

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 66-VOL. III, NO. 14.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

The STANDARD has been removed from 104 Dr. Walker's office to 129 Union square. Address all communications to 129 Union square.

CONTENTS
Awakening Thought.
Single Tax Men in Council.
The Lehigh Region.
A Clergyman's Letter.
London Society.
Pen, Pate and Sclerom.
Queries and Answers.
A Glance of Temits Methods.
Events in England and Australia.
Protection by Blizard.
From Indianapolis.
Society Notes.
General Bryce's Call.
The Language of the World.
A Machine That Will Earn a Salary.
Alien Landlords.
All Along the Line.
The Western War.
Getting into S. J. J.
Graves Which Show the Wind.
Nerve Diet.
Farmer Jones and the Tariff.
Our Indians.
A Growing Tolerance.
Duty on Coffee.
Ode to a Pig.
Mary and Dick.
Publisher's Notes.
Life on Thirty Salaries a Week.
Personal.

AWAKENING THOUGHT.

The Mills tariff bill was reported to the house on Monday substantially as it has been printed. The main changes are a somewhat higher duty on the lower grades of refined sugar, to please the Louisiana sugar planters, and a somewhat lower duty on the winter grades, to meet the objection that the reduction in the duty might inure to the advantage of the sugar trust, and the striking out of the provision doing away with the drawback on the exportation of refined sugar, presumably to compensate the trust. However, there is no reason to blame the committee for these comparatively small concessions to the "infant industries," who have so long had their own way that they have come to believe they have a vested right to plunder their fellow citizens and strangle the industry of a great nation. In the excellent report which accompanies the bill, and in which the absurdities and inequities of the present tariff duties that the committee propose to abolish or modify are well set forth, it is explained that the bill is not such as the committee would have wished to make it, but all they thought it at present wise to propose. And although it does not "say free trade once" the report bristles with good free trade arguments.

We real free traders, whose aim is the abolition of the last shred of a duty, have, indeed, good reason to be satisfied with the work of the committee and with the efficient support the administration has evidently given it. As an entering wedge—for this is all it is—the Mills bill is good enough, and seems well constructed for the purpose of concentrating strength and minimizing resistance. For the present time and situation it is probably better than a more radical bill would be. It will not pass into law, and it may not even pass the house without weakening amendments, but it scares and rouses the protectionists almost as much as a bill abolishing the tariff would. And what is the great thing, it will bring on the tariff fight, and make a clear issue between the parties.

The republican report is a howl of thoroughly alarmed protectionism. It denounces the action of the majority in refusing to hear endless pleas from tariff beneficiaries to retain the taxes on the people, by which they alone profit, and repeats in many variations the old story that tariff reductions will ruin American industry and pauperize the American laborer. The debate on the bill begins on the 17th.

The press in all parts of the country is teeming with evidences that the tariff question has taken such a hold on the popular mind that nothing can now prevent it from becoming the issue before the people in the coming presidential election. On the one side, what began as timid advocacy of tariff reform is amounting into denunciations of protection and something like demands for free trade. And on the other hand protectionists, already thoroughly alarmed, are manifesting the greatest activity and putting forth claims that of themselves will compel men to examine the protective principle who never really thought of it before.

It makes no difference what sort of a tariff bill gets through congress, or whether any bill is passed or not. It makes little difference what the party platforms may be. The question before the American people in the campaign that will begin in June will be no matter of "tariff tinkering," but the question between the theory of protection and the theory of free trade. Already a popular discussion of the tariff question is going on such as has never gone on in this generation. Day by day and week by week, ever since President Cleveland's message brought the tariff question into practical politics, this discussion has become wider and hotter. So must it continue to grow. It will receive a fresh impetus with the opening in congress on the 17th of the discussion of the Mills bill, and a still stronger impetus with the meeting of the democratic convention in the early days of June, at which it is now certain nothing but his death can prevent the nomination of Mr. Cleveland. The re-

publican convention will then follow, and with it a national campaign will begin which for vigor and intensity is likely to equal anything in our national history. It will be, indeed, a fight of giants. On the one side, the democratic party under a leadership which promises to rid it of the timidity that has so long hampered it, and in possession of the national administration. And on the other side the republican party, reinforced secretly, if not openly, by the Randalls and the Danas, and backed by the money and influence of the trusts and combinations that find their profit in protection.

In such a campaign as this, any attempt to run a third candidate on a single tax platform would not only be idle but harmful. The chimerical scheme of running a presidential candidate on a platform that will ignore the tariff question, which underlies the call for a convention at Cincinnati in May, is about as hopeful as would have been the attempt on the 12th of March to get up a picnic procession through the streets of New York that should ignore the blizzard. Before November comes the discussion will rage so furiously that every voter in the country will have some sort of opinion and some sort of a preference on the tariff question. Men will be irresistibly driven to take sides.

The idea that some of our friends still entertain, that a third party candidate should be run on a single tax platform, which should proclaim for absolute free trade is equally chimerical. The votes that such a movement could retain would be so many votes withdrawn from the free trade side in the practical struggle against protection. And it is not in human nature that men who even now feel strongly upon the tariff question should, when the discussion reaches the boiling point, be willing to cast their votes for a free trade candidate for whom there is no hope, at the risk of seeing rampant protectionism emerge triumphant from the bitter contest that is going on.

Thus, no independent candidate could bring out anything like the real single tax strength; and if a move to put one in the field, no matter on what platform, was generally concurred in by the active friends of the movement, it could serve no purpose but to create in the public mind an idea of the weakness of the movement that would lessen its influence and retard its growth, and make it far harder to rally our friends for direct action on state lines when the national campaign should be over.

But so far from all this being a matter of regret, it is a matter for the heartiest congratulation. The bitter contest between the two great parties that is now impending will do more for our cause than we could by any possibility do for it by direct action as a third party.

Our great aim has been to get the labor question into practical politics. It was for this that the conference of labor organizations nominated me for mayor of New York, and for this that I accepted the nomination. It was for this that the united labor party was organized, and for this that we made the campaign last year. And it was in the hope of doing something to this end that we looked forward to entering the national campaign this year.

Our dream of doing this is ended. But why? Because the labor question is already in practical politics. Because it is already clear that it is on the labor question that the two great parties are this year to fight one of the bitterest political battles that ever took place in the United States. One has but to notice the discussion that is already going on to see how true this is. Everywhere—in congress, in the press, in the magazines, in the talk of man with man—discussion of the effect of this or that particular change in the tariff is being merged and lost in the discussion of the principle of protection. And it is on its effect on the wages and conditions of labor that this is turning. This, it is evident, will be the vital point around which the controversy will rage.

Could we possibly ask anything better? Could there be anything more conducive to the spreading of that light that we are trying to spread; to the dispelling of that ignorance which is the great obstacle our movement encounters? The general discussion of whether the tariff does or does not raise and maintain wages, whether protection is or is not the only thing that can keep laborers above the line of pauperism, must inevitably compel the discussion of what it really is that makes wages high or low—of what is the real cause that turns into paupers men who are ready to work.

There are some of our friends, like Mr. Pentecost, thorough free traders that he is, who are disgusted with the old parties and their possible candidates that they declare they will not vote for neither even if they write their own ballots. This is April, and the political thermometer will rise steadily and rapidly from now on to November. If they are of the same mind then as now, they will find in Thomas Jefferson and George Washington perfectly unexceptionable names to write on their ballots. In the meantime, vote as they may, let them take part in the discussion. It is the discussion rather than the vote that is the important thing.

In striking and instructive contrast with

Cardinal Manning's "Pleading for the Worthless," printed in THE STANDARD of last week, is Vicar General Preston's "Socialism and the Catholic Church" in the current number of the *Forum*. Through the one breathes that spirit of broad and deep humanity which attracts, ardent and loving souls to the Catholic church; through the other that spirit, dear to those who profit by injustice, that makes so many deeply religious natures hate it. Cardinal Manning pleads for those who are crushed, body and soul, under the pressure of an unjust social system; Vicar General Preston pleads for the system that crushes them. The one is the foremost of English speaking Catholics—a "prince of the church," standing on the very highest round of ecclesiastical distinction that any man, not born an Italian, can in our times hope to reach; the other is a mere "monsignor," the vicar general, or first assistant of an archbishop. Yet, unfortunately, it is the vicar general, not the cardinal, who in this represents the general spirit of the hierarchy—the general spirit, not merely of the Catholic hierarchy, but of the clergy of all the Christian churches. For no matter how much the various sects into which Christianity has been split may differ as to things of no moment, or what fierce strife they may wage as to vestments, or rituals, or dogmas, the influence of the greater part of the clergy of all creeds is to-day—as, with a few noble exceptions, it has been since Constantine married Roman imperialism with the religion of the Carpenter's Son—exerted on the side of oppression and against the oppressed.

The title of Monsignor Preston's article is a misnomer. He discusses the relations of the Catholic church, not to what is generally understood by socialism, but to the doctrines with which my name has been associated. These doctrines, in his title and throughout his article, he endeavors to confound with socialism in its commonly understood sense, although he must know, if only by the attitude of the socialists themselves, that they are in vital points diametrically opposed to socialism.

Says Monsignor Preston: "Communism and socialism, in the general acceptance of these terms, are related to each other, and differ only in degree, while they are one in principle. Socialism denies the right of private ownership in capital or in land, or in both. Communism denies every kind of ownership, and asserts the individual equality of all men as to all things. The socialism which has been advanced in this country of late, as a panacea for human ills, denies that there is, or can be, any private property in land. We quote the exact words of Mr. Henry George: 'We must make land common property.' 'If private property in land is just, then the remedy I propose is a false one; if, on the contrary, private property in land is unjust, then is the remedy the true one.'

This is the statement of the doctrine that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable that Monsignor Preston chooses for his attack. Of it he says: (1) "It is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations and would destroy the present order of society;" and (2) "It is contrary to the law of God and the teaching of the Catholic church."

As to the first contentions of Monsignor Preston I am quite willing to admit them. The great reform I contend for is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations, if by their constitutions is meant existing laws and prevailing customs. But, as has been decided by the supreme court of the United States and by the supreme court of the state of New York, it is not, as Monsignor Preston says it is, inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and with the Constitution of the state of New York. It is contrary to the constitution of all civilized nations only as a little while ago the denial of the right of property in human flesh and blood was contrary to the constitutions of all civilized nations—only as a little while ago the denial of the right of the state to establish a religion and to hang or burn all who did not conform to it, was contrary to the constitutions of all civilized nations. And it would destroy the present order of society, in the sense of destroying that order which everywhere makes the laboring class the poor class and gives command of the products of labor to those who scorn labor—the order brings deepening want with increasing wealth; that builds brothel and almshouse and penitentiary while it erects the church—sets class against class and nation against nation; that makes our Christianity a mockery; and that with every advance of civilization is intensifying forces that must disintegrate and destroy. In this sense I plead guilty to the charge of desiring to overthrow the constitution of every civilized state and to destroy the present order of society. But it might be worth Monsignor Preston's while to observe that this is precisely what the early Christians wanted to do.

Whether "this kind of socialism," as Monsignor Preston persists in calling it, which holds that every child of God is equally entitled to the use of natural opportunities, is contrary to the law of God, is an all important question; but whether it is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic

church or not is a matter of comparatively little importance. For if a thing be contrary to the law of God, then it must be evil, whether the Catholic church teaches against it or not. But if it be in accordance with the law of God, then if the Catholic church teaches against it, so much the worse for the Catholic church.

Monsignor Preston gives the first place in his argument to the assertion that the Catholic church has condemned the doctrine that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable. In support of this he can point to no decision of ecumenical council, to no declaration of pope speaking ex-cathedra on matters of faith and doctrine and to the universal church. He can only cite vague condemnations of communism and socialism, of attacks upon the "just rights of property," and of the "confiscation of church goods and estates;" the fact that the church holds land herself, and the letter of condoleance from the present pope to Archbishop Corrigan, in which, lamenting the "rebellion" of Dr. McGlynn, the pontiff commands the action of the archbishop "in bringing before his supreme tribunal the false doctrines concerning the right of property disseminated among the people in newspapers and public assemblies." That the "Sacred congregation of the index" have not yet condemned my books (a matter for which he rightly intimates I care nothing, but which, by the way, M. de Laveleye of Belgium in an article in the same number of the *Forum* attributes to the interposition of Cardinal Gibbons), Monsignor Preston virtually says is because they have been too busy to attend to such a small matter, and continues: "When the sacred congregation sees fit in its wisdom to consider the works of Henry George, there can be no doubt that it will condemn his political economy, which is nothing but a new edition of socialism."

These are the grounds with which Archbishop Corrigan's vicar general, with the air of a whole ecumenical council, or a pope addressing the universal church ex-cathedra, declares that no Catholic can believe that men have natural and equal rights to land. If Catholics are willing to accept such authority, there is no reason why non-Catholics should make any objection. But, to say nothing of Cardinal Manning and Bishop Nulty, Catholics may cite against Monsignor Preston's dictum the equally respectable theological authority of the "Nun of Kenmore," who in her recently published "Anti-Poverty and Progress," a work in which she pulverizes my theories with arguments akin to Congressman Bryce's, expressly declares that "the church has not yet spoken on this subject; hence Catholics are free to discuss it on its merits."

"When doctors disagree," etc.

The important question—the question which to men who believe, as I do, that there is a God and that this universe is His creation—is this: Is the doctrine that all men are equally entitled to the use of land, or—to put it in reverse form, that private property in land is unjust—contrary to the law of God? As to this, as distinguished from the question whether it is contrary to the teaching of the Catholic church, Monsignor Preston seems only able to find one peg on which to hang his assertion that it is. "We need only quote," he says, "the commandments of God: 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his house, nor his field, nor anything that is his.'"

Considering that one of the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic church is that it is the letter of the word that killeth, but the spirit that maketh to live; considering that the doctrine of the literal inspiration of the Hebrew scriptures has already almost ceased to be believed in by intelligent Christians and Jews, and is rapidly disappearing; and considering that the divine sanction of slavery and of polygamy might be far more clearly proved in the same way, this is a pretty small peg to hang such a sweeping assertion upon. But even the applicability of this deuteronomical version of the tenth commandment depends upon a false assumption which Monsignor Preston makes throughout his article—that is, that I call landlords thieves and robbers, and that no individual or corporation could for one moment justly hold any property in land, if my theory were true.

Monsignor Preston will look in vain through all that I have written to find one single sentence which will sustain this assumption. I have never called individual landlords thieves; I have never asserted that under the laws as they are no one could justly hold land; I have never called upon land holders to give up their land, or upon other individuals to take their land from them. There is a difference, which I have always recognized, between an individual wrong and a social wrong. Where slavery exists, the slave holder may justly hold his slave as against any other than the slave himself. And when property in land exists by virtue of municipal law, the legal land holder may justly hold his land as against any other individual. In a community where that species of property is recognized there can be no strain upon the conscience of the individual land owner in holding land as against other individuals, even though he may see clearly the injustice of that institution. Nor would anything be gained for society at large if he

were to give up his possessions. I have always declared the wrong involved in private property in land to be a social wrong, and the robbery which it entailed to be a robbery for which not the land owners alone, but the whole community, are responsible—those who submit to the robbery, or at least such of them as have any share of political power, as much as those who profit by it.

It would be but a threshing of straw to go over again as against Monsignor Preston the arguments that prove that the attaching to land of that absolute right of property which justly attaches to the things produced by labor is contrary to the law of God. This is not only proved deductively from principles which the human mind recognizes as self-evident truths, but inductively from the fact that private property in land always has led to gross injustice in the distribution of wealth, and that it stands in the way, not merely of material progress, but of physical health and mental and moral development. That in the matter and extension of this rolling sphere, on which countless generations have preceded him and countless generations will follow him, and of which he is but in his turn the tenant for a few years, no man can justly claim the same absolute right of dominion and disposition that he can justly claim in the things which his labor separates from it and adapts for a time to his use, is in itself so perfectly clear to the unprejudiced mind that it has, but to be stated to be recognized. So true is this that no one ever endeavors to really defend private property in land. When this is nominally attempted, what is really defended is private property in things produced by labor, and to make this seem to the unthinking like a defense of private property in land an effort is always made to confuse these two essentially distinct and even contradictory things.

In precisely this way Monsignor Preston endeavors to confuse the essential distinctions between the things made by God and the things made by man. But there is one thing in which he is decidedly original. Endeavoring to destroy the significance of the fact that land increases in value by the growth of the community and without effort on the part of the owner, he says:

To say that there is in any kind of property an unearned increment is not only to state what is false, but to deny the right of property altogether. The owner has the full title to all the legitimate increase of his property or he does not. If he does not, it is every increment is earned and belongs justly to the owner. If there were no increase in value there would be no inducement to hold property of any kind.

Let Monsignor Preston put this to a practical test. Let him go to Tiffany's and say: "This watch or these diamonds are not increasing in value, therefore there can be no inducement for you to hold them," and see what they would say. Or let him consider his own undisputed property. His hat, his coat, his boots, are certainly not increasing in value. Are they any the less his property, or has he no inducement to hold them?

Yet it is only by such arguments as these that any pretense can be made of justifying private property in land. Monsignor Preston makes quite as good an argument for private property in land as does Archbishop Corrigan, or Professor Sumner, or the duke of Argyll, or anyone else who has attempted it.

