mr. Deverall, who was present and prepared to debate the matter, found no one to oppose him, but was invited to take the affirmative in a debate, "Shall the right of suffrage be extended to women." The young men of this society are both intelligent and fair minded, allowing free discussion on the subjects brought to their notice.

Our club at its last meeting elected the officers for the next six months, when Mr. Joseph McGuinness, 215 Ross street, was unanimously elected president, and F. J. Deverall vice-president. The club meets at 234 Broadway on the first and third Mondays of each month.

OHIO.

BILLY RADCLIFFE AGAIN IN THE RING—STIRRING THEM UP IN MCKINLEY'S DISTRICT.

Billy Radcliffe, F. T. and S. T., Youngstown.—I am just in off the road and will be out again to-morrow. I have been out about six weeks, working in this part of Ohio and Pennsylvania. I find everywhere I go there are some who have heard of the single tax, and in many places I find active single tax men.

I am traveling and operating the same as last year and give them free trade and single tax after business is over, using the banjo, songs, tricks and jokes to get the crowd; and in my talks, a blackboard to more fully illustrate my points; and I see the effect of it the next morning by the discussion it creates, and wherever two or three men are together they are talking on the tariff. It is: "Did you hear that feller on the street last night?" "Why didn't you put some questions to him?" "How did you like that medicine he gave out last?" "What made you run away? Couldn't you stand the fire?" One man who had patronized me to the amount of one dollar swore that if he had known I was going to talk free trade he wouldn't have bought the medicine.

At one place I stopped the landlord of the hotel was also the postmaster and a protectionist. I made my talk right in front of the hotel; and maybe he wasn't hot when the boys asked him if he had got me there to teach them free trade. One man told him the next morning that he heard he was so mad that he was going to lick his wife. It's fun for me to see them laugh and clap their hands at the songs, tricks and jokes; but when I get to the tariff there's a great change. They first look beat; then try to look wise, let out a grunt or two and sneak off, with occasionally some one in the crowd calling them back.

I put in last week in McKinley's district, and will get a part of it again this week. I make good use of his 300 mistakes on the tariff (as per senate bill), and also Congressman Hopkins's remarks about one clause in the bill that would make one man in the lobby worth a million dollars more going out of the house than he was coming in.

I will attend the conference, with possibly one or two others from this place.

Thomas Taylor, Youngstown.—Hard work and long hours prevents me from doing much in this cause, but when I have a day to spare I use it in seeking signers.

Irene Ewing, Zeno.—Even here—the last place in the world to enlist in any reform—there are a few ardent single taxers, and the sentiment is growing; at least, it is coming to be known and recognized as a factor in the politics of the future.

ILLINOIS.

FRANKLIN MACVEAGH, PRESIDENT OF THE ILLINOIS TARIFF REFORM LEAGUE, TALKS TO THE CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB—HE SAYS THAT THE DUTY OF THE HOUR IS TO WORK FOR AND TALK FOR TARIFF REFORM, BUT HIS SPEECH IS A FREE TRADE SPEECH—"PROTECTION IS A FRAUD AND A SHAM."

Warren Worth Bailey, Chicago, July 25.—Despite the threatening weather, our meeting last night was a gratifying success. The attendance was unusually large, the name of the Hon. Franklin MacVeagh, president of the Illinois tariff reform league and one of the leading merchants of Chicago, being the sufficient attraction, many strangers being included among the audience.

Mr. MacVeagh began his address in a pleasing conversational tone with a humorous allusion to an incident of the evening, and then passed on to speak in complimentary terms of the single tax men and their movement. He said he had given the subject only passing thought as yet; he had been waiting for it to blow over; but perhaps the time would come when he would be ashamed to acknowledge that he had hoped that it would blow over. However, he would say that if we single tax men had discovered the true science of taxation, we had got something greater than the philosopher's stone. He thought the question of taxation paramount. "But," said he, "I am not a single tax man—yet. I am merely an old foggy, narrow, conservative tariff reformer." He then proceeded as follows, as stenographically reported for me by Mr. James Malcolm:

"However strange it may appear to single tax people, it is nevertheless a fact that we

old foggy tariff reformers are in some circles considered radicals. That is really one of the serious obstacles which we have found in this work; and yet I say to you that I am well aware that I am only a narrow old foggy tariff reformer. But as I am informed that you single tax men are in sympathy with our movement, it may not be out of place to remind you of your duty as tariff reformers. I believe it is your first duty; and chief among the reasons that brought me here to-night is to urge upon you the importance of discharging the obligation which devolves upon you in this direction in so peculiar and serious a manner. You who see this problem and its solution so clearly should be able to understand that while single tax propaganda is all right it is not wise to mix it with tariff reform propaganda. I have great admiration for the work you are doing—nothing but good can come from it. If there is anything in this world of which we can be certain it is that the present tax system is not true. I am delighted to see that earnest men and women are devoting their attention to it. I want only the right system of taxation to prevail, but I do not think that anyone knows what that system is, not even you people, and yet I believe that you know all there is to know about it at present. But tariff reform is the first step; it is a practical matter, and it is because I have noticed that your speakers at tariff reform meetings constantly introduce the single tax that leads me to offer the advice that I have. With McKinley and Reed in the saddle at Washington the immediate question is tariff reform. You can not ignore these men. They are almost impregnable where they are, fortified by years and years of tradition. There is nothing gained by undervaluing their strength. To attack them with the single tax will make no impression on them. The only battle that can possibly prevail against protection, entrenched as it is, is tariff reform. My being president of the Illinois tariff reform league has led to my being invited here to-night, and as such I am free to say to you that the people in this state are fully ready to take up this one question. I do not think they are ready for the single tax, but they are prepared to consider tariff reform. Illinois is the keystone in this arch, and I therefore beg of you gentlemen to give us your aid and your untrammelled aid at this important juncture.

"It is purely a business question and should be regarded as separated from partisanship. Objection to one of my speeches was once made by a distinguished member of your club because I left out the moral aspect of the question. He said it was good enough for a religion; but I am content for the present to consider it as a matter of business apart from the blighting influence of partisanship.