Such "sound without sense" would signify nothing if it were not that it indicates the position of a powerful body of men in control of a vast and influential organization. As a matter of fact, the Catholic church has not as a church condemned the self-evident truth that the rights of men to the use of land are equal and inalienable, and does not dare to. When the victory of right against wrong, of truth against error has been won, then churchmen will be ready enough to turn around and declare that the church did it. But in the mean time, with a few individual exceptions, the influence of its hierarchy—of what Dr. McGlynn so aptly calls the "machine"—is exerted to confuse the truth and to make the superstitious cower before the wrong. And this is true not merely of the Catholic church, but of all other churches. "The clergy might be usefully employed to assert the rights of mankind," wrote Gibbon, "but so closely connected are the throne and the altar that the banner of the church has seldom been seen on the side of the people." Every great social reform may find in individual priests or preachers heroic advocates, but so long as the masses are poor and the few are rich; so long as the hell of poverty yawns under every man who falls from his place; so long as those who profit by social injustice have in their gift what is necessary to support churches, every phase of the great struggle for human rights must in its first stages at least make its way against the great body of those who have been nominally consecrated to preach the gospel of human rights and human liberty. It was by no accident that the doctors of the Jewish law brought Pilate to crucify Him who came to fulfill the law.

Yet it is the good that is in a thing, and not the evil, that gives it life. It is the

spirit that breathes through Cardinal Manning's plea, and not the spirit of Monsignor Preston's, that in spite of the manner in which her influence has been used to shelter wrong makes the church still loved and influential. A type of the men and women whose good work and sweet lives have illustrated the essential beauty of Christianity, even amid its shortcomings, died in this city last week. The immense building which towers up on the corner of Lafayette place and Fourth street is one of the tangible evidences that remain of the energy, industry and organizing ability of a man who, had he devoted himself to money getting and been fairly favored by circumstances, might have left a fortune like that of Stewart. Father Drumgoole was the son of poor parents who came to New York from Ireland when he was a child. His ambition, as he grew, was to become a priest, and it proved indeed a true vocation. By hard work and close saving he managed to enter a theological college when he became a man, but obliged to leave in order to support his widowed mother, it was not until he was past forty that he was able to enter the priesthood. Then he set about establishing a home for destitute and friendless boys, named after St. Vincent de Paul. Seeing that the usual means of collection would be inadequate for what he proposed, he established a little periodical called the *Homeless Child* at a subscription of twenty-five cents a year, giving to each subscriber, by way of premium, an interest in so many masses. So successful was he that in this way he obtained means to care for some 19,000 children in all; to erect the great ten-story building on Lafayette place at a cost of nearly \$300,000, and to spend over \$400,000 besides in establishing a branch on Staten Island. When he died there were 1,400 boys in his homes.

The work this forceful man did, in spite of such difficulties, is work of the kind that gives the church strength, and its hierarchy influence even when they use it for evil. But it is not the highest work. It is good to shelter homeless children; but it is better to destroy the wrong that crowds the streets of our great cities with homeless children. It is good to relieve poverty; but it is better to end the injustice that makes poverty. It is good to enjoin men to be true and honest and loving, but it is better to remove conditions that tempt, nay that often force them to lie and steal and trample on each other.

And the truth that is spreading and that cannot be stopped or stayed in this poverty and want, and their concomitants of vice and ignorance, strife and greed, are not the results of the laws of God but of the fact that in our most important institutions, we have ignored the laws of God, and have allowed a few to take as their own that abundant provision that nature has made for all. As this truth grows and spreads, more and more of the earnest souls, like Father Drumgoole, who are moved to exertion by the sight of human waste and suffering, will entwine it with their religion and spring forward to do their part in the good work of applying to human laws God's law of justice, and bringing about on earth that kingdom of right doing of which early Christianity dreamed. Thus will the redemption of the church come.

HENRY GEORGE.

More About Senator Edmunds and the Coffee Tax.

WASHINGTON, April 2.—In the last STANDARD a correspondent refers to the fact that Senator Edmunds, in *Harper's Magazine* for February, asserted that when the duties were removed from tea and coffee the consumers received no benefits; and he inquires whether this statement is true. THE STANDARD very properly showed that even if it were true the inference which protectionists seek to draw therefrom would not follow. It may be of some interest, however, to learn what is the fact. The Brooklyn *Eagle* states, and gives the figures to prove it, that when the duty was removed from tea "the price fell off to the full extent not only of the duty, but of the profit that the dealer had been making on the duty." As for coffee, the Philadelphia *Record* says: "Senator Edmunds tripped himself up by asserting to state that when the American tariff duty was repealed, a Brazilian export duty was imposed." Even if Senator Edmunds's statement were true, it would simply prove that after the removal of the duty the importers—or somebody—made more than a fair and equitable profit by the full amount of the duty, and that therefore competition is not, as teachers of the current political economy persist in reiterating, certain to reduce prices to the lowest point compatible with commercial prosperity.

J. L. MCCREERY.

Forgiving Them That Trespass Against Him.

The Emperor Frederick has been graciously pleased, in commemoration of his accession to the throne, to issue a decree of amnesty, pardoning certain classes of criminals. The offenses to which it applies are, insulting the sovereign; crimes and misdemeanors in the exercise of civil rights; insulting or resisting officers of the law; disturbing the public order; press offenses; infractions of the law of public meeting, etc.

William T. Crossdale.

William T. Crossdale of THE STANDARD underwent an operation for hernia on Friday, March 23. He had been a sufferer from the disease for many years, and took this step after consultation with several eminent surgeons. The operation was performed by Professor Phelps, and was entirely successful. Mr. Crossdale is now rapidly convalescing, though it will be still some weeks before he can leave his bed.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Foreign Exchange.

CINCINNATI.—(1) How is the exchange of commodities effected between one country and another?

(2) When the balance of trade is in favor of a country, and a large amount of gold is sent there in consequence, what is done with it?

(3) Shall you publish the "Queries and Answers" in book form? I think they will make a valuable addition to the land and labor library.

H. W. WALFORTH.

(4) For example, omitting middle men for simplicity:

Jones, an American exporter, ships cotton to Smith, an English manufacturer of cotton goods. If the value of the cotton be \$1,000, Smith buys of a London bank a draft on a New York bank for \$1,000, which he mails to Jones. That completes the transaction between Jones and Smith, Smith's bank account being reduced by \$1,000. Smith manufactures the cotton into cloth and ships \$1,000 worth to a New York importer, who buys of the New York bank a draft on the London bank for \$1,000, which he sends to Smith. When Smith deposits his draft his bank account is restored, and the London bank holds a claim of \$1,000 against the New York bank, while the New York bank holds a claim to the same amount against the London bank. The transactions are then equalized, none of the parties in fact owing anything to any of the others.

In practice, of course, the drafts will be on different banks, and from different banks; but that makes no difference, since London nevertheless owes New York \$1,000 and New York owes London \$1,000, a mutual indebtedness which may be utilized for further transactions.

(5) If, in the illustration given, Jones had sent \$1,500 worth of cotton goods to New York, instead of \$1,000, that transaction would have left a balance of \$500 against us, to be equalized either by reverse differences of the value on other exchanges or by a consignment of gold to the value of \$500. If the gold was sent, it would be used for English coinage or for English manufacturing, or it would be shipped from England to some other country to which England was indebted.

But while a balance of trade might exist for some time for or against us relatively to the whole world, exports and imports constantly tend to balance. This is sometimes made to appear otherwise by treating gold as something different from other commodities. Thus, if Australia shipped large quantities of gold for a long time, it might be said that the balance of trade was perpetually against Australia; but that would not be true, for gold is a product. The tendency to balance is also overcome by rents, interest on watered bonds, dividends on watered stock, and gifts sent from one country to another.

The clearing house of a large city is as good a representation in miniature of the world's exchanges as you can probably find.

(6) Edited selections may be published.

The Single Tax and Wages.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—(1) Do you intend to tax church lands as much as land owned by individuals?

(2) If a machine is invented and throws men out of employment, will not competition reduce wages as much under the single tax as at present?

(3) What kind of a currency does Mr. George propose to have?

(4) If we should have the single tax in this country, would not labor flow in from other countries and reduce wages to what they were before?

H. E. FIELD.

(1) Yes. There is no reason why the community should support a religious sect. Let each sect support itself. If it is rich enough to occupy a block at the head of Wall street on Broadway, paying as much to the community for the privilege as business men must pay for similar locations, let it do so; but if it is too poor to pay taxes, let it build on land that has no value and which, consequently, is not taxed.

(2) No. It will increase wages. Private ownership of land is the nether mill stone, and invention the upper; between them labor is crushed. The single tax will remove the nether stone. Machinery presses down wages now, because natural opportunities to work are limited, and tend to still greater limitation with the advance of invention. But under the single tax the only limitation of these opportunities would be their actual use. All natural opportunities not in actual use would be free. And since it is the tendency of machinery to broaden the field of employment, a tendency now held in check by land speculation, a machine that threw men out of employment would, if the single tax were in force, only throw them into other more agreeable and more profitable employment.

(3) I do not know that he proposes any particular kind. You will find his views on the subject of money in "Protection or Free Trade?"

(4) Labor would flow in, but instead of reducing wages, every new comer would add to the common wealth. Just as immigration is now a good thing; for landlords, so would it then be for the people.

An Illustration for I. V. P.

BROCKWAYVILLE, Pa.—As affording apt illustrations of the truth of your answer to I. V. P. in THE STANDARD of March 24, I may say that in this section there is plenty of timber land which sells at \$20 an acre, but is assessed at only \$2 for tax purposes. And much land that could not be bought at \$20, but is held at a much higher valuation—such as coal lands, worth from \$50 to \$300 an acre—is assessed at the same \$2 rate.

BROX H. BUTLER.

Notes.

"A STUDIOUS INQUIRER." Philadelphia.—The statements which seem to you contradictory are not so. They are different forms of stating the same fact; and though they might fairly appear to be contradictory to one so unfamiliar with the subject that every qualification must be expressed to enable him to understand the limitations of a proposition, yet to a *studious inquirer* their consistency ought to be apparent. Selling value, speculation eliminated, is a capitalization of present rental value; and when speculation pre-

ters in the selling value (a capitalization of prospective rental value). But as vacant land transactions in the market are almost exclusively selling and buying rather than renting transactions, men who invest in land feel respecting these investments as they do respecting investments in other property, that the income from them must approximate to the ordinary rate of interest. Accordingly I am not disposed to apologize for having said that when the owner of land rents it "he expects a rental based on" the market price, even though I also said that selling value is based on rental value.

In writing the above I have described land as "property" if you look over the files of THE STANDARD you will find that I have frequently said that land is not and cannot be property. I trust you will not call me to account for this inconsistency also.

If you do not see that the single tax will open natural opportunities that are now closed, I cannot undertake to argue with you. Read "Progress and Poverty," and "Protection or Free Trade?" and if you do not see it then, you had better conclude that to you the cat is invisible and your efforts in behalf of the single tax have been exerted in a cause which you do not understand and possibly could not believe in.

JOHN C. DANA, Greenwood Springs, Col.—Your suggestion will be acted upon.

LOUIS F. POST.

A GLIMPSE OF TOMBS METHODS.

Mr. Warden Walsh's Bill for Producing a Prisoner in Court—A Little Matter of 1,450 Per Cent Overcharge.

Mr. Fatty Walsh—his baptismal name is not really Fatty, but no one would recognize him were his proper first name used—Mr. Fatty Walsh is a local statesman of that class which in England looks to the honor of knighthood as its highest reward. Being an American and not an Englishman, Mr. Walsh has secured a more substantial guard for his political services. He has become warden of the Tombs prison in New York, with seigniorial rights of which no man has ever seen the complete list. He furnishes prisoners with extra food, supplies messengers to run their errands and otherwise relaxes the rigor of his hospitality; all of course, for due consideration. Take it all in all, the honorable Fatty Walsh is considered by Tombs habitués and cognoscenti to have a pretty soft thing.

The best of men, however, have their troubles, and Mr. Walsh has his. He is in trouble now. Undoubtedly, of course. He is being persecuted.

On March 23, Judge Cullen, of the supreme court, then sitting in Brooklyn, issued a writ directing Mr. Fatty Walsh to produce before him the body of John D. Watson, then a prisoner in the Tombs, to give evidence in certain litigation. Mr. Walsh respectfully bowed to the mandate of the law, and sent Mr. Watson to Brooklyn in a carriage under charge of two keepers. Then he sent to George R. Rhodes, Jr., the lawyer who had obtained the writ, a bill made up of the following items:

Carriage hire.....\$10 00
Two keepers at \$7.50.....15 00
Ferryage.....24
Total.....\$29 24

Mr. Rhodes thought this bill excessive. He didn't complain about the charge for ferryage, and he was even willing to stand the hack hire; but he felt there was a misunderstanding about the keepers. He hadn't wanted to pay for the limited time necessary to go to Brooklyn, attend court and return. Evidently Mr. Fatty Walsh had misunderstood matters. And so Mr. Rhodes, after vainly endeavoring to induce Fatty's representative to accept a reasonable sum, submitted the bill to the court, and learned that Mr. Walsh's complete legal fee was two dollars.

Then Mr. Walsh went to his desk in Magnesian indignation, and wrote Mr. Rhodes a letter. "I require," he said, "the full amount of my bill as presented by my keepers, \$29.24. If you do not choose to pay it, I will take no further proceedings in the matter, but make you a present of the bill." And then came this very significant postscript: "You need not ask any more favors from me."

So Mr. Rhodes sent the correspondence to Mayor Hewitt, and Mayor Hewitt sent it to the commissioners of charities and correction, and the commissioners of charities and correction called on the honorable Fatty Walsh, warden of the Tombs, for a report. And the honorable Fatty made a report as requested, setting forth that everything was quite correct, whereas he had charged only \$7.50, explaining that the charge for carriage hire was very moderate, and offering to prove the ferryage.

And so the matter rests for the present. The honorable Fatty Walsh says he is out \$20.24 for carriage hire and ferryage; the keepers are out \$7.50 each, which Mr. Walsh says he would have paid them if Mr. Rhodes had paid him; and Mr. George R. Rhodes, Jr., is in pocket to the extent of \$2. Mr. Walsh's legal fee. The whole affair is a glimpse of Tombs methods. Drop the curtain.

The Rent Increases of the Lumber Distr.

Frederick, Wisconsin in Philadelphia, Pa. Review. When the Williamsport lumbermen went to Washington to prevail on the committee having in charge the bill now before congress to retain the duty on lumber, they were sent by the laboring men. Does any one imagine that the wages of the log chopper or the mill hand? The men who convert the standing lumber into manufactured lumber are not alarmed. The native hand has shared the lumber camps with the Canadian log chopper long enough to know that the duty on lumber forms no part of his wages. The particular kind of labor he has to sell comes in competition with all other kinds of labor, including foreign labor. If the duty on lumber were removed from lumber would lower the price of lumber, it would reduce the value of stumpage; and who could better afford to stand a reduction than the timber owner, who bought his pine timber at a cost of fifty cents and sold it for 100 feet and now gets from \$6 to \$8 per foot on the stump. The only effect the reduction in the price of lumber would have on the laboring man would be to reduce the cost of the house that shelters himself and family.

History Repeats Itself.

Green's History of the English People. Monopolies abandoned by Elizabeth, extinguished by act of parliament under James, and denounced with the assent of Charles, himself in the petition of right, were again set on foot, and on a scale more gigantic than had been seen before. Wine, soap, salt, and almost every article of domestic use, fell into the hands of monopolists, and rose in price out of all proportion to the profit gained by the crown. "They say in our cup," Colpepper said afterward in the song "Parliament." "They dip in our dish, they sit by our fire, we find them in the dye, for the wash bowls and the powdering tub. They shave with the cutter in his box. They have marked and sealed us from head to foot."

Protection for Pennsylvania Coal Spills the

Market for Western Coal.

Birmingham should go on the free list. All New England could then get cheaper fuel than they could get from the Pennsylvania, Nova Scotia, and the Canadian retailing tariff on coal would be repealed, thus opening a new field of export to the coal operators of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.

Protection for Pennsylvania Coal Spills the

Market for Western Coal.

Birmingham should go on the free list. All New England could then get cheaper fuel than they could get from the Pennsylvania, Nova Scotia, and the Canadian retailing tariff on coal would be repealed, thus opening a new field of export to the coal operators of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois.

EVENTS IN ENGLAND AND AUSTRALIA.

At last the bitter cry of outcast London has reached the ears of the nation's masters assembled at St. Stephen's. Lord Dunsen, stocked with facts and figures, arose from his bench in the house of lords the other night and called for a consideration of the "sweating system" prevailing at the east end. He said that the conditions of the lives of many of the people there "are more deplorable than those of any body of workmen in any portion of the civilized world." As an illustration of his assertion, he stated that among the women engaged in making waistcoats he had found one machinist who could earn only 5s. per week by working from 7 in the morning till 12 or 1 next morning. In the manufacture of children's clothes, he found one woman who made knickerbockers for 15d. a pair, and could earn 5s. 6d. per week. "It is not strange," said he, "that under such circumstances women are driven on the streets, and that the strongest men are killed in the course of eight or ten years."

The whole assemblage was thunderstruck at the revelation, and one after another noble lords got up and poured forth eloquence and pathos. One found consolation in the fact that "the great majority of these unfortunate people are not our fellow subjects, but are Irish, Jews, Gypsies and persons of other nationalities. They landed in this country in absolute destitution."