"How do the theories of protection accord with the facts? By its philosophy it is meant to be only a temporary thing; the fact to-day is that its supporters regard it as a permanent institution. Mr. McKinley, who leads the republican party on this question, firmly believes in protection as a permanent policy for this country. Now you will remember that the fact of its being temporary rather than permanent was the only thing that divided it and distinguished it from the Chinese system. The American system was to be a temporary scheme, the Chinese was to be a permanent one; but that distinction is now wiped out. This is a most important feature of the question for Americans to consider. Mr. McKinley has the advantage of being of that mediocre quality that enables him to honestly believe in permanent protection, which gives him a higher moral standard than that of Reed. He honestly believes in protection as a fixed system; and if he rose at all above mediocrity he could not do it. But McKinley is only carrying out the ideas and promises of the republican convention at Chicago as he understands them.

"Another theory of protection is that it protects the laborer. McKinley has no doubt about it. It happens that the fact is directly opposite. There is nothing but opposites to the facts in protection. Not only is this true, but it is to the interest of the protective system that its supporters shall fight against the laborer's interests. American employers at one time beckoned to the best nations of Europe for their labor; but to-day we find the protected interests beckoning to Hungary, Bohemia, Italy and southern Europe for their labor. They have even tried to flood this country with Chinese labor. They have been invited to such a policy by their system, and yet in the face of this their theory is that protection protects American labor. Protection would never have obtained in this country had this specious statement not been believed—a statement that is diametrically opposite to the truth. Indeed, if it were possible for protectionists to be more than diametrically opposite to the facts, they would get there.

"A theory of protectionism is that it creates and maintains a home market. This is the backbone of the superstition so far as the farmer is concerned. All the home market that the farmer gets is the foreign market to sell in and a home market to buy goods in at two or three times the price that he might buy them for in a foreign market. The only way by which the farmer can increase his home market, as well as his foreign market, is through free trade. The only way to enlarge the scope of our manufactures is to give them unhampered access to the markets of the world. The only way to increase the

home market is to increase manufactures, and you cannot do that without increasing the market of the manufacturers, and you cannot do that without opening the markets of the world to them, and that means free trade.

"It is also the theory of protection that while you may have to pay a little more for awhile than you would under no tariff, the prices will soon go down after manufactories have been fostered. You will get your money back and more. The fact is that as soon as competition begins to lower prices trusts are formed. Of course all a trust is for is to raise the price of the article—to prevent competition. The American people have depended on the promise of the protectionists that just as soon as the infant industries were able to take care of themselves the price of goods would go down. Just as this was about being fulfilled they get another dose of protection in the shape of trusts, for trusts are inseparable from the protective system. The bottom fact of this whole affair is that protection is a fraud and a sham. Its philosophy is based on the false representation that it is for the public good, while what has made it potent these many years is that it is an institution for private gain. It would not continue if it did not rest on partisanship, which has become such a vice in the blood of the American people. Thank Heaven, it is not a chronic vice; but partisanship is to-day the prevalent vice. The farmers of Illinois are to-day blinded, by their attachment to party, to this outrageous system of protection, of which they are the principal victims. I am convinced that outside of ancient Egypt there has not been such a case as is shown in the farmers of Illinois in their infatuation, amounting almost to a superstition, with the tariff. It is a hopeful question, after all. The light is breaking, even among the farmers, and what is more to me, the attitude of the manufacturers themselves is changing. It was said to me when I entered this movement two years ago, 'You call yourselves tariff reformers, but are you not likely to end with free trade?' I said in reply: 'Although our movement does not contemplate free trade, still if anything can be predicated on the intelligence of the people the probabilities are that it will end in free trade; that it would not be left to the farmers of Illinois to bring it about; but that as soon as the manufacturers of the east were brought in clear sight of the trade of the world they will make a break for it.' And that is just what is happening. There is scarcely a New England manufacturer who is not to-day clamoring for free raw material. But while there is a Major McKinley in the saddle at Washington there is another major in the saddle at Harrisburg, Pa., who represents the dominant sentiment of the near future on this question. I refer to Major Bent, president of the Pennsylvania steel company, who told me personally that he was a pronounced and absolute free trader. It has been growing upon him for some time. I heard a story of an ex-governor of Pennsylvania who, some time since, thought he would write a book on protection. Henry Carey was dead, and it seemed necessary that this ex-governor or some one else should take the place of Carey and write a book. As a preliminary step he set out to hob-nob with the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, and discovered, to his utter dismay, that these men were becoming free traders, and he gave up the idea of writing the book. That man lost his opportunity; he was ten years too late. It is a fact that the manufacturing interests of Pennsylvania are honeycombed with tariff reform and free trade; and I therefore say, that even with McKinley in the saddle at Washington, he and his party will not be able to prevail against the sentiment represented by such men as Major Bent at Harrisburg, the place known hitherto as the heart and strength of the protectionist system."

Mr. MacVeagh was loudly applauded at several points, especially when he talked straight free trade and disapproved his own statement that he was "a mere tariff reformer." He is really a tariff abolitionist, if his own words mean anything, and Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, in moving a vote of thanks, which was vociferously carried, took occasion to remind the distinguished speaker of this fact, at the same time defining the position of single tax men in relation to the tariff reform movement. Mr. Brown's remarks were very clear and to the point, and he was enthusiastically cheered.

General Trumbull was called for and spoke for five minutes with great effect, referring to the Gladstone-Blaine controversy and expressing the belief that Mr. Blaine had become a convert to the free trade doctrines of the Grand Old Man.

Clinton Furbish closed the discussion with one of his brilliant five-minute talks that set the audience wild. He didn't think Mr. Blaine was a convert; he was the same "Slippery Jim," as much devoted as ever to the tariff robbers, whom he sees that he can better serve by throwing a tub to the whale than by carrying out the policy of Major McKinley. "Mr. Blaine may lead the tariff reformers in 1892," said Mr. Furbish, "but in that event Mr. Cleveland will lead the free traders."

On next Thursday evening the club will hold a meeting to protest against the Force bill, when Mr. Furbish, and perhaps Mr. Dar-

row and other distinguished orators will speak.

MISSOURI.