But what was to be done? The London Star said rightly that the discussion "suggests much the same kind of feeling as would be aroused by a convention of cannibals meeting to discuss the prevention of hasty mastication." These privileged persons had no intention of really changing the condition of things, for upon those conditions the continuance of the luxuries which they enjoyed depended. Besides, quoted one, "if these dens are entirely swept away there is danger of trade being driven away." But that was a way out of the difficulty they were not agreed, and the discussion dwindled down to a plea for protection. "Men and women," cried Lord Dunsen, "have to work eighteen hours a day for merely starvation wages; women are driven to a life of dishonor, as being less degraded than the circumstances which attend a life of honest toil," because of that "free competition which political economists tell us is so beneficial." Consequently, competition from abroad must be cut off by rearing up a wall of duties, the virtue of which is that the price of products would rise and apparently be given to increase rents, or at all events to prevent their decline.

And well may the noble lords speak eloquently in this cause. They are driven hard. From every quarter come dismaying reports. Rents shrieking and all kinds of schemes afoot to cause their further shrinkage—chief among them a plan to shift upon rents the burden of those taxes that have for so long hampered industry. In the Scottish highlands and in Ireland commissioners are chopping down the trees of the land, the financial reform association in connection with the Scottish land restoration league, has just passed resolutions to the effect that "unless provision be made in the imperial budget for the repeal of the duties upon tea, coffee, cocoa, chicory, dried fruits, gold and silver plate, and the tax upon carriages, the sense of the house (parliament) be taken as to the abolition of such duties and the substitution of a tax upon land values."

In London the rate committee of the Lambeth vestry recommends the taxation of ground rents for the defrayment of public improvements and suggests that the metropolitan vestries do likewise. Influential newspapers, such as the Star, the Pall Mall Gazette and Reynolds's Weekly, are blazing away for gradual absorption of rents for public purposes. Clergymen and lay speakers are everywhere urging the same thing. Members of parliament are working for it in the house of commons and candidates are advocating it upon the hustings. Here, there and everywhere the cry is raised against landlords' confiscation of the products of the workers' toil. It is not the hot heads and wild schemes of the reformers, the row, but cool heads and reasoned "philosophies." "The city is not a hot bed of socialism or even of radicalism," says the London Echo. "On the contrary, conservatives largely preponderate in its representative bodies, yet here the proposal to levy a direct impost upon the owners of property (land) receives general support."

Moreover, at the instance of William Saunders, one of the most persistent advocates of the single tax doctrine, when the Walworth liberals and radicals propose to place a rent upon the next vacancy, the London Echo says: "The taxation of ground rents and values" is preparing to place a statement of the doctrine in the hands of every elector in the metropolis. The statement will be issued in the form of a thirty-two-page pamphlet. A thousand dollars toward defraying the expense of this undertaking was guaranteed at the first meeting, and further subscriptions have since been supplied. Such a document in the hands of thinking people, even if supplemented by no greater public discussion than that which is now going on in press, on platform and in pulpit, must be productive of great good, and will lead into the ranks of the new crusade hundreds, perhaps thousands, of strong hands and sturdy hearts.

But the climax of assault against the peers was reached in the big vote in the commons in favor of reform in the house of lords. True, the Tory vote outnumbered that of radicals and liberals, but the subject is one that is persistently coming up, and each time the cause is weaker and the assailants more audacious. Excepting a few men like Lord Salisbury, Earl Spencer and Lord Roseberry, who foresee the social crash, and are prepared to stand from under, the five hundred gentlemen who constitute the house of lords are strongly prejudiced against the rising tide of democracy, and whenever a popular measure comes up they leave pigeon matches, race courses, prize fights and gambling helts to vote against it. And now John Morley gives the climax of ingratitude toward these saviors of British society by declaring that "the accident of birth can no longer count for anything in making laws for a free and self-governing nation."

This sentiment is ominous, indeed, for, carried out to its logical end, it puts an end to royalty itself, and sweeps the land clear for the establishment of a republic.

The London Christian Commonwealth, in a recent editorial, says:

It was no part of God's arrangement that millions of poor men and women—aye, and children, too—should be working their fingers to the bone and living on bread and water in order to fill the pockets of a few thousand people, who stand behind them to appropriate the fruits of their labor. No; this is not of God; no sanction can be found for it in the scriptures; and the voice of God which speaks to every man through his conscience and his reason, condemns it as treason against primary human rights.

The Christian Commonwealth announces that a conference of Christian men and women will shortly be held in London to make a move toward securing recognition of these human rights and to meet Cardinal Manning's question, "What is society doing, or willing to do, to redeem and save the worthless?" Of what the Christian Commonwealth is in favor there can be no question, as it is a staunch advocate of the single tax and gives large space in its columns to the propagation of anti-poverty gospel.

The closeness with which the interests of Australia are linked to those of Great Britain in the great social struggle, and the radical sentiments that are abroad in Australia may be seen by the following extract from the Brisbane (Australia) Boomerang, commenting on the agitation in the highlands of Scotland and the scheme of wholesale deportation of crofters to Australia. "What permanent good will it do them to 'come to Australia'?" asks the Boomerang.

Will it not be simply dropping them from the clutches of one land robber into the clutches of another? And if the latter robber, our own Australian landlord, does not yet realize quite so fully as his British prototype it is only because the monopoly is not yet quite complete and because he is obliged to be a little reasonable until it is. The crofter holds the winning hand in Scotland. He's got the land; he's got the case, and he's got a mighty flood of public indignation drowning the land robbers before his eyes, but bearing him safe and sound upon its topmost crest. The Tories of the British land, however, have been as usual, and the land league has proved itself invincible, safely introduced in the hearts of the Irish people. Scotland, by that Edinburgh jury which acquitted the Lewis deer raiders, has declared itself for the English radicals. The English crofters, the gulf of universal hatred and now fight the battle of the English people upon Irish soil. If the crofter stays to share the fight, he's in at the division of the spoil. If he comes here there'll be a few years' rest for the English crofters. The old fight must be taken up again. For it matters little what we call the tenure under which men hold land in Australia so long as mortgages and land syndicates, the fore-runners of a landlord caste, are enabled to extort in rent or interest or by lowered wages the lion's share of the wealth wrung by labor from the soil. Those who want the crofter to come to Australia are those who want to make him a tenant out of him. His coming here would be like jumping out of the fire into the frying pan when he has the prospect of jumping clean out to the door.

The Boomerang goes on to say that "this land question is the bugbear of Australian politicians and writers. They all see it and feel it, but they dare not speak out like men." No effectual remedy can be found for a condition of things under which there are ten thousand of the starved people in Sydney, thousands of unemployed men in Brisbane, wretched homes for many a struggling family, and girls by hundreds driven to sell their honor, until "the land is reclaimed by the state, and industry released from the dwarfing bonds of monopoly, and the soil thrown open to the user, and the unearned increment poured into the treasury of the people who make it."

Our Commonwealth of Adelaide, South Australia, remarks in a recent issue that the single tax doctrine is spreading "quietly, slowly, but firmly, among the thinking portion of the people of New South Wales."

At Dubbo, Goulburn, Forbes, Wagga, and other country societies have been formed to preach the new gospel of redemption to the people. Last month a land nationalization society was formed in Sydney; being in the hands of good, earnest men, there is no probability of its doing a good work in that city. The first meeting was a most enthusiastic one, and good practical speeches were delivered by Messrs. Foxall, Dobbie, Guilford, Trail and others.

At Port Pirie an anti-poverty society has been started. Mr. A. Dungey, who is indefatigable in the good cause, was chairman at the inaugural meeting, at which several good speeches were made.

PROTECTION BY BLIZZARD.

A Picture of the Prosperity That Would Have Been the Result of the Great Storm Had Been Permitted.

William Lloyd Garrison, son of the great anti-slavery apostle, is doing good service for the cause of freedom in fighting protectionist fallacies in New England. In a recent speech before the Mercantile library association in Boston he used the following happy illustration:

A cyclone or blizzard has many of the attributes of a protective tariff. It is a barrier to the free interchange of commodities. It produces scarcity and enhances prices. It profits a few at the expense of the many. It benefits the dealer in milk or coal or meat, or other necessities of daily use, provided he is caught with a good stock on hand. The herding company does not grieve over the troubles of the horse railroad company. It has all it can do to gather in the harvest which enforced custom has so suddenly created. No, not created. Taxes and storms destroy, but do not create. I should have said, to gather in the harvest which the horse railroad was prevented by accident from gathering itself.

The snow storm tariff raised the wages in some employments. The snow shovellers on one railroad were able to exact \$2 an hour for their services in clearing the 12½ cents which they ordinarily got. Some of the New York hackmen were able to make their patrons pay from \$10 to \$50 for a single ride. The lively stable men appreciated the benefit of protection, while their poor horses did not. The firemen on the telegraph routes were much in request, and employment overtook even the tramps who ordinarily flee from it. Looked at from the point of view of these prospering people, the storm embargo brought a benefit. The hotel keepers of New York, who found customers for their rooms at \$50 a night, all have a good word to say of the blizzard.

Sidney Smith, a member of a party who would speak disrespectfully of the equator, but if that imaginary line had conferred a pecuniary benefit upon him his language would have been deferential.

Supposing that, instead of a few days' isolation, a much longer period of non-intercourse with the adjoining towns and cities should occur, and business, in a measure, adapted itself to the circumstances, as it always has a way of doing, what more natural thing than the conviction of the parties who find the situation painful that a blizzard is a blessing? And if the weather could be controlled by the votes of a community, who doubts that we should have plausible arguments to prove that storms assist trade? The land and the Fifth avenue hotel might reason after the manner of the treasurer of a great woolen mill and say: "If I got large prices for my rooms, how many more servants I can employ; how much more food I can buy of the marketmen, thereby helping them, and how many more dollars my employees will have to spend, thus increasing the general trade of the community. Don't you see? What benefits me must benefit all."

And the other favored industries would echo the idea, and the government and merchants might worship a storm for the sake of a temporary relief from people crying for "protection for the sake of protection." Fortunately, we cannot run the weather by ballots or lobbies, and in a few days the railroads and the ferry boats and the telegraph wires are all working again, and

humanity rejoices that the embargo is lifted, and that free trade once more pours in its bounty to the great city. It brings the milk to the pining babies, the coal to freezing families and meat and vegetables to hungry mouths, even though the landlords, the hack drivers and the snow shovellers lose their monopoly.

A tariff is a railroad interruption, a suspension of shipping, a derangement of the natural laws of supply and demand, which, left to themselves, bring constantly and unerringly the needed commodities, and avoid the gluts and overstocks and scarcity which result from artificial attempts at regulation.

Unhindered communication between nations brings the same blessing that comes from the interdependence and free exchange of neighboring communities, because economic law is universal, and while governments and peoples vary, are themselves as fixed and immutable as the laws that govern the movement of the planets.

FROM INDIANAPOLIS.

Legislation and Office Seeking—The Anti-Poverty Society.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., March 28.—Some stand ought to be taken by the new political forces on the question of the complete divorce of the legislative branch of our government from the office seeking element. About half of the time of a congressman is taken up by solicitors, and we see the evil effects of this impurity of office seekers and the badgering of the president and heads of departments by congressmen for places for their "fence members," in the backwardness of legislation. Almost four months of the present session have expired, yet scarcely anything of consequence has been enacted. Evidence is forthcoming every day of neglect of legislative matters in order to satisfy an office seeking constituency. Legislators should be elected to legislate for the people's interests, and not for the purpose of intriguing for places for office seekers. The people's interests will suffer until the divorce takes place, and I hope the conference on the Fourth of July will take a commanding position on this subject. We are struggling for principle, not spoils, and can well afford to deprive our position.

For myself I am in favor of a strict civil service law that would make fitness for place the test, rather than slick political engineering. But as many are opposed to "an office holding aristocracy," I propose to be conservative on the question while insisting that we should declare for the separation. It matters not how it is brought about; let us declare that our national and state legislators should be freed from the responsibility of procuring places for office seeking constituents.

Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland was in the city the latter part of last week and called on our society, but on account of the slippery condition of the walks and the disagreeableness of the weather we postponed the meeting until next Sunday evening. We were very sorry, as we would have liked much to hear Mr. Johnson speak to us. The attendance had been splendid all along until that evening. Mr. Johnson's father, the veteran Colonel Johnson, came with him to see us, and promised to attend our meetings as often as the state of his eyes would permit. The colonel is the president and largest stockholder of the Citizen's street railway of this city, and like his son is a thorough believer in the single tax.

I am learning every day of prominent people who are quiet advocates of this great doctrine, but they are playing the role of Nicodemus. We would like to have such men come and see us and take on enough nerve to say a few words of encouragement, or, if they can't do this, to write some lines. If requested we will not divulge their names.

L. P. CUSTER.

The Result of Mature Reflection.

FORT WAYNE, Ind., March 26.—For a long time I was strongly in favor of running a presidential ticket, and your action in suggesting the opposite course made me hot. After more mature reflection I am one of those who believe that for the labor party to enter the coming campaign (that is, the tariff fight) and ignore the tariff question, would be to use an ancient figure, like the play of "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out. Worse. It would be, by avowing a lack of conviction on a great question, to confess our inability to deal with public affairs. We cannot be indifferent on the tariff question. Either a protective tariff is a benefit to the people of this country, or it is not. In either case our duty is plain. If we are not a unit on the question, it is our fault.

Up to the day of the national election in 1854 I was an advocate of a protective tariff—or rather, I voted for protection because I "did not want American wages cut down one-half." Since that time I have tried to give to the tariff question the kind of study that for the past seven years I have given to the principles of "Progress and Poverty," and the result is that I am an absolute free trader. Until the labor party has positive convictions on vital questions it had better keep out of the fight.

All this is on the assumption that free trade will be the issue this year. Should events prevent this result, then the course to be pursued will remain to be settled. If the democrats offer to do part of the work that otherwise we would have to wait years to accomplish, I am sure I shall not object. I am not so anxious to make extra work for myself as to decline to ride a wagon going part of my way. I believe we ought, on this or any other question in which we are interested, to get into the first wagon that comes along. We shall not be required to carry that wagon will be fit for hauling saw logs ten years from now. We shall not be expected to endorse the democratic party, the republican party, or any other party.

W. E. McDERMOTT.

The Sooner the Better.

HAMILTON (ONT.) TIMES. Canada cannot afford to tax the raw materials of manufactures when the United States admits them free of duties.

Once a beginning is made it will not take long to get the tariff down to a revenue basis, which in the United States means a very close approach to free trade. As each protective duty is removed a set of lobbyists drops out, and the strength of the high tariff ring is decreased. With few and low import duties the United States must become a very prosperous country upon earth, and Canada must either adopt the same means (free trade) to attain equal prosperity, or the people of this country will go across the border in droves to better their condition. This is the situation confronting Canadian statesmen. The sooner they understand it, and prepare for it by reducing public expenditures and the rate of taxation, the better it will be for the dominion.

Who is Afraid of the Post Office?

Richmond 15 State. Who is afraid of the post office? Who would be willing to see the mails taken from the government and entrusted to the hands of any corporation? In a very short time after the establishment of a government telegraph there will be found few who would ever consent to see the telegraph placed once more in private hands. The needs of the age require a telegraphic system as efficient as the post office system.

SOCIETY NOTES.

—Miss Chandler Moulton in Morning Journal. The glad dawn sets his fires upon the hills. Then floods the valleys with his golden light. And, triumphing o'er all the hosts of night, The waiting world with new-born rapture thrills.

And, hark! I seem to hear a song which thrills The trembling air of earth with heaven's delight.

And straight uplifts with its Celestial Might Souls faint with longing, compassed round with ill.

"Christ, Christ is risen" the unseen singers sing.

"Christ, Christ is risen" the echoing hosts reply. The hushed wind knows a passing seraph's wing.

And holds its breath while shining ones go by: "Christ, Christ is risen" loud let the anthem ring.

"He lives, He loves, He saves; we need not die."

Whether the season of Lent has or has not any but a conventional influence upon social movements, there is no question that Easter brings with it a glow of gladness to every heart. It is the crowning festival of the Christian world, and apparently has its perfect consummation in this great city of ours, where lights, music and flowers, the three great emblems of gravity and rejoicing, are brought within the reach of all.—(New York Sun.)

A dispatch from Reading, Pa., announces that an average reduction of eight per cent in wages has been made throughout the Pennsylvania coke regions. About one-third of the men are now idle, and it is thought that those at work will submit to the reduction without making any serious complaint.

The emergency fund for the relief of the next fortnight are almost without limit, and to keep them all with their respective dates clearly in mind would be a task even for those whose memories have been made better than now by the Lullaby method. The performance of the French school for the purpose of raising funds for a French school promises well, as it has a good list of patronesses, including among others Mrs. James Otis, Mrs. Gibert, Mrs. Alphonse Montant and Mrs. R. L. Clarkson, and an excellent company of amateurs, who will give a charming operetta in French and an English play called "An Old Master," in which Miss Alice Lawrence will appear. On Monday, April 9, Miss Kate Thoburn, Mrs. De Nardis and other ladies of the Roman Catholic faith will preside over a fête at Delmonico's to aid those who are sick and in prison, charities which should appeal to all.

Then come Mr. Louis Tiffany's Pass festival to help the hungry for women and children, a charity musicale at Mr. Frederick Goodridge's on the 9th, and on the same evening will occur Mrs. Van Schaick Oddie's dance at the Mendelssohn glee club's rooms, which will be a most successful and profitable affair in the cause of charity by the young ladies of Mrs. Oddie's sewing class, which has met at her house during Lent. The Venetian carnival, to take place at the Metropolitan Opera House on the 12th, will, of course, take the form of all the festivals of the year. Mrs. Chauncey M. Depew and the other ladies who are on the committee of management have spared neither money nor trouble to make it completely successful. Unique and original it must necessarily be.—(New York Sun.)