L. P. CUSTER, FORMERLY OF INDIANAPOLIS, NOW A RESIDENT OF ST. LOUIS.

L. P. Custer, St. Louis.—I presume many of your readers, particularly those of Indiana, who have become familiar with my name by seeing it so often in your columns, have begun to wonder what has become of me; and especially will they marvel at the clam-like silence of single tax men of Indianapolis, as there has not appeared a line in THE STANDARD for nearly three months, and that is about the length of time I have been away from that city. I have often determined to sit down and write a few words for publication to let the faithful know that I am still alive and in the harness, but, as it were, am prevented from making much noise or doing much prancing, by being buckled down and gagged by force of circumstances.

I left Indianapolis about the middle of May and went to Chicago. I there met the indefatigable worker, Warren Worth Bailey, and was importuned by him to cast my lot among them, but I felt more at home in St. Louis, having been a resident of the place before; hence I came here and have been earning my daily bread by the sweat of my brow (for it has been almighty warm) since, in the employ of the Western union telegraph company.

I was sorry to leave Indianapolis for the advantages to be gained by active work there on account of the close margin in the vote between the two great parties—a field that offers extraordinary advantages to the men who are honest and upright and will work for the interests of the great cause irrespective of their own political interest—offers opportunities for the promulgation and advancement of economic ideas that are lacking in a great majority of the states. But it requires energy and earnestness as well as unselfish devotion to the cause. Many men, who used to shine in Indiana as true reformers, have fallen into obscurity and their names are only remembered as a reproach, who turned aside from true principle for the sake of some petty personal advantage, either political or pecuniary. Such false steps always meet their reward. But on this line of thought there is a point that I have never seen in print. Men cannot make themselves true to principle and unselfish in devotion to a cause by simply declaring they will be, or are so. They must be built that way. They must be imbued with the fire of conviction, and never at ease unless doing something to advance the interest at stake. The cause they espouse must be the first in mind and heart, and nothing must supplant or subordinate it as a claim on his leisure time.

How many men subordinate the cause we battle for for other routine matters of little consequence to humanity? I know many men who belong to lodges or social clubs, who would not dream of neglecting them to go to a single tax meeting; who always consider the cause of humanity of less consequence—of the least consequence—for some petty social affair or some secret order, that have for their object at best the mere gratification of some selfish enjoyment or benefit. This is not written as a condemnation of secret orders, but I could never let such an order or society keep me from participating in meetings, the objects of which are the bringing of justice throughout the land. The reason is easily determined. I am full of the enthusiasm that "Progress and Poverty" lends, and I am never happier than when I am in a single tax meeting (large or small) or conversing with kindred spirits on the all-engrossing theme. Few, comparatively, there are who are thus fired.

The love of little ones and wife who are dependent on my labor for support is the only check to this, at all times, escaping enthusiasm; but I trust, sooner or later (it may be months or years—a few), that I can be in position to give full play to my thoughts and poor capabilities to the pushing of this great work throughout the English speaking world. As it is at present, I am hampered by both bossism and necessity. I have been unable to do anything at this point because I am engaged at night work; but I hope in the near future to be able to lead a hand in pushing the good work in this locality. I have already written at greater length than I intended. In a future letter I will say something of St. Louis and her single tax workers. I wish to extend a fraternal greeting to all single taxers, and especially to those of my native state, Indiana, and urge those of Indianapolis and other sections to emulate the example of our Evansville friends, and results of an important character will follow. You have the advantage, why do you not grasp it?

CONNECTICUT.

J. L. Hopkins, Middletown.—We are talking all of the time and I think making some converts. We are few in numbers, but strong in courage. I wish that we could get some good single tax speaker to come here and address us on the real question.

NEW JERSEY.

Jno. H. Edelman, Newark.—There is a large and sympathetic following here. The club includes members from Belleville and Woodside, and is for "business," "Acres lots" and "farming property" in the limits of Newark are under Jrs. Meetings have been held in

the halls at both Woodside and Belleville. The local Knights of Labor are working on this line.

PENNSYLVANIA.

C. F. Knight, Frankfort Springs.—The discussion of tariff and single tax goes on merrily all about me. Mr. S. S. Saxton, whose name I sent recently, is now stirring up his neighbors. The inclosed signature of J. D. Saxton (his brother) marks his first victory by a complete conversion from republican protectionist to a thorough "cat worshiper."

MARYLAND.

J. W. Jones, Baltimore.—A public debate of the single tax question will take place September 5, at the Y. M. C. A. hall, between William J. Ogden of the single tax league of Maryland and Rev. A. C. Dixon of the Emmanuel Baptist tabernacle.

WEST VIRGINIA.

W. I. Boreman, Parkersburg.—We are stirring up the animals here, and will give a report after awhile.

LOUISIANA.

George W. Roberts, New Orleans.—At the last meeting of the Louisiana single tax club it was resolved that the club would only meet twice a month (for the next two months), viz, the first and third Thursdays of each month, and changed the place of meeting from 205 Canal street to 41 Natchez street.

We have started a little patent outside paper and call it the Louisiana Tax Reformer. We have also appointed two delegates to the single tax conference, viz, James Middleton (our president) and J. T. Walters. There is some doubt about their attending, but will do so if possible.

MINNESOTA.

C. J. Buell, Minneapolis.—I have sent in a number of signed petitions. No. 1 is a carpenter, No. 2 is a stair builder, No. 3 is a farmer, No. 4 is a lawyer, No. 5 is a representative Scandinavian and editor of the Times, No. 6 is assistant-attorney-general of the state, No. 7 is the most noted criminal lawyer of the northwest, and whose great speech at the Farmers' alliance convention was one of the most masterly efforts I ever heard.

NEBRASKA.

Rufus S. Parker, Omaha.—I find it easy to secure signers to the petition among the Knights of Labor, and I intend to keep at work among them.

COLORADO.

H. C. Niles, Denver.—I have been thinking about that stereopticon suggestion of W. H. Van Ornum of Chicago in connection with tariff reform, and think the Reform club could best take charge of the selection and preparation of the plates. There should be at least one hundred in a set. Mr. A. T. Thompson, 13 Tremont row, Boston, Mass., is engaged in such work, and it might be possible to have many sets prepared if he could be guaranteed a ready sale. My idea is that a committee of the Tariff reform club should make a selection from Puck's cartoons of say one hundred, and then have some photographer prepare the plates. I believe it would do much good in all the large cities. One of our members is negotiating for a stereopticon outfit, and if we can get the plates we will give it a trial here in Denver. If the Reform club can get up the plates I think the single tax men in all the cities would use them.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

W. E. Brokaw, Watertown.—July 18 a few of us met at the office of the clerk of the circuit court and organized the Watertown single tax club. R. T. Warner was elected president and L. E. Brickell secretary. We will meet monthly until after the election this fall. Our next meeting will be on August 13. Mr. Warner is register of deeds and Mr. Brickell an alderman.

I have sent some signed petitions to the committee. Part of them were sent me by E. M. Sturgis of Ames, S. D., others by Roland Hill of Frankfort, and a few I got from callers at this office. Mr. Sturgis and Mr. Hill are both farmers. They are two of the sixty-three committeemen (in twenty-nine counties of the state) that I have on my list. All but a few of them have promised to do what they can, but most of them are hard worked and have but little time to spare.

"PROTECTION TO HOME INDUSTRIES."

The great principle of "protection to home industries" seems to have a strong foothold in Lowell. The board of trade of that city refuses to petition for lower passenger rates to Boston, on the ground that cheap fares would injure local trade by making it easy for Lowell people to come to Boston to do their shopping. This is nice for the Lowell shop keepers, but rather rough on the shoppers.

YES, WHERE ARE THEY?

Harrisburg Patriot.
The Tribune and the other muzzled republican organs told the workingmen during the presidential campaign that the election of Benjamin Harrison meant better wages. Where are the better wages?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE COMING CONFERENCE.

To the Editor of The Standard.—Sir: Now that it has been decided to hold a conference it becomes the duty of single taxers to use all means within their power toward making it one worthy our cause.

A successful conference will be the means of awakening a wider interest in our principles, and a good demonstration of our strength and importance, besides the many other advantages already enumerated in THE STANDARD. It is to this end that I ask space for a few words, that, in my opinion, will not be out of place at this time.

Through an oversight on the part of the enrolment committee, their invitation to attend the proposed conference was extended to clubs alone.

There are thousands of active workers throughout the country that are situated so as not yet to enjoy the benefits of a club, many of whom could, with some little sacrifice, make a good addition to the club delegation.

But some may not feel at the same liberty in attending they otherwise would could the committee make its invitation more universal.

Another idea, if proposed through the columns of THE STANDARD, would be sure to meet with a hearty response from all quarters. Those members of clubs who cannot personally attend should contribute of their mite—let it be much or little—toward the expense of the nearest club in sending one or more delegates.

This would greatly relieve clubs whose members in most cases have been standing the brunt of the battle right along.

Such a plan, if liberally responded to, would do much toward lightening the burden of clubs in the west, northwest and south, where the expense of sending but one delegate must necessarily be great.

Bryan, Wyoming. WM. MATTHEWS.

"WILL THE SENATE HAVE TO GO?"

To the Editor of The Standard.—Sir: While fully sympathizing with your indignation over the partisan perversion of the power to admit new states, I cannot help thinking that in so large a country as ours there is a legitimate and important function for the senate to perform. To give to the numerical majority of the people of the entire country unqualified control over legislation would be to subject the thinly populated regions to a practically "alien" government by the voters of the more crowded parts having different feelings, ways, and interests. Ireland has about its proportion of members in the house of commons, but, as the members from Great Britain can always out-vote them, Ireland very rightly feels that it is practically governed by Great Britain.

I hold that true congressional reform would make the lower house represent the people of the United States, considered as one people, while the senate should represent the various sections into which the people are divided by local interests, sympathies and traditions. The concurrence of the two kinds of majority I believe to be indispensable.

But then, each of the two houses should be adapted really to perform its function. The lower should consist of the 333 candidates standing highest as to votes received (irrespective of districts), each elector voting for one candidate, and each representative having in the house not one vote only, but precisely as many votes as he received in the election. The largest 333 groups of voters in the country would thus have each its chosen spokesman in the house, and, in order to pass a measure, would have to be supported by the spokesmen of a majority of the whole body of electors thus really represented. In the senate, on the other hand, each state should have a senatorial delegation consisting of the three candidates receiving most votes from citizens of the state, each citizen naming only one candidate, and each of the three senators having in the senate not a single vote only, but the proportion of one hundred votes to which his share of the votes received at the election should entitle him. Thus, if the democrat had received 41,000 votes, the republican 39,000, and an independent 17,000, then the democratic senator would in the senate cast 44 votes, the republican 39 and the independent 17. Every state would have 100 votes, but these would be fairly apportioned among the spokesmen of the three largest groups of voters in the state.

Washington, D. C.

SINGLE TAX WORK BEARING FRUIT.

Journal of the Knights of Labor.
Land reform is in the air. The persistency with which the single tax doctrine has been preached are bringing about practical results in many quarters, even without any change

in the law. In Chicago they are compelling the real estate speculator to give up a portion of his gains to the rightful owners—the community—by the simple process of carrying out the existing law and taxing unimproved lands up to their full value. If even this much were done everywhere the beneficial effects would very soon be felt. Land speculators would be forced either to sell—which would mean a general reduction of prices and render land cheap—or to improve, thus giving labor employment and putting up wages. It is surprising how much could be done by simply availing ourselves of laws now in force, which have been set aside owing to capitalistic influence.

WHAT SUBSIDIES WILL AND WON'T DO.

Philadelphia Telegraph.
The subsidy bill will bring into existence and keep there for a brief while a few ships, but it will not give us back our fair share of the world's commerce—for if it did so, it would bankrupt the treasury in a single year—nor will it give us back tens of thousands of the best seamen that any country ever had. With free ships, with American flags and registers, open competition and no favors asked, American commerce and American sailors would be restored to the seas. Subsidies won't restore either; what they will do will be to enrich a few shipbuilders at the cost of the entire people.

LET'S HAVE AN ALL-ROUND SUBSIDY ACT.

Boston Globe.
Why not pay farmers a subsidy to resume their deserted farms? After driving commerce from the seas by unjust tariff laws the republicans propose to bring it back again by subsidizing it. To be consistent they should also subsidize farmers after they have driven them from their farms. Vermont farms need subsidizing as badly as they do fertilizing.

REPUBLICAN EYES ARE OPENED.