The health department says that over six thousand children under fifteen years of age are known to be engaged in various employments in this city.

That a feeling of relief comes with Easter to the youthful heart is easily understood. The shackles of dullness and restraint thrown off, plans for all kinds of diversion and merriment present themselves, and even though there may be no immediate prospect of fashionable entertainments, yet luncheon, races and summer gayeties loom up in the near future and disperse all the clouds and darkness of the past six weeks.—(New York Sun.)

THE STANDARD.

SENEY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
11 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers in every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1888.

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

GENERAL BRYCE'S CAFE.

General Lloyd S. Bryce, having considered the question of land nationalization, publishes a confession in the *North American Review*. He is embarrassed at the thought of the cow which has done duty so often to illustrate one phase of opposition to land reforms, as the blacksmith shop alongside the palace has for another phase. But General Bryce does not call it a cow; he calls it a calf.

If the principle that man must not monopolize what his own labor has not created prohibits private ownership of land, General Bryce wants to know if, it does not also "interdict private ownership in a calf." And General Bryce is a member of congress!

The economic identity of land and cows, or, if you please, calves, has been often asserted and the fallacy and absurdity of the proposition as often exposed; but for the purpose of observing a congressman's mental machinery in full operation it may be instructive as well as entertaining, despite the danger of dizziness, to follow General Bryce through this little exercise of his in economic gyrations.

"God," he says, "made the calf as well as he did the land," the inference being that man has no more right to absolute ownership of calves than to absolute ownership of land. That God made calves as well as land is true, just as it is true that God made the rainwater which the housewife collects in her tub as well as the clouds from which it falls or the sea from which it evaporated. And in the same sense it is true that God made houses, locomotives, ships and dry goods as well as land. But for certain natural laws which man may direct, but can neither originate nor control, he could have none of these. No matter how much labor he expended he could not collect a drop of water nor produce any inanimate thing but for laws of cohesion; and if he could it would float away into space but for laws of gravitation; and but for laws of generation calves would not be born. But given these and other natural laws, and man may produce ships, houses, locomotives, dry goods or calves at will; and if he direct his labor exclusively to the production of any one, the others will disappear. It is just as much on account of human labor that the supply of calves and cows is maintained as that ships and houses are produced and preserved. But not so with land, the source of all these things, and the ultimate governor of their production; no labor can make it, no labor can increase it, no lack of labor can diminish it. Land is, as it always has been and always will be, the source of life, the mother of wealth, upon which we must live and in which we must deliver; to be denied it is a sentence of death, to be compelled to buy it a sentence into slavery.

A perfect calf syndicate could subject us to temporary inconvenience, but a perfect land syndicate would reduce us to servitude. General Bryce might do very well with land, even if he could get no calf to put upon it; but what would he do with his calf if he could get no land to put the calf upon?

Since man is an earthling and not a cauldron, unless members of congress be excepted, there is all the difference of life and death or slavery and freedom between monopoly of land and monopoly of calves; and since all that is drawn forth from the earth is drawn forth by man's labor, while the earth itself is as it came from the hand of omnipotence, there is all the difference of title by production and title by force between ownership of land and ownership of calves.

"The calf grows," says General Bryce, "and with its growth its value is enhanced," and "the calf costs its owner no more in proportion to bring up than it costs the land owner to bring up his land." It is well to remember that General Bryce is a member of congress, for in the supposition that membership in that body implies a moderate amount of intelligence, the fact would never be suspected from this observation. What if the value of a calf does grow with its growth? Does the value of land grow with its growth? And who ever heard before of land owners "bringing up" land? The land had attained its full growth long before any land owner appeared to say to his fellow man: "This is mine! work for me or get you gone!" What Congressman Bryce probably means by "bringing up" land, is improving it. But if he does mean that, he wanders from the question, for it is not asserted that the value of improvements do not belong to the producer, but that the value

of the place improved does not belong to the appropriator. Land with a house on it is worth more than without a house, and the difference belongs to the builder. Land fertilized is worth more than if not fertilized, and the difference belongs to the cultivator. Land so favorably located that ten thousand men want it is worth more than land so unfavorably located that no man wants it; but the difference does not belong to the appropriator. In those cases the owner has earned the difference; in this he has not.

The "unearned increment" of the cow General Bryce finds to be her milk; and let him beware who would intimate that the milk has been earned by the owner of the cow who has fed her on the produce of his fields, for General Bryce is ready with a reply that "if the land does not belong to him, neither does the produce of the land." General Bryce, it will be seen, has an airy way, learned in congressional committees, perhaps, of disposing of such trifles as the distinction between land from which labor produces and the things that labor produces.

Is it any wonder that the influence of the metropolis is so slight in congress? Here is a prominent representative from this city to a body which legislates upon economic subjects for a whole nation, who publicly confesses that he cannot distinguish between calves and land, between the value that comes from the growth of a calf and that which comes from the growth of population, between power to produce land and power to produce land products, between purchase of pieces of Ireland and purchase of Irish pigs; a representative who from sheer ignorance of the distinction would as soon confiscate men's cattle as repeal parliament titles which have vested "the land of the free" in a part of their number, and discounted the labor of unborn generations.

Verily a tariff agitation is needed, if for no other reason than that some members of congress may be taught to take a primary lesson or two in political economy.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE WORLD.

Volapuk (in the pronunciation of which, by the way, o is sounded as in "roll," a as in father, u with a dexterous intermingling of oo and e, and the accent is on the last syllable), is the new language invented by Father Schleyer, a German priest, of which we are just beginning to hear. Its students claim for it that it not only meets all the requirements of a universal language, but is rapidly being accepted as such. It was first published in 1879, but made no progress until 1882, and very little until 1884. In the former year it spread into Austria, and in the latter into Holland and Belgium. In 1885 it was extensively studied in France, and in the following year in Sweden, Denmark and Russia. It is still almost unknown in the United States, but there are over one hundred influential societies on the continent of Europe devoted to its propagation. Eleven periodicals, including a humorous paper, are published in the language; its bibliography comprises nearly one hundred books in about a dozen languages; two general assemblies have been held by its scholars, and there is an academy to govern its development.

It was the aim of the inventor of Volapuk to devise a clear and accurate method of expressing thought, and to make the language as easy as possible to learn. In this he has been, so far as it is possible to judge without a thorough knowledge of the subject, completely successful. Respecting ease of acquisition, his success is demonstrated. Three or four weeks of moderate study will qualify a student to translate readily within the limits of his vocabulary, though a great deal of practice will, of course, be necessary to give fluency either in writing or speaking.

The most difficult part of the study of Volapuk is the memorization of the alphabet, which, to the English student, is not very difficult either, for all the letters have the English form, and excepting the vowels and three consonants the English sounds; but from this point there is a logical simplicity of structure that makes the study as fascinating and almost as easy as the reading of a novel.

After learning the vowels, a few minutes' study will enable one to count without limit. Each of the digits is simply a vowel sandwiched between two consonants; the tens are the plural of the digits, indicated by the addition of s; there is one simple word for "hundred" and another for "thousand" and from that on radical changes in numeration are indicated by the addition of *ion* to the digits and tens. Thus: *bal* is one and *tel* is two; *bals* is ten and *telts* is twenty; *balsbal* (ten-and-one) is eleven, and *teltsel* (twenty-and-two) is twenty-two; *tum* being hundred, *balturn* is one hundred, and *telturn* is two hundred; *nul* being thousand, *balnul* is one thousand; *balion* is million, *bal balion* is one million, and *tel balion* is two millions, while *telion* is billion, and so on. All variations in numbers have this basis. For example, "second" is *telid*, "twice" is *telidna*, and "the second time" is *telidna*. The months of the year and the days of the week, being enumerated, are also based upon the cardinal numbers. Month being *nul*, the first month, or January, is *Balnul*, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*.The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday, is *Baludel*. The cases are nominative, possessive, dative and accusative, and are indicated by vowel endings. The persons have syllable endings: first, *ob*; second, *of*; third, *om* for masculine and neuter, *of* for feminine, and *del* being day, the first day, or Sunday,

ALL ALONG THE LINE.

HOW THE MOVEMENT FOR INDUSTRIAL EMANCIPATION IS PROGRESSING.

The County General Committee.
The general committee of the United Labor party meets at Clarendon hall Thursday evening, April 5.

The difference of opinion among the leaders of the party as to what should be done in the coming campaign is the cause of the general apathy now prevailing among the district organizations. Very few of the clubs are now holding regular meetings, and some of them have given up their headquarters.

The State Committee.
The state committee has been called to meet at the Mansion house, Albany, on Saturday, April 7. The object, as stated in the call, is "to prescribe the method of electing delegates to the national conference of the United Labor party, to be held at Cincinnati, May 15, and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the committee." The call is signed by John H. Blakeney, chairman.

Discussing Methods of Propaganda.
A few single tax men assembled at an informal dinner at Pedro's restaurant on Duane street, near Centre, on Thursday evening, March 29, to talk over plans for stimulating the propagation of single tax doctrine. Ben Jamin Uner was in the chair, and Louis F. Post, Jerome O'Neill, Walter Carr, E. J. Shriver, Henry George, A. J. Steers and about twenty other gentlemen took part in the proceedings. The drift of opinion seemed to be in favor of the formation of an organization or conducting active personal propaganda on lines similar to the National tax reform association, as described by Mr. H. F. Ring of Texas. After a general expression of opinion a resolution was adopted, declaring that "the chairman of this meeting shall appoint a committee of three to draft a plan of organization, with a name, to be submitted to a future called meeting of this body; and that the said committee shall invite suggestions in writing as to various plans for organization." J. R. Dunlop, Read Gordon and J. L. Dunham were appointed on the committee, and, on motion, the chairman of the meeting, Mr. Uner, was added.

The next meeting will be held at the same place on Friday evening, April 6.

The Brooklyn Tax Reform Club.
BROOKLYN, March 28.—The meeting of this club last evening was enlivened with a discussion of the ethical side of the relation between employers and laborers. Several visitors were present, and took part in the debate and in the informal talk that followed. The next meeting will be held April 11 at Everett hall, Fulton street, near Gallatin place.

Five to Four.
ELIZABETH, N. J.—I was one of nine men in a store here the other night when a vote was taken on the tariff question. The result was four in favor of protection and five for clean cut free trade.

THE FREE TRADE REVOLUTION IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Waking Up and Beginning to Ask Questions—Resolutions by Blacksmiths and Machinists—Specimens of Letters to the Press.

The yeast is working in Pennsylvania as it never worked before. The experience of the miners, the coke burners and producers generally, has set them to thinking. Soft words butter no parsnips, and men are beginning to discover that the advocates of land monopoly and tariff taxation have nothing but soft words to offer them. Mark L. Roberts, secretary of Henry George club No. 1 of Pittsburgh, writes to THE STANDARD:

I know that your conclusions were right in regard to the discussion which the tariff issue will bring up. Our local papers are beginning to teem with articles from workmen, etc., who take the stand for free trade, and the protectionists are making such absurd arguments in refutation that a child can see through their flimsiness.

A glance over THE STANDARD exchanges confirms Mr. Roberts's statement. Here, for instance, is what the Mauch Chunk Democrat says of the situation:

For many years public opinion was overwhelmingly on the side of the high tariff and taxation idea, and but few men were bold enough to express themselves either as free traders or for low tariff tax only for revenue. But, the change from error to truth and common sense was bound to come, the campaign opened, though many in Pennsylvania several years ago. During the last congress three out of eight democratic representatives in congress, Storn, Scott and Swipe, boldly voted on the side of tariff reform. And now the great tax equalization proclamation of the president's message is before the country, the issue is made and it can no longer be dodged or ignored, and if we are not outrageously mistaken the change of popular sentiment generally, the experience of the many now going on, is much more rapid and positive for liberating the tariff than the change of sentiment for emancipation during the corresponding period of a century ago. We are already in the period of the great tariff tax revolution. And an even more "never go backward," victory is certain and near.

Significant, too, of changing thought are these resolutions, passed by a meeting of blacksmiths and machinists, in Pittsburgh, March 24:

Resolved, That whereas the policy of a protective tariff has resulted in benefiting a few capitalists at the expense of the many workmen by making millionaires of the former and paupers of the latter;

Resolved, That the strikes and labor troubles, resulting in distress and bloodshed, are the results of this policy;

Resolved, That the effect of the protective policy is to reduce wages to the lowest possible point and raise living to the highest point.

Resolved, That competition protects the majority and protection protects the minority.

Resolved, That a protective policy has spruagled the wheels of industry and made combinations possible and dictatorial.

Here, again, is an extract from a letter to THE PITTSBURGH PRESS, suggestive of the spread of truly radical ideas:

Land, labor and capital are the factors in production, but the free gift of God for the equal benefit of all, and labor exercised on land and its products evolves all wealth that is properly capital; therefore all production is due to human labor and should go to it either directly as wages or indirectly as interest on capital. Land value is the concomitant of population, and it is not capital, nor is it a just exchange for labor's earnings. It has no labor basis, as all proper capital has, but as it is so used in the present vicious system I will call it bogus capital. According to these principles any rent or price for land is a wrong to labor directly or indirectly. These are beneficent principles of reform which, if adopted, will prevent the numerous wrongs and evils which cannot be remedied under the present system.

The communication from Mr. Estell, which we print in another column, tells how the light is spreading among the miners whom the cry of protection and "good times

coming" has fooled so long. All through the protection ridden state, from Philadelphia, where the anti-poverty society is working to such good purpose, and the Record is striking such sturdy blows for free trade through the collieries and furnaces, through the great manufacturing towns—everywhere the people are asking "why?" And they are learning the answer to the question.

Of course the pro-poverty side is not silent; but their trouble is that the more they say the more the verdict goes against them. Here is the sort of thing the Pittsburgh Press gets from one of its protection correspondents. He is endeavoring to answer a free trade correspondent, who wrote under the pseudonym of "Workman":

"Workman" further says: "All wealth comes from the land." So it does, but through a protective tariff only. He asks Mr. Reese or some other protectionist to tell him how tariff will make land more productive. Well, "Workman" comes up here in the coke region he can easily see how a tariff has made the land more productive. He can see how it has increased in value from \$50 to \$200 per acre.

He can have a protective tariff; first, that the manufacturer can command a good price for his products, and secondly, that we can command a good price for our services.

Argument like this is of the genuine boom-rang order. The more of it the protection advocates indulge in the sooner will they learn what a vain thing they are imagining.

Rabbi Jesselson in Columbus.

COLUMBUS, Ohio, March 28.—At the Jewish temple in this city Rabbi Jesselson yesterday delivered a remarkable address. The rabbi is an ardent friend of our cause. He has attended some of our meetings, and his address was in fulfillment of a promise to give utterance to his belief.

Rabbi Jesselson began his address by stating that he would discuss the present labor question from a Jewish standpoint. All the great questions of to-day have been entered into and in a manner solved by the sages of Israel. The bible is not a wholly a religious book; it has not been handed down to us merely as a guide for the priest, but is intended by its teachings to warn us of the dangers which have assailed the past, and which yet threaten us, and to point out in forcible language the manner of avoiding such evils.

Referring to strikes, he said: Exodus, the event we celebrate as the greatest in our history, was but a gigantic strike which then, as now, proved the only remedy against oppression. He likened the struggle between capital and labor to that between Israel and Pharaoh, the king and the people. To-day the capitalists cry: "Humanity, you say, respect of rights! What have we to do with these? With humanity we can get no profit. God and humanity are excellent for church purposes, but for practical life—bosh."

Pharaoh cries to Moses: "Wherefore do you keep the people from their work? You are a demagogue; a man who is dangerous to me; a disturber and agitator; you shall die." This is not quoted from some manifesto of a railroad king, but were words spoken and acted by the king of Egypt. And Israel rebelled—struck work. When men are sore pressed and their plights and distresses are not listened to, they grow mad with want and loss of hope, and thus revolutions are born. So to-day, unless these men are listened to patiently, we may fear the worst, and the terrible movement will be beyond power of check and we will regret our former apathy.

Referring to the land question he said: I agree with Dr. McGlynn in this. He has my fullest sympathy, and the great father of this movement, Henry George, has also my fullest sympathy. I believe in these men, and it is my sincere hope that they will go on as they have begun. Therein lies our safety as a nation.

The doctor then dwelt on the beauties of the Jewish legislation on this question, and suggested that only by a return to the simple and comprehensive laws of Moses, improved by modern research and intelligence, could we hope for a peaceful solution of our social question; that this Mosaic law is founded on eternal justice, the very essence of God's love and mercy, and recognizes in all men equal rights before God and his law.

Edw. L. HYEMAN,
Sec. Land and Labor Club No. 3.

Has Changed His Mind.

HAMILTON, Ohio.—About the time Henry George and a few others took the stand they did against placing a presidential candidate in the field this year I was considerably discouraged, and thought they were all wrong. But I see clearly now that it was bad judgment on my part and that I was wrong. In the light of past events and the stand President Cleveland has taken in favor of a reduction in indirect taxation, I think your decision is the shrewdest move that has been made since we had any organization at all. By pushing the war into Africa with our Spanish artillery we can prove ourselves to be mighty troublemakers "thorn in the flesh" to the old political machines, and literally force one or the other of them to go our way, especially as the old parties are now nearly equally divided.

Land and Labor in Chicago.

CHICAGO, March 31.—Land and labor club No. 1 of Illinois has been for a year past holding very pleasant and profitable meetings; at first every fortnight, but since Christmas weekly. Our attendance averages forty, with a large proportion of ladies. We have some very bright, brainy members, who seldom fail to make us feel sorry when half-past 10 sounds from the board of trade close by. It is sometimes 11 before we adjourn.

Last Thursday it was resolved that a state conference should be called to meet at the close of the Bailey conference, to be held here on Independence day. We shall try to make it successful, in the hope that it may lead to a better acquaintance and a closer union between all who live in Illinois—and love the cause.

We had an animated discussion of half an hour on the subject of interest, Professor Orchardson and Mr. Furbish attacking Henry George's views of its rightfulness and Messrs. Malcolm, White and Beck taking the other side. This was followed by an admirable paper from our president, Mr. R. H. Cowdry (who by the left the club room in time to see his place of business completely destroyed by fire). We hope soon to have it in tract form, when others will be able to enjoy it as we did. As usual, we had some good singing from one of our members, accompanied by his wife, on the piano loaned us by Miss Leonard Beck.

Our association will be glad to correspond with friends of the cause throughout the state of Illinois. FRANK PEARSON, Secretary,
45 La Salle street.

Anti-Poverty in St. Louis.

St. LOUIS, Mo., March 27.—An interesting meeting of the anti-poverty society was held last Sunday night at the hall corner of Ninth and Franklin avenues. President Mansel opened the meeting with a few pertinent remarks, stating briefly, yet comprehensively, the tenets and objects of the society, and then introduced Mr. Roth as chairman.

The speakers of the evening were Hon.

George W. Davidson, George M. Jackson and E. Meyer, all of whom delivered able and forcible addresses. The chief topic of discussion was the political duty of the society's members, and it was forcibly urged that a straight labor ticket should be nominated and the two old parties left severely alone. At the next meeting of the society the question of sending delegates to the Cincinnati convention of May 15 will be discussed.

Progress in Iowa.

FOREST CITY, Iowa, March 29.—I have believed in the doctrine of the single tax for several years, and two years ago I began to agitate it. People were induced to read my articles through curiosity, and with many the doctrine found ready and easy acceptance. We have since made such advance that I think a measure for taxing land values, exclusive of improvements, would be approved by the majority of men in this county. The county is only half settled. The rest of the land is held by eastern and European speculators. One-third of our settlers do not own the land they work, but are only tenants. This spring landlords are demanding outrageous leases, in which the tenant stipulates to waive trial by jury in the event of a dispute arising between the parties to the lease, and agrees to abide by the decision of the court alone.

If the democrats adopt a platform in line with the president's message we will be opposed to an independent candidate for the single tax party. We should take one step at a time, and the first step is to abolish protection.

We are making more converts among republicans than among democrats.

W. W. OLMSTED.

Tax Reform in Texas.

The following is in response to a letter asking if the organization of the tax reform association, which is doing such good work in Texas, is not too elaborate:

HOUSTON, Tex.—The laws of the National tax reform association are too elaborate, and in practice we disregard them and allow to local clubs the largest individual freedom. Thus in Galveston there is only one club, though its membership is probably equal to that of the four clubs in this city combined. And we have more than five members in each of our clubs. The point that I wanted to make was that three men, or even one man, in any community could go to work and do effective service, without making any particular fuss about it. People don't like to be considered cranks, and you can't get them out to public meetings at first. You can, however, get them to listen in private conversation. Our bylaws should be remodeled, and perhaps we can really organize a National tax reform association at the Chicago conference in June.

We are gaining ground in this community at a rate which exceeds my most sanguine expectations. We are working so quietly as not to bring down upon ourselves any opposition or personal odium. At the same time our work is couching. A prominent local politician came to me yesterday and said we were right, that we had converted him, and he is talking for us on the street corners, simply in my opinion, because he thinks ours is to be the winning side. Last Sunday we organized a club of seventeen farmers eight miles from town—getting every single man in the settlement.

H. F. RING.

THE WESTERN WAR.

The Railroad Companies and the Engineers in Close Conflict.

It would seem as if the struggle now going on between the organizations of labor and organized capital would take on many of the features of the late war for the Union. The skirmishes ended when the street railroad strikes took place in this city two years ago. Since that time it has been a bold grapple, a locking of horns, a determination on both sides to try conclusions, to see—in prize ring parlance—who was the best man. Although the street railroad men were to a certain extent defeated, the result of their fight was to strengthen the associations of working people throughout the country. A large proportion of the contests between employers and employed in 1886 and the earlier part of 1887 were decided in favor of the employed.

With the exception of the Pennsylvania coal miners' strikes, which began last April, there seems to be a disposition on both sides to let matters stand as they were for a while.

Almost in the beginning of this year, however, the struggle was recommenced through a difference between the Burlington railroad company of Chicago and the western brotherhood of locomotive engineers. For a time the fight was carried on in an amicable and conservative spirit; but the developments at the opening of the present week would indicate that there will be no further parley—that the hatchets have been dug up, that an industrial war is upon us.

The record of the week up to the time THE STANDARD goes to press is as follows:

SUNDAY, April 1.—Chicago.—At one o'clock a. m. the men of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, the Chicago and Alton, the Lake Shore, the Michigan Southern, the Pan Handle and the Port Wayne—one of the largest trunk lines entering the city—were called out, and when morning came it found the Chicago division of the St. Paul road hopelessly paralyzed. Every engineer, fireman and switchman had quit work. These strikes are "sympathetic," the men refusing to handle or move "Q" (Burlington) cars.

MONDAY, April 2.—Chicago.—A Pan Handle freight train was attacked by strikers and the train hands put to flight. Several collisions occurred at Western avenue between the police of the St. Paul company and the strikers, several shots being fired. The Chicago, St. Paul and Milwaukee mail train No. 2 was derailed by a misplaced switch, thrown open by some unknown person.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—The switch engineers and firemen of all the roads entering the city, with the exception of the Burlington, resolved not to handle any Burlington freight after noon, except live stock or perishable freight which had been started previous to that hour, and the roads were so notified.

Indianapolis, Ind.—The engineers, firemen, brakemen and switchmen of the Ohio, Indianapolis and Western were to strike at midnight. There were indications that a general tie-up of all the roads leading west would take place within three days.

Milwaukee, Wis.—The switchmen employed in the yards of the St. Paul company refused to handle any Burlington freight after eleven o'clock. The engineers threatened to join the switchmen.

Cleveland, O.—"Being tired of hotel life in Chicago," Chief Arthur has returned to the comforts and seclusion of his home. He gave the papers a long interview, in which he told how badly the Burlington was crippled. He "holds President Perkins and General Manager Stone personally responsible for the present state of affairs." He does not say anything about the charge of the strike having been laid off by his hands, but thinks that "it would be a great liberty to let the country at large should the Burlington succeed in winning this strike," because "if

the brotherhood is broken up the engineers will go into other labor organizations where strikes will be as common as they are among the other classes of workmen." While the struggle is progressing Mr. Arthur will rest.

Crescent, La.—A mob made an attack on the guards at one of the gates leading into the roundhouse yard, drove the guards away and assaulted and badly pounded up eight of the new men. Soon after about seventy-five leading men attacked the mob and dispersed them.

Troy, N. Y.—Thirty switchmen passed through here to-day on their way west to take the places of strikers in Chicago.

TUESDAY, April 3.—Chicago.—The situation in this city yesterday was very grave. An attempt was made to transfer a train of twenty Burlington freight cars to the Michigan Central under escort of armed guards and city policemen. The Michigan Central crews unanimously refused to handle the train. An attempt to transfer a train to the Chicago and Atlantic yard was also a failure. Several other attempts to move cars being defeated, stones and other missiles being freely used. The railroad yards are patrolled by Pinkerton men and the police stations are filled with reserves. It is believed that a riot is imminent.

Milwaukee.—The St. Paul road to-day reduced its force along its lines by laying off between 4,000 and 5,000 men, many of whom are clerks in the offices here. The switchmen are handling all local cars, but as shipments are not being made to country points, there is little to do.

Pittsburg.—Captain Linden, superintendent of Pinkerton's eastern agency, with a party of fifty detectives, were in the city this morning on their way to Chicago.

Philadelphia.—Captain Daugherty of the Pinkerton agency had his hands full to-day recruiting switchmen, conductors and switchmen for the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy railroad. About 100 men appeared at his office. Most of the applicants were from the ranks of the late strikers on the Reading railroad system. About fifty men were engaged.

WEDNESDAY, April 4.—Chicago.—Yesterday afternoon occurred what appears to be a break in the strike. The Michigan Central and Fort Wayne men returned to work, and agreed to handle Burlington freight. There were a number of collisions at the depots during the day. The conductors' society published an official statement that they were not in sympathy with the present strike.

A STANDARD reporter visited a number of railroad engineers, firemen, etc., to get their opinions as to the probable spread of the strike. The weight of opinion seemed to be that the strike would spread west, but not east; "for," said one of them, "the managers of the strike will be sure to be disobeyed on some of the eastern roads if they attempt to turn the strike this way. Westward they may have a clear field." The railroad men in this vicinity are non-communative, but it is easy to see that they are watching events with a great deal of anxiety.

In New York.

The journeyman brewers of this city appear to be again on the eve of a fight with their bosses. After a long struggle, during which a boycott was placed on nearly every boss brewer in this city, an agreement was reached a year ago which has resulted in peace up to the present time. But the time is close at hand when a new understanding must be reached or the agreement of last year renewed. About a month ago a semi-official announcement was made that the boss brewers did not intend to sign any agreement with their employees for the coming year through their organizations, but would deal separately with each individual in their employ. Since that announcement appeared the officers of the various journeyman brewers' organizations have been actively preparing to resist the bosses. Last Sunday morning the journeymen met at Clarendon hall to decide on their future course. They decided to continue to work until some of the Central labor union had waited on their employers. The committees will present to the bosses a contract, which they will be asked to sign. If this is refused, then final action will be taken. Several of the brewers have already made terms with their men, but it is expected that the majority will refuse to sign the contract, whereupon a strike will result. The struggle, when it does come, will be a long one, for an agreement has been reached by the employing brewers by which they will make a pool so as to sell the boycotted beers, as they hope, in spite of the efforts of the journeymen and those who sympathize with them. The latest report was that eighteen boss brewers had signed new contracts for the year.

A tie-up was threatened last Monday on the cross-town surface railroad in Brooklyn. Typographical union No. 6 last Sunday withdrew its delegates to the Central labor union.

A Suggestion.

PORT JERVIS, March 31.—The miners of Pennsylvania are, many of them, virtual slaves, not mere serfs of the soil, but slaves, wearing themselves away in the bowels of the earth for the mere pittance that sustains their lives and those of their miserable families. They are subjected to the competition of Hungarian hordes from the provinces bordering on Turkey, whose wages are lowest, imported to keep the men of Pennsylvania in subjection, to stifle the spirit of native manhood. I know of no better campaign literature than the articles furnished by Henry George to the North American Review during the summer of 1886, reporting the condition of the coal and iron mines of Pennsylvania. I hope that these reports will be plentifully circulated throughout the country the coming summer, in order that all the Union may be apprised of the condition of things and unite to abolish this terrible, degrading, disgraceful system.

B. F. HENLEY.

Trades Union Methods Extending.

The San Francisco correspondent of THE TRIBUNE asserts that the leading wine merchants of this city have formed a wine dealers' association and issued notice to Napa and Sonoma vineyardists that hereafter they will buy no wine from those who do not deal exclusively with them. The association also fixes the prices to be paid for wine. By this combination the wine producer is shut off from selling a few gallons or a barrel of choice wine to a private purchaser, and he is forced to give all his wine to the association at a fixed price. Dealers this year will pay only eighteen cents per gallon, which leaves a narrow margin of profit to the producers. The correspondent says this wine boycott, as it is called by vineyardists, will result in discouraging the planting of new vineyards to choice wine grapes.

He Likes the Idea.

St. LOUIS, Mo., April 2.—I like the plan of the "Society Notes" column in THE STANDARD, presenting alternately pictures from the extremes of society. There is enough of a shock produced by the sudden change to set people thinking. It is the awful contrast that shows the breaking down of republican government.

A. C. KENZIE.

GETTING INTO SOCIETY.

Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood Gives Some Advice to Poor Young Wives—How to Get There and How to Behave When You Are There.

"An American at home," says Mrs. M. E. W. Sherwood, "if he leads a good and useful life, is a nobleman, as good as anybody, and he and his wife are entitled to the very best the world over."

Mrs. Sherwood has been telling the readers of that staunch democratic journal, the Sun, something about how to get into New York society and how to behave after you get there. "It is hard," Mrs. Sherwood tells us, "to imagine a young couple who have to begin life without acquaintances, but the fact exists." It is a pitiable truth that there are people old enough to be married—indeed, actually married—who are not yet in society. What are these unfortunate to do? To remain permanently out of society would be inconceivable misery. Yet how shall they get in? As Mrs. Sherwood pathetically puts it:

How shall they begin? Who is to find them out? Who shall break the entering wedge into this dense block which we call society? The answer is generally that somebody will turn up who will introduce them to somebody. Nice young people do not remain long unknown. But these early days are lonely to the poor young wife, who sighs for the brilliant belle whom she has left behind her.

Profligate people might remark that there are quite a number of persons, both in society and out of it, who are by no means anxious to be found out. But THE STANDARD is above such rascality. Let us go on in a spirit of humble teachableness to learn what it is that these nice young people, this "poor young wife"—and presumably, the poor young husband of the poor young wife as well—must do to get into society and so be saved. For manifestly it won't do for them to wait for somebody to turn up to introduce them to somebody. Mrs. Sherwood doesn't suggest that they should do that. They must hustle for position if they want to achieve any social success.

There is one way of getting into society which Mrs. Sherwood suggests to her disciples, by advising them on no account to take it:

A young married woman, if she be pretty and unknown, is exposed to one danger which her husband must guard her against. Some faded beau of fashion may find her out and promise to introduce her into society if she will flirt with him. This succeeds wonderfully well at first, as all empirical remedies are said to do, but is apt to be fatal in the end. For even a fashionable position, which is not the best thing to strive for, must be honestly gained if it is going to last at all.

Mrs. Sherwood is probably sincere in advising the poor young husband to see that his poor young wife doesn't take this method of "driving the entering wedge," but the fact that she finds it necessary to mention it is a queer commentary on "society." However, let that pass. There are other less questionable methods which this princess of society feels at liberty to indorse.

In the first place, the "poor young wife," supposing her to come from some other city, may have letters of introduction from people in society in that city to people in society in this city. If she is happily furnished with such documentary evidences of social eligibility, she must "lose no time in leaving them, with her card, and then she must wait until they are answered." This method, Mrs. Sherwood confesses, is not absolutely infallible, because "in this country people are singularly inattentive to letters of introduction."

Suppose, then, that the poor young wife, having sent her letters of introduction with her card, gets no invitation to dinner or "other attentions," but is left to dwindle, peak and pine in the parlor of her \$20 flat, sighing for "the brilliant belle whom she has left behind her," and only imperfectly consoled by the attentions of her poor young husband. What is she to do in such a case? Mrs. Sherwood is ready with a ready answer: "Two—or should we say, number three? The young woman must consider if she has not some special talent, such as music, in which case she soon gathers about her a congenial circle." This method is rather obscure as to details, and we are left in doubt as to whether the young woman should "drive the entering wedge" by hiring a piano and playing in her own apartment with the windows open, or by giving *ad libitum* performances on the violin, piccolo or tambourine in front of society's doors. However, Mrs. Sherwood is probably going to write some more about society, and may elucidate the matter in a future communication to the Sun.

Still, it isn't given to every poor young wife to have a special talent. What is to be done if the letters of introduction remain unnoticed, and the piano can't be played? Ah! In that case she must cultivate a taste for charities or good works—Mrs. Sherwood is responsible for that "or"—and that will bring her into the charmed circle, if nothing else will. Of course she must be sincere. No humbug or hypocrisy will do for society. No charity in New York, Mrs. Sherwood tells us, shudderingly:

One charity in New York is now called "The Stepping Stone," so many young women of social ambition joined it simply that they might know the eminent ladies who compose its board of directors. When a woman uses her religion or her charity to increase her fashion, she deserves to be found out and turned out.

Alas! again the oracle is obscure. What is that charity that has become so fashionably debased as to be known as "The Stepping Stone"? How is the poor young wife who has saved \$5 from her housekeeping money to know that she isn't squandering it upon a useless "stepping stone" when she subscribes it to charity? Fancy the anguish of the woman who has let the pure fountain of her charity splash uselessly upon a "stepping stone." How is such a fatal blunder to be avoided? How is it to be retrieved? Mrs. Sherwood doesn't tell us. She must write another article.

Meantime, we have in the present essay some "pointers" about the way the poor young couple should behave after the entering wedge has been driven, and they have got into society. Mrs. Sherwood advises 4 o'clock tea to begin with:

She can send her card and give a tea without much expense or formality, and without being thought pushing or pretensions. If people choose to stay away, that need not hurt her; if they send a card, that is a visit, and she may go and see them, as she pleases. It generally opens the way to a pleasing acquaintance. If people do come, she should be cordial, and the lady who receives should rise and extend her hand. It is the American custom, by far the best custom. She should be so agreeable that all her new friends feel that she should be cultivated. Make them all wish to come again, young hostess. It is not customary to introduce the guests of the same city. Strangers should be introduced, but ladies who sit near to each other should speak to each other, if they wish to make it agreeable to both hostess and guest. The custom of reception days and these 4 o'clock

teas are meant to save labor and to make all the interests of society harmonize.

If the 4 o'clock teas are a success, invitations to dinner will probably come pouring in. These must be answered immediately; and if they are accepted—as of course they will be—the young couple must be on their best behavior.