Boston Globe.
The Minnesota republicans are not so blind as some of their eastern fellow partisans. They see very clearly that the tariff protects trusts and combines, and they demand that all articles whose production in this country is controlled by a monopoly shall be placed on the free list. At the rate trusts are organizing this would soon be practical free trade.

LOVELY AS A ROSE!

As we gaze upon a new-blown rose, we involuntarily exclaim, "How lovely!" Our admiration is excited by the color and delicate tints of the flower. So it is with

A Beautiful Maiden.

Her clear velvet-like skin and peach-bloom complexion fascinate us. These exquisite charms always result from the use of

GLENN'S SULPHUR SOAP.

A never-failing remedy for removing all imperfections from the skin and making the complexion

PEERLESSLY BEAUTIFUL.

FOR SALE BY ALL DRUGGISTS. BEWARE OF IMITATIONS.
Glenn's Soap will be sent by mail for 30 cts. for one cake, or 75 cts. for three cakes by C. N. CRITTENTON, Sole Proprietor, 115 Fulton Street, New York City.

ELY'S
CREAM
BALM
IS WORTH
\$1,000
TO ANY MAN,
WOMAN OR CHILD
suffering from
CATARRH.
NOT A LIQUID OR
PUFF.



A particle is applied into each nostril and is agreeable. Price 50 cents at Druggists; by mail, registered, 60 cts. ELY BROTHERS, 56 Warren St., New York.

THE GEORGE HEWITT CAMPAIGN.

An account of the New York municipal election of 1896, containing HENRY GEORGE'S speeches and the famous correspondence with Mr. Hewitt. Paper covers, 193 pages, 20 cents.

THE STANDARD.

12 Union Sq.,
N. Y. City.

A. B. FAR YUNAR, Manufacturer, York, Pa.
SEND FOR
Illustrated
Catalogue.



SAW MILLS AND ENGINES A SPECIALTY.

ELLY'S CURE FOR
CURES WHERE ALL ELSE FAILS.
Best Cough Syrup, "Tastes good. Use in time. Sold by druggists."

SINGLE TAX ORGANIZATIONS.

(Secretaries of clubs are requested to send any corrections in the list below, and all newly formed organizations are asked to report promptly, either to the enrollment committee or The Standard.)

ARKANSAS.

LITTLE ROCK.—Little Rock single tax club. Every alternate Thursday evening, 717 Main st. Pres., Sol F. Clark; sec., O. D. Hemming, 1910 Main st.

CALIFORNIA.

SAN FRANCISCO.—California single tax society. Every Sunday evening, St. George's hall, 909 1/2 Market st. Library and reading room open from 9 a. m. to 10 p. m., 841 Market st. Pres., L. M. Munzer; sec., H. M. Welcome; fin. sec., John A. Maynard. Address of all officers, 841 Market st.

SACRAMENTO.—Single tax club of Sacramento. Every Friday evening, Dr. Reed's office, 6th and K sts. Pres., Dr. Thos. B. Reed; sec., C. W. Farnsworth, 1406 4th st.

OAKLAND.—Single tax club No. 1 meets every Friday evening at St. Andrews hall, 1056 1/2 Broadway. Pres., A. J. Gregg; sec., E. Haskins.

LOS ANGELES.—Los Angeles single tax club. Pres., L. J. Harrell; sec., Clarence A. Miller.

SAN DIEGO.—Single tax question club meets every Sunday afternoon, 2 p. m., at Horton hall. County committee room, 444 5th st. Geo. B. Whaley, chairman.

BLACK DIAMOND.—Contra Costa county single tax committee. Jeff. A. Bailey, sec.

COLORADO.

STATE.—Colorado State single tax association, 303 16th st. Pres., A. W. Elder; sec., H. C. Niles; treas., Geo. Champion.

DENVER.—Denver single tax association. Every Thursday evening, 303 16th st. Free reading room open every day, 9 a. m. to 9 p. m. Pres., G. H. Phelps; sec., H. C. Niles, 303 16th st.

PUEBLO.—Commonwealth single tax club. First and Fourth Thursdays at office of D. B. V. Reeve, Union av. Pres., D. B. V. Reeve; sec., J. W. Brentlinger, Pueblo Smelting and Refining Co.

GRAND JUNCTION.—Mesa county single tax and ballot reform club. Pres., James W. Bucklin; sec., Geo. Smith.

CANYON CITY.—Single tax committee; sec., Dr. Frank P. Blake.

CONNECTICUT.

DANBURY.—Single tax club. Pres., John E. Jones; sec., W. E. Grunman. Address for the present, Sam E. Mann, 10 Montgomery st.

NEW HAVEN.—Tax reform club. Every Friday evening. Pres., Willard D. Warren, room 11, 102 Orange st.; sec., Alfred Smith, 105 Day st.

MERIDEN.—Meriden single tax club. 3 p. m. every Sunday. Circle hall. Pres., Wm. Hawthorne; sec., Wm. Willis. P. O. box 1342.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON.—Washington single tax league; always open; regular meeting Friday evening, 609 F street, N. W. Pres., Paul T. Rowen; sec., Wm. Geddes, M. D., 1719 G st., N. W.

FLORIDA.

PENSACOLA.—Pensacola single tax club No. 1. Tuesday evenings, K. of L. hall, corner of Zaragoza and Palafox sts. Pres., J. Dennis Wolfe; sec., James McHugh.

TAMPA.—Thomas G. Shearman single tax league. First Monday in each month, business meeting; Sundays, public speaking. Pres., C. E. Ainsworth; sec., John H. McCormick.

GEORGIA.

ATLANTA, Ga.—Atlanta single tax club No. 1. Pres., J. M. Beath; sec., J. Henley Smith, 67 Whitehall st.

AUGUSTA.—Augusta single tax club. Every Friday evening. Hussar hall. Pres., Ed. Flury; sec. George Haines, care of Loflin & Meyer.

ILLINOIS.

CHICAGO.—Chicago single tax club No. 1. Every Thursday evening, club room 4, Grand Pacific hotel. Pres., Warren Worth Bailey; sec., F. W. Irwin, 217 La Salle st., room 835.

SPRINGFIELD.—Sangamon single tax club. Pres., Joseph Farris; sec., James H. McCrea, 623 Black ave.