Formerly it was the custom for a wife to take her husband's arm on entering a room; now that is considered out of fashion. The lady enters first, the gentleman following with his crush hat in his hand.

Don't neglect the crush hat. It is important. Above all, let there be no pushing, no matter how poor you may be.

No lady will push herself. She will be a lady through all the trials of poverty, and the greater trials of sudden and crude wealth. She will do her part in the social world, gently, humbly, and bravely.

Good breeding is very essential:

It is easy enough to learn when and where to eat a card, how to behave at a dinner, how to eat with one's fork and to use a finger bowl, how to dress, where to sit in a carriage, how to bow and how to courtesy, how to receive and how to drop an acquaintance—what a varied education is that which teaches us to be well bred! Can we acquire it? Can we get to be a thoroughbred all by ourselves?

Yes, Mrs. Sherwood thinks we can, and we suppose she knows, though there seems to be a certain confusion of thought in the remark about getting to be a thoroughbred all by one's self. The "poor young wife" who adopts Mrs. Sherwood's suggestions, and wriggles herself into society, will be apt to have a pretty good time, but her poor young husband will probably find it necessary to strike for higher wages before the first 4 o'clock tea comes off.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

A non-partisan reform league has been formed in Minneapolis, and has issued a tract containing the following resolutions:

Mr. George himself accepts the situation in a patriotic spirit, and we cannot but do him the justice to say so. If that is inconsistency, we glory in it.—(Grand Rapids Leader.)

The senate of New Jersey has passed a bill providing that all railroad and canal property shall be taxed the same as that of individuals, and that no railroad or canal shall close toll roads and toll bridges and make them free.

There is one thing that ought to be insisted on at once and everywhere in the matter of convict labor, and that is that the profits on convict labor above expense of maintenance should go to the families of the prisoners.—(Labor's Stage.)

The Magnolia farmers' alliance of Texas have resolved that they will not support any candidate for the legislature who will not pledge himself to vote for imposing such taxes on non-resident land owners as will compel them to sell at a fair value.

This is probably the only country in the world that tolerates within its borders armed and officered bands of mercenaries not recognized either by the civil law or by the military establishment, but ready at the word of command to march out and do the dirty work of the law

Herve Riel.

Robert Browning.
On the sea and at the Hogue, sixteen hundred
ninety-two,
Did the English fight the French—was it
France?
And the thirty-first of May, helter skelter
through the blue,
Like a crowd of frightened porpoises a shoal
of sharks pursue,
Came crowding ship on ship to St. Malo on
the Rance,
With the English fleet in view.

'Twas the squadron that escaped, with the
victor in full chase:
First and foremost of the drove, in his great
ship, Damfreville;
Close on him fell, great and small,
Twenty-two good ships in all;
And they signaled to the place,
'Help the winners of a race!
Get us guidance, give us harbor, take us
quick, or, quicker still,
Here's the English can and will!'

Then the pilots of the place put out brisk, and
leaped on board:
'Why, what hope or chance have ships like
these to pass?' laughed they:
'Rocks to starboard, rocks to port, all the
passage scarred and scored,
Shall the Formidable, here, with her twelve
and eighty guns,
Think to make the river mouth by the single
narrow way?
Trust to enter where 'tis tidlish for a craft
of twenty tons,
And with flow at full? beside?
Now 'tis slackest ebb of tide.
Reach the mooring? Rather say,
While rock stands, or water runs,
Not a ship will leave the bay.'

Then was called a council straight:
Brief and bitter the debate.
'Here's the English at our heels; would you
have them take in tow
All that's left us of the fleet, linked together
stern and bow,
For a prize to Plymouth sound?
Better run the ships aground!
(Ended Damfreville his speech.)
'Not a minute more to wait!
Let the engines all and each
Shove ashore, then blow up, burn the ves-
sels on the beach!
France must undergo her fate!'

'Give the word!' But no such word
Was ever spoke or heard:
For up stood, for an' stepped, for in struck,
amid all these—
A captain, lieutenant, a mate—first, sec-
ond, third!

No such man of mark, and meet
With this better to complete!
But a simple Breton sailor, pressed by
Tourville for the fleet,
A poor coasting pilot—he Herve Riel the
Croisicse.

And 'What mockery or malice have we
here?' cried Herve Riel.
'Are you mad, you Malouins! Are you
cowards, fools or rogues?
Talk to me of rocks and shoals—me, who took
the soundings, tell
On my fingers every bank, every shallow,
every well,
Twixt the offing here and Greve, where the
river disembogues!
Are you bought for English gold? Is it love
the lying's for?
Morn and eve, nights and day,
Have I piloted your bay,
Entered free and anchored fast at the foot of
Solidor.

Burn the fleet, and ruin France! That were
worse than fifty Herve!
Sirs, they know I speak the truth! Sirs,
believe me, there's a way!
Only let me lead the line,
Have the biggest ship to steer,
Get this Formidable clear,
Make the others follow mine,
And I lead them, most and least, by a passage
I know well.

Right to Solidor past Greve,
And there lay them safe and sound;
And, if one ship misbehaved—
Keel so much as grate the ground—
Why, I've nothing but my life; here's my
head!' cries Herve Riel.

Not a minute more to wait.
'Steer us in, then, small and great!
Take the helm, lead the line, save the squad-
ron!' cried his chief.

Captains, give the sailor place!
He is admiral, in brief!
Still the north wind, by God's grace.
See the noble fellow's face,
As the big ship, with a bound,
Clears the entry like a bound,
Keeps the passage as its inch of way were
the wide sea profound!

See, safe through shoal and rock,
How they follow in a flock!
Not a ship that misbehaves, not a keel that
grates the ground,
Not a sign that comes to grief!
The peril, see, is past!
All are hushed to the last!
And, just as Herve Riel tells 'Anchor!'
sure as fate.

Up the English came—too late!
So the storm subsides to calm:
They see the green trees wave
On the heights overlooking Greve;
Hearts that beat are stanch with balm.
'Just our capture to enhance,
Let the English rake the bay,
Gash their teeth and glare askance
As they canoodle away!
'Xanth rammed Solidor pleasant riding on
the Rance.'

How hope succeeds despair on each captain's
countenance!
Out burst all with one accord,
'This is paradise for hell!
Let France, let France's flag,
Thank the man that did the thing!
What a shock, and all one word,
'Herve Riel!'

As he stepped in front once more,
No symptom of surprise
In the frank blue Breton eyes—
Just the same man as before.

Then said Damfreville, 'My friend,
I must speak out at the end,
Though I find the speaking hard;
Praise is deeper than the lips:
You have saved the king his ships;
You must name your own reward.
'Faith our sun was near eclipsed
Demand what'er you will,
France remains your debtor still.
Ask to heart's content, and have! or my
name's not Damfreville.'

Then a beam of fun broke
On the bearded mouth that spoke,
As the Lord's heart laughed through
Those frank eyes of Breton blue—
'Since I needs must say my say,
Since our boat rode the Croisic point what
is it but a run—
Come! A good whole holiday!
Leave to go and see my wife, whom I call
the Belle Aurore!'

That he asked, and that he got—nothing
more.
Name and deed alike are lost;
Not a pillar nor a post

In his Croisic keeps alive the feat as it be-
fell;
Not a head in white and black
On a single sailing smack
Is memory of the man but for whom had gone
to wrack

All that France saved from the fight whence
England bore the bell.
Go to Paris; rank on rank
Search the heroes flung pell mell
On the Louvre, face and flank:
You shall look long enough ere you come to
Herve Riel.

So, for better and for worse,
Herve Riel, accept my verse!
In my verse, Herve Riel, do thou once more
Save the squadron, honor France, love thy
wife, the Belle Aurore!

FARMER JONES AND THE TARIFF.

Yes, I've got to quit farmin'. My jints
are gettin' stiff and somehow I get tired
now by night than I use to; and I notice that
Mary Jane sits down after an' moves
sloower about the house. I reckon it's 'cause
we're gettin' old an' farmin' is one o' them
businesses that makes no 'lowance for
gettin' old.

Help! oh, I've tried that an' it don't pay.
Time you've paid your store bills and your
help there isn't anything left. It makes
one feel as if you were working for the
storekeeper and your hired men for noth-
ing and boardin' yourself.

My girls are all married now, and their
men are shiftin' for themselves, and one
by one my boys have been leavin' me and
goin' into business. I tried to keep them
on the farm—offered to divide it; or to buy
them another farm near by; but they
always said that farmin' didn't pay and
that they was going into somethin' where
work wasn't so hard and what work they
did do brought more pay. One is in the
lumber business—got a mill up in the
woods now and is gettin' rich. Bill went
up into the iron country and struck a mine
and got some fellows with money to go in
with him, and he's president of a stock
company an' workin' his mines, and they
say that he's rich too. Tom writ me last
year that I might find it pay good enough
to be raisin' corn, but that he found it a
heap easier and better payin' to be makin'
starch out of the corn us farmers raised.

I've hated to see my boys turnin' away
from what I've always reckoned the nob-
lest callin' men can follow, an' for a long
time I couldn't understand it. Fust I
thought they was gettin' lazy, and I use to
break out at them in that way, but I
know that I hadn't any cause, for stidier,
harder workin' boys never turned a sod
than mine were; and when I go to see
them I can see that they are workin' just
as hard, if not harder, than they did on
the farm.

I've been a thinkin' a good deal o' late
tryin' to get at the bottom of the matter.
I've noticed that my boys ain't the only
ones that's gone from the farms into the
shops. All round my neighborhood the
bright, smart boys have drifted off to the
cities, and either gone in for their
selves or are working for others. Every
once in a while I find some paper with a
long editorial in it about the tendency of
population, towards the cities and over-
crowdin' of 'em, and they seem to think that
it is a bad thing, and to wonder that men
and boys will leave the pur air and inde-
pendent life of the farm for the crowded,
pinched, dependent life of the city. They
seem to think that somehow it's owin' to
men gettin' weaker, more womanlike, lov-
ing ease and the sight of the wealth of the
cities, even if they can't have it them-
selves, an' bein' hungry for a closer touch
with their fellow critters than they git on
the farms. There's somethin' in all this;
but these editorials don't make the boys
stick to the farms a bit closer, and the
cities keep on robbin' the country of its
brains, leaving it only its muscle. These
editors haven't got to the bottom of the
case by a long sight. And the bottom is
so all-fired clear when you come to look
for it steady that it is surprisin' that they
have missed it.

Now, if you'll let me fill my pipe again—
cigar? No, I'm beholden to you, but cigars
and plug hats and broadcloth coats
slipped out of my reach years ago; can't
afford 'em. And, queer, isn't it? but I can
always think better when my pipe is a
go'in'. I reckon it is 'cause these ques-
tions turn themselves over in one's mind
much as these clouds of tobacco smoke roll
over each other as they climb up. Well,
in my thinkin' of this question over it
shapes itself about this way:

What do men work for, anyway?
Money? No; beyond makin' their livin'
they are workin' to get the things that
money will buy. Someshort sighted ones
work only for the money, as if that was
the main thing, but most men want to get
money so that they can get with it some-
thing that they want. There isn't much
need of argument to prove that. Some-
one handy at puttin' facts into words has
said that "force runs on the line of least
resistance." That kind of a definition is as
handy as a foot rule. When you've got it
it makes lots of things easier to under-
stand; and the more you try it the truer it
appears to you. My cattle come up from
the valley pasture by the ravine instead of
directly up the hill. It is the law that ex-
plains why wagons and reapers and rail-
roads and all these contraptions to save
work have been made. When any of us
have a job to do we study how to do it the
easiest. We don't always hit it, and some-
times we go ploddin' along doin' things by
the hardest. But the quicker witted a
man is—the more he uses his head—the
less he finds he will have to use his muscles
in gettin' what he is after; and it's just
as true of gettin' money as of anything else.

We all want to get the most money
with the least amount of work—or you
may put it another way and get to the
same point by saying that we all want to
get the most money for what we raise.
Of course men are controlled in using their
power in makin' money by their bein'
able to do some things well and others not
at all, but each in his way obeys this law.

Nacherly, then, if everything is equal—
an' in the long run, if left alone, all ocu-
pations are about equal—men go into that
work for which they are best fitted; but if
things aint equal, if greater advantages
are given to some class of work, so that
work of that kind will bring more money,
men will be drawn to it an' away from the

work that is disadvantaged. For instance,
farmers shift their crops to those which
bring the most profit; go to pork when that
rises, or corn, or butter, or wool.

Now in this country, for a hundred
years, we have been worshipin' manufac-
turers. All the talk has been about en-
couragin' 'em. You never heard tell
of a man comin' inter the country and
askin' the community to give him a bonus
if he would go to farmin', but it's a common
thing in the towns for men to ask and get
a snug bonus for goin' to manufacturin'.
An' congress has caught the same fever,
and it acts an' talks as if it hadn't much of
anything else to do but think up ways to
encourage all kinds of manufacturers.
They've advertised that the whole United
States was bound to give manufacturers
more than their even chance by taxin' the
goods of outside manufacturers, so that the
home fellows can get more for what they
make than they could if competition was
free. In fact, they have put a premium
on manufacturers of about fifty per cent to
get people to go into them.

Now, the other side of the disposition of
human nature to get the most it can for
the least effort, makes men throw off any
burden that hinders them in this gettin'
as fast and as far as they can. It costs
money to encourage manufacturers be-
cause it raises the price of things manu-
factured. Those who buy these things,
payin' more for them, are hindered just
so much in gettin' all they could for their
labor, and nacherly they try to pass the
cost off on to some one else. They can
do it if they can raise the price of what
they have to sell. If iron or steel or wool
rises, the men who use them in makin'
things raises the price of what they make.
Now it's pretty clear that the last shift of
this cost falls on the shoulders of the men
who can't raise the price of what they
make, the class who haven't and can't have
the control of this great "home market,"
of which we hear so much. An' this class
takes in the farmers and most of the men
who work for wages.

Now there's lots of reasons why manufac-
turers would rather be in the cities.
The railroads or the lakes or the ocean are
generally there, an' they can get the stuff
in easy and cheap that they want to work
up, and the same means makes the sendin'
away of what they make cheap, an' easy too.
That the city is the home of manufac-
turers is shown by the way a city grows
up around a manufactory that is built up
by some work power.

Well, now, can't you see why our boys
go to the city? With the government
puttin' a premium on the manufacturers
which go to cities or make cities come to
them, and makin' the farmers pay that
premium—encouragin' manufacturers an'
discouragin' farmin'—can't you see that
any boy with brains an' gumption isn't
such a pesky idiot as to stay on a farm?
Can't you see that the government has
smoothed down the lines of resistance
runnin' towards manufacturers, and that in
fact business the same work can bring
more money? Why, if I wasn't so old an'
set in my ways, I'd go to the city, get the
life styles behind me and before me, with
pleasures to look back upon, no hope to look
forward to. The wages she earns, those
wages which proudly separates her from the
slave, are barely sufficient to keep body and
soul together, and at last the body gives out,
or the soul revolts. Then comes the inevitable
end, and a verdict of "Death from starva-
tion" or "Found drowned" closes the scene.

The Soudan girl is taken from her parental
but of rocks and shoals—me, who took
the soundings, tell
On my fingers every bank, every shallow,
every well,
Twixt the offing here and Greve, where the
river disembogues!
Are you bought for English gold? Is it love
the lying's for?
Morn and eve, nights and day,
Have I piloted your bay,
Entered free and anchored fast at the foot of
Solidor.

Now, if you'll let me fill my pipe again—
cigar? No, I'm beholden to you, but cigars
and plug hats and broadcloth coats
slipped out of my reach years ago; can't
afford 'em. And, queer, isn't it? but I can
always think better when my pipe is a
go'in'. I reckon it is 'cause these ques-
tions turn themselves over in one's mind
much as these clouds of tobacco smoke roll
over each other as they climb up. Well,
in my thinkin' of this question over it
shapes itself about this way:

What do men work for, anyway?
Money? No; beyond makin' their livin'
they are workin' to get the things that
money will buy. Someshort sighted ones
work only for the money, as if that was
the main thing, but most men want to get
money so that they can get with it some-
thing that they want. There isn't much
need of argument to prove that. Some-
one handy at puttin' facts into words has
said that "force runs on the line of least
resistance." That kind of a definition is as
handy as a foot rule. When you've got it
it makes lots of things easier to under-
stand; and the more you try it the truer it
appears to you. My cattle come up from
the valley pasture by the ravine instead of
directly up the hill. It is the law that ex-
plains why wagons and reapers and rail-
roads and all these contraptions to save
work have been made. When any of us
have a job to do we study how to do it the
easiest. We don't always hit it, and some-
times we go ploddin' along doin' things by
the hardest. But the quicker witted a
man is—the more he uses his head—the
less he finds he will have to use his muscles
in gettin' what he is after; and it's just
as true of gettin' money as of anything else.

We all want to get the most money
with the least amount of work—or you
may put it another way and get to the
same point by saying that we all want to
get the most money for what we raise.
Of course men are controlled in using their
power in makin' money by their bein'
able to do some things well and others not
at all, but each in his way obeys this law.

Nacherly, then, if everything is equal—
an' in the long run, if left alone, all ocu-
pations are about equal—men go into that
work for which they are best fitted; but if
things aint equal, if greater advantages
are given to some class of work, so that
work of that kind will bring more money,
men will be drawn to it an' away from the

work that is disadvantaged. For instance,
farmers shift their crops to those which
bring the most profit; go to pork when that
rises, or corn, or butter, or wool.

Risen Indeed.