JACKSONVILLE.—Morgan county single tax club. Pres., Col. Wm. Camm of Murrayville; sec., Chas. W. Alexander of Jacksonville.

SPARTA.—Single tax committee. Sec., Wm. R. Bailey.

QUINCY.—Gem City single tax club. Every Friday evening, Opera house building. Pres., C. F. Perry; cor. sec., Duke Schroer, 327 S. 3d.

INDIANA.

STATE.—Indiana single tax league. Pres., Henry Rawie, Anderson; vice-pres., L. P. Custer, Indianapolis; sec., Thos. J. Hudson, 155 Elm st., Indianapolis. State executive committee, Henry Rawie, Anderson; S. W. Williams, Vincennes; L. O. Bishop, Clinton; Dr. C. A. Kersey, Richmond; Chas. G. Bennett, Evansville; Wm. Henry, Connorsville; W. E. McDermott, Ft. Wayne; T. J. Hudson, J. F. White, L. P. Custer, Indianapolis.

CLINTON.—Single tax club. Sunday afternoons, 8 o'clock, Argus office. Pres., Isaac H. Strain; sec., L. O. Bishop.

FORT WAYNE.—Single tax club. Pres., W. E. McDermott; vice pres., J. M. Scherzger; sec., Henry Cohen.

INDIANAPOLIS.—Indianapolis single tax league. Every Thursday evening, 8 p. m., Main hall, n. e. cor. Washington and Alabama sts. Pres., Dr. Brown; sec., L. P. Custer.

EVANSVILLE.—Single tax association. Pres., Edwin Walker; sec., Charles G. Bennett.

RICHMOND.—Single tax club. Pres., C. B. Schneider, 105 South Third st.; sec., M. Richie, 973 South 4 st.

IOWA.

BURLINGTON.—Burlington single tax club. First and third Wednesday of each month, 313 Jefferson st. Pres., Richard Spencer; sec., Wilbur Mosens, 940 Hedge ave.

DES MOINES.—Single tax club. Pres., H. B. Allison, box 4; sec., J. Ballangee.

COUNCIL BLUFFS.—Council Bluffs single tax club; second and fourth Sunday of each month, 4:30 p. m.; 704 Sixth st. Pres., Chas. H. Bennett; sec., L. E. Winchman, 304 W. Broadway.

ALBANY.—Tax reform club. Every Thursday evening, Vest's hall. Pres., A. J. Morgan; sec., H. D. Shriver.

MARSHALLTOWN.—Single tax committee. Pres., James Skaggs; sec., Hans Erickson.

MASON CITY.—Single tax committee; 1st and 3d evenings of each month at Dr. Osborne's office. Pres., J. A. Scranton; sec., J. S. Mott.

KANSAS.

ABILENE.—Single tax club. Pres., C. W. Brooks; vice-pres., H. Chart rs; sec., A. L. Russel.

GROVE HILL.—Grove Hill single tax club. Thursday evenings, Grove Hill school house, Lincoln township, Dickinson county. Pres., E. Z. Butcher; sec., Andrew Reddick.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS.—Louisiana single tax club. Meets 1st and 3d Thursday night at 8 p. m. at Natchez st. Pres., Jas. Middleton; sec., G. W. Roberts, 326 Thalia st.

MAINE.

AUBURN.—Auburn single tax club. Saturday evenings, room 3, Phoenix block, Main st.; reading room open every evening. Pres., Thos. Marsden; sec., W. E. Jackson, 1227th st.

LEWISTON.—Single tax committee. Every Wednesday evening, 79 Summer st. Chairman, F. D. Lyford; sec., Joseph Walsh, 79 Summer st.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE.—Single tax league of Maryland. Every Monday, at 8 p. m., in hall 506 E. Baltimore st. Pres., Wm. J. Ogden, 5 N. Carey st.; sec., John Salmon, 415 N. Eutaw st.; cor. sec., Dr. Wm. N. Hill, 1438 Baltimore st.

Baltimore single tax society. Every Sunday evening, 8 p. m., at Industrial hall, 316 W. Lombard st. Pres., J. G. Schonfarber; W. H. Kelly.

Single tax association of East Baltimore. Pres., J. M. Ralph; sec., Chas. H. Williams, 312 Myrtle av.

MASSACHUSETTS.

STATE.—Single tax state central committee of Massachusetts. Pres., Edwin M. White, 1498 Washington st., Boston; sec., G. K. Anderson, 30 Hanover st., Boston.

BOSTON.—Boston single tax league, Wells's memorial hall. Pres., Hamlin Garland, 13 Moreland st.; sec., Edwin M. White, 1498 Washington st.

Neponset single tax league. Sec., Q. A. Lothrop, Wood st. court, Neponset.

Dorchester single tax club. Every other Wednesday evening, Field's building, Field's Corner. Rooms open every day from 10 a. m. to 10 p. m. Pres., Ed Frost; sec., John Adams, Field's building.

Roxbury single tax club. Pres., Frank W. Mendum; sec., Henry C. Romaine, 250 Rugles st.

STONEHAM.—Stoneham single tax league. Pres., Dr. W. Symington Brown, Stoneham.

LYNN.—Lynn single tax league. Pres., C. H. Libbey st., 331 Washington st.; sec., John McCarthy, 140 Tunson st.

WORCESTER.—Tenth district single tax league of Worcester. Meetings first Thursday of each month, class room, Y. M. C. A. building, 20 Pearl st. Pres., Thomas J. Hastings; sec., Edwin K. Page, Lake View, Worcester.

LAWRENCE.—Lawrence single tax club. Every Thursday evening, Col. J. P. Sweeney's office. Pres., Col. John P. Sweeney; sec., John J. Donovan, city clerk's office.

HYDE PARK.—Single tax club. Sec., F. S. Childs, 40 Charles st.

ORANGE.—Single tax league of Orange. First Wednesday of each month, pres. and secretary's residence. Pres., H. W. Hammond; sec., Charles G. Kidder.

NEWBURYPORT.—Merrimac assembly. Saturday evenings, 48 State st. Pres., Dennis F. Murphy; sec., W. R. Whitmore, 236 Merrimac st.

MALDEN.—Single tax club. Meetings fortnightly at Deliberative hall, Pleasant st. Pres., Geo. W. Cox, Glenwood st.; sec., Edwin T. Clark, 100 Tremont st.

MICHIGAN.

DETROIT.—Single tax and ballot reform club. Pres., John Bridge; sec., J. R. Burton, sec., room 11, Butterfield building.

STURGIS.—Sturgis club of investigation. Pres., Rufus Spaulding; sec., Thomas Harding.

SAGINAW.—Single tax club, rooms 413 Genesee av., East Saginaw. Pres., Edward L. Weggener; sec., Jas. Duffy, 503 State st.

MINNESOTA.

MINNEAPOLIS.—Minneapolis single tax league. Every Tuesday evening at the West hotel. Pres., C. J. Buell, 402 W. Franklin av.; sec., J. A. Sawyer, 300 Lumber exchange.

South Minneapolis single tax club. Wednesday evenings, at 1809 E. Lake st. Pres., A. M. Goodrich; sec., P. F. Hammersley.

ST. PAUL.—Pres., H. C. McCarthy; sec., R. C. Morgan, Northern Pacific railroad office.

MISSOURI.

ST. LOUIS.—St. Louis single tax league. s. e. cor. 8th and Olive, meets every Tuesday evening. Rooms open every evening. Pres., H. H. Hoffman; sec., J. W. Steele, 2738 Gamble street.

"Benton School of Social Science." Sunday, 4 p. m., 6839 Waldemar ave., St. Louis. Pres., Dr. Henry S. Chase; sec., Wm. C. Little.

LA DUE.—The Reform club of La Due. Pres., W. Stephens; sec., Jas. Wilson.

KANSAS CITY.—Kansas City single tax club. Meets every Sunday afternoon at 3 at headquarters, cor. 15th and Grand av.; open every night. Pres., H. S. Julian; sec., Warren Wasson, 110 E. 15th st.

HEMMANN.—Single tax committee. Pres., R. H. Hasenritter; sec., Dr. H. A. Hibbard.

HIGH GATE.—Single tax league. Meetings on alternate Thursdays at the house of W. M. Kinhead. Pres., Wm. Kinhead; sec., J. W. Swaw.

OAK HILL.—Single tax league. Pres., F. Dobolt; sec., J. W. Miller.

REN BURN.—Single tax league. Pres., J. S. Cahill; sec., J. Krewson, Red Bird, Mo.

SAFE.—Glen single tax club. Meets second Saturday evening of the month. Pres., W. H. Miller; sec., H. A. Sunder, Safe.

NEBRASKA.

OMAHA.—Omaha single tax club. First and third Sunday, Gate City hall, cor. 13th and Douglas sts. Pres., Rufus E. Parker.

WYOMING.—Henry George single tax club. Pres., H. C. Jaynes; sec., J. A. Hanna.

NEW JERSEY.

JERSEY CITY.—Standard single tax club. Meets every other Thursday evening at the National assembly rooms, 648 Newark ave. Pres., John W. Jekaway; sec., Joseph Dana Miller, 367 Grove st.

NEWARK.—Newark single tax club. Pres.,

Herbert Boggs, 83 Broad st.; sec., M. G. Gaffner, 43 Warren place.

NEWARK (Forest Hill).—Essex county single tax club. Pres., John H. Edelman; sec., Geo. M. Vesceilius, Forest Hill, Newark.

PATERSON.—Passaic Co. single tax club. Pres., E. W. Nellis; sec., John A. Craig, 192 Hamburg ave. Meetings every Sunday evening at 169 Market street.

S. ORANGE.—S. Orange single tax club. Pres., E. H. Wallace; sec., Henry Haase.

VINELAND.—Vineland single tax and ballot reform club. Pres., Rev. Adolph Roeder; sec., Wm. P. Nichols, box 924.

JANVIER.—Janvier single tax and ballot reform club. Alternate Thursday evenings, Janvier hall. Pres. W. J. Rice; sec., Sydney R. Walsh.

CAMDEN.—Camden single tax club. Pres., Louis M. Randall; sec., Wm. M. Callingham.

WASHINGTON.—Washington land and tax club. Pres., John Morrison; sec., W. H. Christine.

BAYONNE.—Single tax committee. Chairman, Wm. R. DuBois.

PASSAIC.—Single tax committee of Passaic. Pres., Oscar D. Wood.

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK.—Manhattan single tax club. Business meeting, first Thursday of each month, at 8 p. m.; other Thursdays, social and propaganda. Club rooms, 73 Lexington ave.; open every day from 6 p. m. to 12 p. m.

Pres., Louis F. Post; sec., A. J. Steers.

Harlem single tax club, room 8, 247 West 125th st. Business meeting every Tuesday, 8:30 p. m. Whist and social evening every Thursday. Pres., Eugene G. Muret; sec., Chas. H. Mitchell.

North New York single tax club. Every Tuesday at 8 p. m., at 2440 3d ave. Pres., James R. Small; sec., Thomas F. Foy.

BROOKLYN.—Brooklyn single tax club. Business meetings Wednesday evenings. Club house, 193 Livingston st.; open at all hours. Pres., G. W. Thompson; sec., W. T. Withers, 8 Willow st.

The Eastern District single tax club. Meetings first and third Mondays, 284 Broadway. Pres., Joseph McGuinness, 215 Ross st.; sec., Emily A. Deverall.

East Brooklyn single tax club. Meets every Tuesday, 8 p. m., 1243 Broadway, in Women's Christian temperance union. Pres., Herman G. Loew; sec., James B. Connell.

BUFFALO.—Tax reform club. Every Wednesday evening, Central labor union hall. Pres., S. C. Rogers; sec., H. B. Buddenburg, 824 Clifton st., E. Buffalo.

ROCHESTER.—Rochester single tax union. Wednesday, 8 p. m.; Sunday, 3 p. m.; 80 Reynolds Arcade. Pres., J. M. Campbell; sec., D. Waters, 80 Reynolds arcade.

ALBANY.—Single tax club. Meetings every Thursday, 7:30 p. m. Pres., J. C. Roshirt; sec., George Noyes, 308 First st.

SYRACUSE.—Syracuse single tax club. 113 Walton street. Pres., F. A. Paul; sec., H. R. Perry, 149 South Clinton st.

POUGHKEEPSIE.—Single tax club. Every Thursday evening, 8 p. m., 236 Union st. Pres., W. C. Albrow; sec., F. S. Arnold.