From Lead a Hand.
Aye, the lilies are pure in their pallor, the
roses are fragrant and sweet,
The music pours out like a sea wave, break-
ing in praise at his feet,
Pulsing in passionate praises that Jesus has
risen again,
But we watch for the signs of his living in
the life of the children of men.

Wherever a mantle of pity falls soft on a
wound or a woe,
Wherever a peace or a pardon springs up to
O'ermaster a foe,
Wherever a soft hand of blessing outreaches
to succor a need,
Wherever springs bealing for wounding, the
Master is risen indeed.

Wherever the soul of a people, arising in
courage and might,
Bursts forth from the errors that shrouded its
hope in the gloom of the night,
Wherever in sight of God's legions the armies
of evil recede,
And truth was a soul or a kingdom, the
Master is risen indeed.

So fling out your banners, brave tollers;
bring lilies to alter and shrine;
Ring out, Easter bells; He has risen; for you is
the token and sign.
There's a world moving sunward and God-
ward; ye are called to the front; ye
must lead;
Behind are the grave and the darkness; the
Master is risen indeed.

"OUR" INDIANS.

"Most of my Indians are living in
houses," writes W. L. Lincoln, Indian agent
at Fort Belknap, Montana, in his seventh
annual report to the commissioners of In-
dian affairs, whereby the reader is left
to infer that "Mr. Lincoln's Indians" are
being civilized. But the reader is further
left to ask, "Well, what about my In-
dians?" surely if Mr. Lincoln has for
himself an Indian tribe or so, the rest of
us must have some interest in at least a
squaw or a papoose. The remainder of
the voluminous report of the commissioner
of Indian affairs for 1886, gives some sort
of an answer to the question. And ac-
cording as the report is opened on one
page or another the American citizen
finds that his Indians are drunken or so-
ber, lazy or industrious; that they worship
the Christian God, or long for their heath-
enish "sun dance"; that they are strong
and healthy, or suffer from some of those
loathsome diseases, the product of our
civilization and morality, which "have
taken hold on all and permeated the sys-
tem with some to such an extent as to be
beyond the reach of all remedial agents."

But the net result seems to be that our
civilization, advancing with the bible and
the whisky bottle, the saving drug and
the destroying disease, affects the Indian
more for bad than for good.

Many of the reports discuss the degener-
acy of the Indians, their ignorance, their
idleness and the causes. But there was
a time when such discussion would have
been needless, if not impossible. The In-
dian certainly lived a healthy life in years
gone by, and attained to a certain personal
dignity of character and bearing, and his
people evolved a system of government
which assured him liberty and life. Some
of the refinements they had, too. Jeffers-
on, in his early life, was struck with the
grace and eloquence of their orators and
the musical beauty of their language, and
Sam Houston, once the governor of Ten-
nessee and member of congress, was not
the only man of ability who found a life
with the as yet uncivilized red man per-
haps even preferable to civilized life among
the whites. Let us hear a few of the
agents, part of whose duty it is to philo-
sophize once a year, on the social status
of the Indians.

From the Ouray agency, Utah, William
A. McKewen writes:

He (the Indian) won't work because he isn't
forced to it, and it is beneath his dignity.
Besides, that far-away, mystical, benig-
cent Washington kindly furnishes him
with food, clothing and pocket money.
Then why should he work? He don't. He
glaciously sits on the banks of the White and
Green rivers, kicks his feet in the muddy
waters, lounging and dreaming, perhaps, of
the coming of the Indian millennium—the
downfall of the whites, his country regained,
and the delight of the chase and the trail, as
in days of yore.

To this might be added scores of quota-
tions to the same effect—that government
charity is ruining the red man.

M. W. Stevens of Flint, Mich., gives it
as his opinion that "Whisky, the bane of
the Indians, is their worst enemy."

The Reverend Father Thomas at the
Sacred Heart mission, Indian territory,
says:

We are convinced that the best means to
promote and carry on the work of civilization
among them is a good practical education.
We propose to open an industrial school
where we can train them from childhood,
teach them the industrial arts, and put them
on an equal footing with their white brother.

From Darlington, Indian territory, Cap-
tain J. M. Lee writes:

If those hard working philanthropists who
are so fond of quoting the command, "If any
man will not work, neither shall he eat,"
would only insist with equal vigor, "If a man
does work he must eat," there would not be
the constant dread to the Indian that as soon
as he begins to merge from idleness and bar-
barism the governmental assistance is to be
withdrawn, and it were better for him to
make no effort to become civilized. The dis-
crimination should be on the side of industry
and obedience.

And so they go on, giving all sorts of
reasons for the ignorance, idleness and
demoralization of the Indian. But there
are one or two reports so different in their
tone from the rest that they deserve notice.
The missionary at Rosebud agency, Dakota,
William J. Cleveland, says:

What we deprived him (the Indian) of, in
actual fact, was his former means of making
a living. Give him a substitute for that, one
which shall at least call out as much of the
true man in him as did his old tasks of ward-
ing off the enemy and slaying the buffalo.

But "this former means of making a
living" was the prairie, the forest and
stream; the land, in other words. Must
we, then, if we are to do anything for the
Indian, "provide him with a substitute" for
the earth? Perhaps a better plan would be
to guarantee to every Indian his right to a
share of the earth or what part of it the
government has left to his people. In this

connection, then, let us read what Robert L.
Owen, the agent at Muscogee, Indian ter-
ritory, says:

The most striking feature in the govern-
ment of the Indian nations of this agency,
when contrasted with that of their white
neighbors, is that the title to their entire do-
main is in the nation as a practically unqual-
ified fee, and the individual has only the right
to use and occupy. He may sell and devise
to other citizens his improvement and the
right of use and occupancy of a certain tract,
and in case he dies intestate it descends, ac-
cording to Indian statute law, to his wife,
children or nearest relatives. He has the
right to use all he can, but he must use it
on his abandonment another citizen can take
possession. This insures to every Cherokee
who is willing to work a certain home and a
certain remuneration for his labor. They
have availed themselves of this in proportion
to their intelligence, ambition and several
abilities. There is a constitutional provision
against unseemly speculation or monopoly of
improvements on the public domain.

Although this tenure of lands may seem
strange to those who have not seen its quali-
ties tested, it is a proposition which from a
public standpoint might well be argued as
superior to the fee simple in the individual.
This system precludes a possibility of unjust
pauperism so often imposed on worthy labor
by force of modern circumstances or ancient
customs surviving in modern times. However
this question may be argued by political
economists, there is no doubt in my mind that
this is the true safeguard for the Indian peo-
ple until they have grown, under the educa-
tional influences now working, up to the
capacity of full American citizenship, until
they are able to cope with that most ingenu-
ous of all thieves, the insidious land swindler.

Only Mr. Agent, by your own acknowl-
edgment that "unjust pauperism" exists
among the whites, who are supposed to be
able to cope with land swindlers, you have
proved that the only way for the Indians
to ward off this pauperism is to keep on,
not for a time, but forever, recognizing
the rights of all to the earth.

Add to this the testimony of W. L.
Powell, the agent at Neah bay, Washing-
ton territory, who says, "These Indians
do not desire, nor would it be to their in-
terest, to have the land divided in sever-
alty."

Mr. Owen's statement is that of a man
who cannot be called a mere theorist. He
does not say that if drinking were stop-
ped the Indian question would be solved.
What he says amounts to saying that
where there is no private property in land
there is no Indian question; there is then
no possibility of unjust pauperism.

Against this opinion are those of almost
every other agent in the list. With but
few exceptions, the agents seem to think
that the best thing that can be done for
the Indians is to divide their lands among
them, to be held by them forever as private
property, or sold to the land speculators, as
the case may be. Our people are opposed
to acting on mere theories, it is said.
Good. They want precedents and facts.
Equally good. Now, the prevailing theory
as to the Indians is that allotting them
lands in severalty as private property is
going to make them better off. This theory
is supported by say ninety-five per cent of
the agents, and all the land speculators.
But the fact is (as shown above) that
recognizing the rights of all to the land
has already solved the "labor question"
among the Cherokees, and involuntary
pauperism is unknown. Shall we act on
the fact or the theory?

A GLOWING UTTERANCE.

The following extract from a recent com-
munication in the Cincinnati Christian Stand-
ard, from Mrs. Frances M. Milne of San Luis
Obispo, Cal., will be read with interest by the
many people who have learned to know
Mrs. Milne through her letters and poems in
THE STANDARD. Our cause needs more such
ardent and outspoken champions:

If it be true—as who but an atheist would
deny—that God has made ample provision
for the needs of all men during their resi-
dence upon earth, it must follow of necessity
that the heaped up gain of some, and the
direful want of others, must be alike due to
some infringement of the laws which a just
creator ordained for his creatures' good.
But we are not merely the creatures of an
omnipotent will, we are also the children of
an all-wise, all-loving father, "for one is our
father, even God, and all we are brethren."
And can we suppose our heavenly father less
just, less merciful, less careful, for the
physical and mental and moral welfare of all
his children, than would be an earthly
parent? What sort of a household were that
where one child gorged while another starved?
where one was given every advantage of
moral training and the highest intellectual
culture, and another groined in brutish
ignorance where one was clothed in soft
furs and velvets or coolest lavas, as befit-
ted the season, while another shivered in "un-
womanly rags" where one shivered or swe-
tered in a cheerless, unwholesome garret, while
another monopolized the green play ground
that should be common to all? Yet, does not
our present social system in effect declare
that such is the ordering of heaven?

No, never, never, shall my heart or lips re-
knowledge such a blasphemy, but with fullest
gratitude and thrilling joy give thanks for
even the humblest place in the ranks of those
who carry forward the banner of love and
light, and "vindicate the ways of God to
man."

Providing Work for Women.

The beneficent United States tariff en-
courages industry of mothers and house-
wives by a duty of twenty per cent on in-
fants' food, and a similar duty on "powder
for custards" and plum puddings. Human
hair, such as is grown by many of our most
fashionable young ladies, is subject to a duty
of twenty per cent when "unclean and not
drawn," and of thirty per cent when "clean
and drawn."

Single Tax and Double Tax.

Justice, the paper recently started by the
Philadelphia anti-poverty society, says:

We had hoped that this split in the party
would not occur, but that all those who really
wish to emancipate labor could join hands and
work together in the coming campaign. This,
however, was not to be. It appears that a
portion of the party do not understand the
difference between a single and a double tax;
they do not see that the single tax means
free trade, and that they still believe in the
fallacy that a tariff makes wages high. Be-
lieving in these things, it is better that the
split in the party should come at this time,
for the result will be that if the issue before
the old parties is free trade and protection,
then we who believe in free trade will be able
to aid it by our ballots, while the protection-
ists will waste their ballots, as far as this elec-
tion is concerned, in the effort to elect a third
party candidate.

Night.

By Bianca White.
Mysterious Night, when our first parent knew
Thee from repton divine, and heard thy
name,
Did he not tremble for this lovely frame,
This glorious canopy of light and blue?
Yet, 'neath a curtain of translucent dew,
Bathed in the ray of the great setting
flame,
Hesperus with the host of heaven came:
And lo! Creation widened in man's view!
Who could have thought such darkness lay
concealed

Within thy beams, O Sun! Or who could find,
Whilst fruit and leaf and insect stood re-
vealed,
That to such countless orbs thou mad'st us
blind?
Why do we, then, shun Death with anxious
stifed
If Light can thus deceive, wherefore not Life?

THE DUTY ON COFFEE.

Did Its Abolition Increase the Price?—A
Criticism of Senator Edmunds's Argu-
ment.

United States Senator George F. Edmunds,
in an article published in the February number
of *Harper's Magazine*, offers some statistics to
sustain an argument that a duty upon im-
ports is not paid by the consumer of the
article imported, but by the foreign pro-
ducer. He quotes the price of coffee in the
United States six months before the abolition
of the duty and six months after, and shows
that the wholesale price of Rio and other low
grade coffees was not affected by the
abolition of the duty, the price being about
the same after as before. From this it is con-
tended that an import duty does not affect the
price of any dutiable article in the country
into which it may be sent. It is well, there-
fore, to examine this case.

See to a Pig, While His Nose Was Being Bored.
Robert Southey.
Hark! hark! that pig! that pig! the hideous note,
More loud, more dissonant, each moment grows—
Would one not think the knife was in his throat?
And yet they're only boring through his nose.

You foolish beast, so rudely to withstand
Your master's will, to feel such idle fears!
Why, pig, there's not a lady in the land
Who has not also bored and ring'd her ears.

Pig! 'tis your master's pleasure—then be still,
And hold your nose to let the iron through;
Dare you resist your lawful sovereign's will?
Rebellious swine! you know not what you do.

To man o'er every beast the power was given,
Pig, hear the truth, and never murmur more!
Would you rebel against the will of Heaven?
You impious beast, be still, and let them bore.

The social pig resigns his natural rights
When first with man he covenants to live;
He barter them for safer joys and delights,
For grains and wash, which man alone can give.

Bare is the provision on the social plan,
Secure the comforts that to each belong;
Oh, happy swine! the impartial sway of man
Alike protects the weak pig and the strong.

And you resist! you struggle now because
Your master has thought fit to bore your nose!
You grant in fact rebellion to the laws
Society finds needful to impose.

Go to the forest, piggy, and deplore
The miserable lot of savage swine!
See how the young pigs fly from the great boar!
And see how coarse and scantily they dine.

Behold their hourly danger, when who will
May hunt, or snare, or seize them for his food!
Oh, happy pig! when none presume to kill
Till your protecting master thinks it good!

And when, at last, the closing hour of life
Arrives for pigs must die as well as man,
When in your throat you feel the long sharp knife,
And the blood trickles to the pudding pan!

And, when at last, the death wound yawns wide,
Fainter and fainter grows the expiring cry,
Is there no grateful joy, no loyal pride,
To think that for your master's good you die?

MARY AND DICK.

Three years ago, when I was a delegate to the Central labor union, I was appointed on a committee to take charge of a strike of girl weavers employed in a silk factory on Forty-second street. My relations with the strikers were such that it was necessary that we should be more than acquainted—we should be confidential. In the course of this confidential acquaintanceship I met Mary, a very handsome girl of the Irish type. She was an active member of the weavers' striking committee, and through having often to meet together to discuss matters connected with the strike, it was but natural that a feeling of friendship should spring up between us.

Young women, when they feel that they are with male friends desiring to advance their interests, often throw aside their habitual reserve and tell their true thoughts and aspirations. These girl weavers were young women—were about the same as other young women—and among other interesting topics, they would talk about the young men of their acquaintance; and those who had "fellows"—or steady company—would talk about them. I wish to say here that these talks would go on when I was present just the same as if I had not been there. I was in no danger, for I had been captured years before. I will say for the girls, though, that whenever any, to my mind, more important matters were on hand, the "fellows" and the "steadies" were banished from the talks, and were not allowed to return until there was nothing else to talk about.

Mary had a "steady." The other girls knew him, and he used often to be brought up for discussion or dissection. He was a butcher, and his first name was Dick. "He was a nice fellow," "he worked in his father's butcher store," "he had a beautiful complexion," "when any poor person bought meat of him, especially a poor woman, he was always pleasant and gave good weight" (a virtue, by the way, that butchers do not all possess), "he had such a sweet mustache and laughing blue eyes," "he didn't hang around corners of an evening," "he liked to have fun, but took Mary along," and so on, and so on. Evidently Dick was a paragon.

Hearing his praises sung so often I could not but become curious about Dick myself, so I took the liberty once to ask Mary about him. She told me a whole mass of things about him—all good, of course—and I said I would like to see him some time. Mary said she would get him to come down to a meeting some night, when she would introduce him. I also got her to promise me an "invite" when the wedding should come off. Dick never came to any of the meetings, however.

In the course of time the strike ended, the girls being defeated, and we gradually drifted from each other's sight.

Probably a year had passed when I met Mary one evening on the Third avenue elevated road. She was working in a silk factory at Union Hill, New Jersey, but living in New York, up town. The work was "pretty fair," but she had to get up very early in the morning in order to be at the factory by seven o'clock, and she hardly ever got to her home before half past seven or eight at night. Yes, it was pretty hard work, and the earnings were small, and from five o'clock in the morning to eight o'clock at night was fifteen hours; but a girl must work; her earnings were needed to help support the house. No, she was not married yet.

"What has become of Dick—your Dick?" He was still working with his father. "You see," she said, "we were to be married as soon as Dick's father took him into partnership. The business was good and growing; Dick's father and Dick were so nice that the customers kept increasing,

and Dick's father half-way promised that Dick should be made a partner last May. Before May came round, Dick's father's landlord raised his rent three hundred dollars. That made Dick's father decide to postpone the partnership affair, and now Dick and I must wait until the business is built up a little more, for that three hundred dollars' rise in the rent rather upset Dick's father. Oh, no, when I do get married I want you to be present."

One evening, some time after, perhaps nine or ten months, I was walking up Tenth avenue. Women and children were streaming from a large building—a factory. I was making my way against this human tide as best I could, when suddenly I heard my name called. I looked up, and there was Mary.

She was working in this factory now, and had just got through her day's work. Was "awfully glad" to see me. I turned back and walked with her to the corner, where she was to take a cross-town car. She had had to quit work at Union Hill on account of crossing the ferry twice a day and the walk from the landing to the factory during the cold weather. It had laid her up sick. The wages were not so good on Tenth avenue, but she didn't have to face the cold winds on the North river in winter, although she had to get up early to be in time for her work where she was now.