AUBURN.—Single tax club. Mondays, 7:30 p. m., College hall. Pres., Dan. Peacock; sec., H. W. Benedict, 6 Morris st.

ELLENVILLE.—Single tax club of Ellenville. First and third Monday of each month, Canal st., over E. Bevier's drug store. Pres., Wm. Lambert; sec., Benj. Hull.

FLUSHING.—Single tax club. Pres., D. C. Beard; sec., Fred Sheffield.

NEW BRIGHTON, S. I.—Richmond county single tax club. Every Monday evening, Farabola hall, New Brighton. Pres., J. S. Coogan; sec., A. B. Stoddard, W. New Brighton.

NORFOLK.—Single tax committee. Sec., J. K. Rudyard.

OWEGO.—Single tax club. Pres., Michael J. Murray; sec., J. M. Wilson, 204 Front st.

THROY.—Single tax club. Meetings weekly at 576 River st. Pres., Henry Sterling; sec., B. B. Martis, 576 River st.

COHOES.—Single tax committee. Pres., P. C. Dandurant; sec., J. S. Crane 128 Ontario st.

GLOVESVILLE.—Single tax committee. Chairman, A. P. Slade; sec., Dr. Wm. C. Wood, 30 S. Main st.

JAMESTOWN.—Single tax club of Jamestown. Last Saturday evening of each month. Pres., Adam Stormer; sec., F. G. Anderson, 300 Barrett st.

YONKERS.—The Jefferson single tax club, 13 N. Broadway. Public meetings every Tuesday evening at 7:45. Pres., Fielding Gower; sec., Wm. Young, P. O. box 617.

OHIO.

STATE.—Ohio single tax league. State executive board: Pres., W. F. Bien, 1638 Wilson av., Cleveland; vice-pres., J. G. Galloway, 263 Samuel st., Dayton; treas., Wm. Radcliffe, Youngstown; sec., Edw. L. Hyneman, room 3, 348 1/2 S. High st., Columbus.

CLEVELAND.—Cleveland single tax club. Every Wednesday evening, 8 p. m., 144 Ontario st., room 16. Pres., Tom L. Johnson; sec., L. E. Siemon, 7 Greenwood st.

CINCINNATI.—Cincinnati single tax club. Every Sunday afternoon. Club room, Bradford's block, n. w. cor. 6th and Vine sts. Pres., James Sample, 478 Central av.; sec., Alfred H. Henderson, 23 Clark st.

COLUMBUS.—Central single tax club. Sec., Edw. L. Hyneman, 348 1/2 S. High st.

Columbus single tax club. Meets Sunday at 3:30 p. m. Pres., H. S. Swank, 51 Clinton building; sec., E. Hullinger.

Tiffin.—Single tax committee. Sec., Dr. H. F. Barnes.

GALLON.—Gallon single tax club. Every Monday evening, residence of P. J. Snay, 103 S. Union st. Pres., P. J. Snay; sec., Maud E. Snay.

DAYTON.—Free land club. Pres., John Birch; sec., W. W. Kile, 103 E. 5th st.

AKRON.—Akron single tax club. Pres., Jno. McBride; sec., Sam Rodgers.

MIAMI.—Land and labor association of Miami.

MIAMI.—Land and labor association of Miami. Pres., C. F. Beall; sec., J. T. Beall.

MANASSAS.—Manassas single tax club. Pres., Dr. T. J. Bristol; sec., W. J. Huggins, 27 W. 1st st.

TOLLEDO.—Single tax club No. 1 meets at 114 Summit st. every Sunday at 10 a. m. Pres., A. R. Wynn; sec., J. P. Travers.

YOUNGSTOWN.—Every Thursday evening, Ivorites hall. Pres., Billy Radcliffe; sec., A. C. Hughes, 6 S. Market st.

ZANESVILLE.—Central single tax club. Pres., W. H. Loughhead; sec., Wm. Quigley.

OREGON.

PORTLAND.—Portland ballot reform and single tax club. First Monday of each month, Real Estate Exchange hall. Pres., T. D. Warwick; sec., Wallace Yates, 48 Stark s.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA.—Single tax society of Philadelphia. Every Thursday, 8 p. m., 904 Walnut st. Cor. sec., A. H. Stephenson, 214 Chestnut st.

Southwark tax reform club. Meets every Saturday evening at 8 p. m., at Wright's hall, Passyunk av. and Moore st. Pres., John Cosgrove; sec., H. Valet, 512 Queen st.

PITTSBURG.—Pittsburg single tax club. Meets every 1st and 3d Sunday evening at 7:30 64 4th av. Pres., Edm. Yardley; sec., Mark F. Roberts, 140 S. 24th st.

BRADFORD.—Single tax club, Hevenor's hall, 41 Main st. Meetings for discussion every Sunday at 3:30 p. m.

READING.—Reading single tax society. Monday evenings, 522 Court st. Pres., Chas. S. Prizer; sec., Wm. H. McKinney, 522 Court st.

ERIE.—Erie tax reform league. Pres., W. G. McKean; sec., J. L. Babcock.

MIDDLETOWN.—Middletown single tax club. Meets every Thursday evening in K. of L. hall, corner Water and Nisely sts. Pres., Jno. Steadman; sec., Harry M. Roes.

EDWARDSVILLE.—Jefferson ballot reform and single tax club. First Friday of each month. Pres., J. J. Smythe, M. D.; sec., J. P. Hammond.

LEBANON.—Lebanon single tax and land club. Pres., Adam Behny; sec., J. G. Zimmerman, 111 N. Fourteenth st.

SCRANTON.—Henry George single tax club 1st and 3d Friday evenings of each month, Noake's hall, cor. Franklin ave. and Spruce st. Pres., Duncan Wright; sec., Arthur McGee, 914 Capouse ave.

SHENANDOAH.—Single tax club. Sundays 3 p. m., 415 W. Coal st. Pres., Morris Marsh; sec., Thomas G. Potts.

UPPER MERION.—Single tax committee. Pres., J. B. Carr; sec., George McGee.

JOHNSTOWN, Pa.—Henry George club. Meets every Monday evening for public discussion. Pres., A. J. Moxham; sec., Richard Eyre.