She rode across in the Forty-second street car to Second avenue and then walked to where she lived—Eightieth or Ninetieth street, I forget which. Why didn't she ride up Second avenue? That would cost five cents more, and she couldn't afford it. Up and down the ride would cost ten cents extra a day; that was sixty cents extra a week. No, she couldn't afford it, so she walked. Yes, she had to get up earlier on that account, but her mother needed that extra sixty cents to help keep up the house.

"Well, what has become of Dick?" He was still working with his father. Dick said his father was feeling somewhat discouraged. Business was good in the butcher store, but it needed to be, for the rent had to be raised. "No, not again—oh, yes, I told you about it on Third avenue—but Dick's father told Dick that that rise of three hundred dollars had discouraged him. It seemed to him (Dick's father) that even if the business were to double he would get no good of it, because if it did so, it was more than likely that the landlord from whom he rented would raise him again next May."

What did Dick and his father intend to do? Well, Dick's father had told Dick that the best thing he could do would be to get a job to Washington market and try to get down there. Dick's father himself seriously thought of shutting up his store—in fact, said he would do it if his rent was raised again. "I don't know now," she said, sadly, "when Dick and I will get married. The time seems farther off than it did two years ago."

We had reached her corner by this time, and as I helped her on to the car, I jokingly said to her, "Don't forget that I am to be invited to your wedding." She turned toward me and tears welled up into her eyes as she said: "I hope it will be soon, but I am afraid some one has set the day a long way off."

Three or four months ago some engagement called me one evening to Third avenue and about Ninetieth street. I was a little ahead of my appointment, and was killing time looking in the shop windows and reading the signs, when I heard some one say "Good evening." There was Mary again, but this time she had an escort, and, taking a quick glance at him, and remembering how the girls had described him when we used to meet during the Forty-second street strike, I judged that I was facing the redoubtable Dick. And I judged correctly, for Mary introduced him to me. He shook my hand very cordially; was glad to know me, for Mary had often talked to him about me; he had often been almost [jokingly] jealous because she praised me so much, etcetera. They invited me to stroll along with them, and I accepted the invitation.

Dick was a fine looking young fellow, a typical New Yorker. As we walked along it seemed to me that both Mary and he acted as if they were very happy. The shade of care that I had noticed on Mary's face when I saw her last on Tenth avenue was gone, and in its place was the same happy look she wore when I first met her. "Surely," I thought, "Mary's fears as to the future have proved to be groundless. Evidently the time is near when she and Dick will have that wedding which has been so long postponed."

As soon as I got the opportunity I asked Mary what news she had. Oh, nothing new. She was still working on Tenth avenue. What were the prospects? "Splendid! Ask Dick."

I turned to Dick and asked him how he was getting along. Well, he hadn't been doing anything since his father closed up his store.

"What?" said I, "has your father closed out his business?" "Yes; the landlord wanted a second rise, and the old man couldn't stand it."

"What are he and you doing now?" "Well, the old man got a job in Washington market."

"What about you?" "I haven't got a place there yet. I guess I won't need it; some of my friends with a pull are going to get me in pretty certain to pass."

"I'm glad to hear it."

"Yes," Mary broke in; "and when he gets on we are going to get married; and mind, you must come to the wedding."

Oh, yes, I would be there. But it seemed sad to me that this young man should—in order to place himself in a position where he could marry the girl who thought so much of him—have to put himself under such binding obligations to some politician or set of politicians—for I know from what I have seen how subservient a person must be to the "boss" whose influence gets him a public position of any kind.

The time of my appointment had about come, and I bade them good evening and went my way.

time in a street car. The happy look was gone, and in its place was a haggard, pinched expression. She had got very thin. It seemed to me as if she had aged five years. I must confess that I was startled at her appearance. She did not see me until I spoke to her.

"What is the matter, Mary? Have you been sick?"

"No," she said despondently, "I haven't been sick, bodily; but I am sick at heart."

"What has happened? Oh, I see; you and Dick have had a quarrel. Is that it?"

"No."

"Anything the matter at home?"

"No."

"Well, then, what is the matter? The last time I saw you, when you were with Dick, you seemed to be perfectly happy. What has happened?"

"Well, you see, when you walked up the avenue with us that evening we told you that Dick was going on the park police and then we were going to get married."

"Yes, I remember."

"Well, he was sure he would pass the examination, and he did in all but one thing."

"And what was that, Mary?"

"He was half an inch too short."

W. M. McCABE.

Teaching that Teaches.

A correspondent in a large western city writes:

I was much interested in the letter from the teacher friend of August Lewis. I also realize how much is to be gained by interesting teachers. Six months ago I began talking the single tax to a teacher in our high school. The inclosed question paper on the subject of political economy, for the current high school examination, indicates the progress she has made and the method she has taken to sow the good seed.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

1. Define value. Upon what does it depend? Give reasons why a laborer should have a share in the profits of a business.

2. Upon what is the right of property based? State your opinion of the right of private ownership in land. Define and illustrate wealth and poverty.

3. What is price? Causes of fluctuations. What considerations affect the rate of wages?

4. Upon what does the rate of interest depend? Objections, if any, to usury laws.

5. Distinguish between money and credit. Name three uses and three abuses of credit.

6. Describe the banking system of the United States. What objections can be raised to it?

7. Are you in favor of protection or free trade? Give the strongest arguments in support of your opinion.

8. What are the principles of equitable taxation? What is Henry George's theory? Reason out the following:

9. Difference between direct and indirect taxation? Which is the better? Why? Describe the operation of a "clearing house."

10. When is a strike justifiable? When is it unjust? Name a strike which you consider just and one which you consider unjust.

11. What causes tend to promote differences between employers and employees?

First the Game, and Then the Crofters—An English You Know.

Baltimore Sun.
A party of gentlemen went from this city yesterday morning on an inspection tour over the eastern shore with an ultimate purpose of making extensive land purchases for a shooting preserve. Prominent New York and Maryland sportsmen are interested in the enterprise. That section of the state has been selected in preference to localities in New York, New Jersey and Kentucky because of its climate, topographical and geographical advantages. One important feature in its favor is that winter weather is less severe, particularly snow storms, which cause heavy losses among partridges, a breed of birds that is contemplated to raise in large numbers. This game will shelter aside logs, trees, and in holes, and be snowed in to die because unable to work their way through the surface, which generally freezes. As soon as suitable property can be obtained a club will be formed, with a local and visiting membership. An effort will be made to have increased transportation facilities, especially by steamers, from here. Pleasant shooting will also be included, and to secure the game in plenty it is intended to get some of the stock of Mr. Robert Garrett, from his country seat, Uplands, as well as from other sources, and breed the birds extensively.

Is Not the Reason of This That Social Condition Make Wrong Using a Condition of Existence?

James Payn.
I sometimes wonder—but always to myself, lest the susceptibilities of those who hold "whatever is, is right," should be wounded—whether it might not be of advantage to the human race if less time were given us for reflection. On the whole, the intricacies of men are, at least, as good as their principles; and certainly self-interest asserts itself more and more, the longer the opportunity that is afforded her to do so. How often do we say, "That is right," and then after a little thought, "But it is expedient," or, "It is advantageous?" after which the good deed is postponed indefinitely.

Where the question lies between "What is right?" and "What is pleasant?" to hesitate is indeed to be lost.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE RAILWAY NEWS is a monthly journal which discusses all the railway problems and specially undertakes the interpretation of railway emblems. Mechanical and technical articles by leading experts. This journal now attains a high standard and is in sympathy with its progress. Office, 31 Broadway, New York.

THE NEW CHRISTIANITY—A bi-weekly independent journal, recognizing the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as the essentials of religion, and Emanuel Swedenborg as the divinely inspired instrument of the new dispensation and era now so manifestly beginning. In sympathy with every movement toward the realization of the Lord's kingdom on earth, and having no desire to build up a sect or to interfere with any one's church relation, it opens its columns to all religious, moral and social questions, edited by one principle alone—the thought and love of God. Editors, E. F. Bond and A. H. Spurr, Jr. Price, 25 cents a year. Sample copies free. Address NEW CHRISTIANITY, Germantown, Pa.

\$5.00 LABOR LIBRARY—30 STANDARDS. Wins, Spencer, Huxley, Kropotkin, Ruskin, Hyndman, George, Speeches of anarchists, Lassalle, Bradlaugh, in 1 vol.; cloth, \$5; postpaid, \$5.50. Complete list mailed free. 201-13 Bowery, New York.

DR. MCGILLYN, POWDERLY, HENRY GEORGE, 12 Union square, New York city.

HENRY GEORGE'S WORKS.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY, An Inquiry Into the Cause of Industrial Depression and of Increase of Want With Increase of Wealth—The Remedy.

By HENRY GEORGE. 25 pages.

INTRODUCTORY—THE CONTENTS.

Book I.—WAGES AND CAPITAL.
Chap. 1. The current doctrine—its insufficiency.
2. The meaning of the terms.
3. Wages not drawn from capital, but produced by the labor.
4. The maintenance of laborers not drawn from capital.

Book II.—POPULATION AND SUBSISTENCE.
Chap. 1. The Malthusian theory—its genesis and support.
2. Inferences from fact.
3. Inferences from analogy.
4. Disproof of the Malthusian theory.

Book III.—THE LAWS OF DISTRIBUTION.
Chap. 1. The inquiry narrowed to the laws of distribution—necessary relation of these laws.
2. Rent and the law of rent.
3. Interest and the cause of interest.
4. Of surplus capital and of profits often mistaken for interest.
5. The law of interest.
6. Wages and the law of wages.
7. Correlation and coordination of these laws.
8. The status of the problem thus explained.

Book IV.—EFFECT OF MATERIAL PROGRESS UPON THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.
Chap. 1. The dynamics of the problem yet to seek.
2. Effect of increase of population upon the distribution of wealth.
3. Effect of improvements in the arts upon the distribution of wealth.
4. Effect of the expectation raised by material progress.

Book V.—THE PROBLEM SOLVED.
Chap. 1. The primary cause of recurring paroxysms of industrial depression.
2. The persistence of poverty amid advancing wealth.

Book VI.—THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Insufficiency of remedies currently advocated.
2. The remedy.

Book VII.—JUSTICE OF THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Injustice of private property in land.
2. Employment of laborers the ultimate result of private property in land.
3. Causes of land ownership to compensation.
4. Property in land historically considered.
5. Property in land in the United States.

Book VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Private property in land inconsistent with the social organization of the land.
2. How equal rights to the land may be asserted and secured.
3. The proposition tried by the canons of taxation.
4. Indorsements and objections.

Book IX.—EFFECTS OF THE REMEDY.
Chap. 1. Of the effect upon the production of wealth.
2. Of the effect upon distribution and thence upon production.
3. Of the effect upon individuals and classes.
4. Of the changes that would be wrought in social organization and social life.

Book X.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS.
Chap. 1. The current theory of human progress—its insufficiency.
2. Differences in civilization—to what due.
3. The law of human progress.
4. How modern civilization may decline.
5. The central truth.

CONCLUSION—THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE.
The new Land and Labor Library, paper edition of "Progress and Poverty" is now ready, price thirty-five cents. This is printed on better paper, in larger type, is better bound and a considerably larger book than the previous twenty-cent edition.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.
By HENRY GEORGE. 62 pages.

CONTENTS:

1. The increasing importance of social questions.
2. Political dangers.
3. Coming increase of social pressure.
4. Two opposing tendencies.
5. The march of concentration.
6. The wrong in existing social conditions.
7. Is it the least of all possible evils?
8. That we all might be rich.
9. First principles.
10. The rights of man.
11. Dumping garbage.
12. Over-production.
13. Completed labor.
14. The effects of machinery.
15. Slavery and slavery.
16. Public debts and indirect taxation.
17. The functions of government.
18. What we must do.
19. The great reform.
20. The American farmer.
21. City and country.
22. Conclusion.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?
An Examination of the Tariff Question with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labor.
By HENRY GEORGE.

CONTENTS:

I. Introductory.
II. Clearing ground.
III. Of method.
IV. Protection as a universal need.
V. The protective unit.
VI. Trade.
VII. Production and producers.
VIII. Tariffs for revenue.
IX. Tariffs for protection.
X. The encouragement of industry.
XI. The home market and home trade.
XII. Exports and imports.
XIII. Confusions arising from the use of money.
XIV. B. high wages necessitate protection.
XV. Of advantages and disadvantages as reasons for protection.
XVI. The development of manufactures.
XVII. Protection and producers.
XVIII. Effect of protection on American industry.
XIX. Protection and wages.
XX. The abolition of protection.
XXI. Inadequacy of the free trade argument.
XXII. The Real Strength of Free Trade.
XXIII. The Real Strength of Protection.
XXIV. The Robber that Takes All that is Left.
XXV. True Free Trade.
XXVI. The Lie in the Way.
XXVII. Free Trade and Socialism.
XXVIII. Practical Politics.
XXIX. Conclusion.

THE LAND QUESTION.
What It Involves, and How Alone It Can Be Settled.
By HENRY GEORGE. 67 pages.

PROPERTY IN LAND.
A Passer-at-Arms Between the Duke of Argyll and Henry George.
77 pages.

FORTSCHRITT AND ARMUTH.
(Progress and Poverty in German.)
TRANSLATION OF C. D. F. GUTSCHOW. 430 pages.

PRICE LIST.

Progress and Poverty, paper.....\$.35
" " cloth.....1.00
" " half calf or half morocco.....2.50

Social Problems, paper......20
" " cloth......50
" " half calf or half morocco.....2.50

Protection or Free Trade? paper......35
" " cloth......50
" " half calf or half morocco.....3.00

Property in Land, paper......15
" " cloth......30
" " half calf or half morocco.....1.50

Land Question, paper......10
" " cloth......20
" " half calf or half morocco.....1.00

Progress and Poverty, German, paper......35
For sale by all book-sellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price. Foreign orders, with books imported on order.

HENRY GEORGE, 12 Union square, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.'S

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A Novel with a Plot:

THE TRUTH ABOUT TRISTREM VARICK.

By Edgar Saltus, author of "Mr. Inoué's Misadventure," etc.
12mo, cloth, \$1. Paper covers, 50 cents.
In this novel Mr. Saltus has treated a subject hitherto unexploited in fiction. The scene is Fifth avenue, the action emotional, the plot a surprise. "There is," says one who has read it, "as much mud in the upper classes as in the lower; only in the former it is gilded." This aphorism might serve as epigraph to "Tristrem Varick."

Thirteenth thousand ready April 1.

THE TRICARDY ON IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES AND THE FREE LIST.

As contained in act of March 3, 1883, also the Hawaiian Reciprocity Treaty, and extracts from the Navigation and Commerce Acts.
Indexed. 12mo, Paper covers, 25 cents.

ASHES OF THE FUTURE.

By Edward Heron-Allen.
Beautifully printed in the best French style, with an illustrated cover, 50 cents.
"The story is of absorbing interest."—Chicago Journal.

"The work of a very vigorous and cultivated pen, as well as of a deep thinking and fervid brain. It is the story of a restless lover of many things, and of too many good women whose hearts he breaks and whose lives he shatters."—Brooklyn Eagle.

"MES AMOURS"

Confessions: Passionate and Playful.
Written to me by people, celebrated and obscure, and my answers to some of them. With an introduction and notes. Illustrated, small 4to, with portrait, \$1.25. Solms-Delaware, author of "In the Fashion."

"It is seldom that the English reader happens upon a book of verses so full of French humor as this pretty volume, 'Mes Amours,' the opening selection is edited with a running list of comments that renders it delightful. The 'afterthoughts' alluded to at the verses are often very clever and womanish."—New York Herald.

PRINCE COWSTOWN'S VICTORY;

OR,
The Entry Bride of Croton Lake.

By Mrs. Miles H. McNamara.
With illustrations. Small 4to, cloth, illustrated cover, \$1.00.

"A pretty fairy story, which will delight while it taxes the credulity of young readers. The book is tastefully printed and in handsome covers, and inclosed in a box ready for mailing."—Chicago Inter Ocean.

THE ROMANCE OF A QUIET WATERING PLACE.

12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
Thirty French illustrations by Graves.
By a New York Society Lady.

A SLAVE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

By E. DeLancey Person.
12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
A Novel of Incident, Plot and Action. Scene, Fifth Avenue, New York.

IN PRESS:

A DREAM AND A FORGETTING.

By Julian Hawthorne.
12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
Mr. Hawthorne's latest and most interesting novel.

HIS WAY AND HER WILL.

Author unknown.
12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
A Great New York Society Novel.

SOPHIA-ADELAIDE.

Illustrated with Portraits of the Princess.
Paper covers, 30 cents.
"The Deserter Daughter of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert." An awful story of romantic life by a Princess.

CHESTNUTS NEW AND OLD.

By Bill Nye.
12mo, cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.
His Last and Funniest Book.

THE POLITICS OF LABOR.

By Phillips Thompson.
Cloth, gilt top, \$1.25.
"An original and masterly work on the great question of the hour, the relations between capital and labor." Written for the hour in a clear, plain and forcible style. Competent critics predict that it will be the hand book for laboring men wherever the English language is spoken.

PECK'S IRISH FRIEND, PHILAN GEORGEHEGAN.

By George W. Peck, Jr.
Illustrated by True Williams.
12mo, cloth, \$1. Paper, 50 cents.
"Mr. Peck has made quite a reputation as a dialect writer, and his Georgehegan sketches have been well received."—Milwaukee News.

THE QUESTION OF THE DAY.

ANTI-POVERTY AND PROGRESS.

By Sister M. Frances Clare (The Nun of Kenmare).
12mo, paper, 25 cents.
"Discusses some of the questions recently brought to public notice by Henry George and Father McGivney. She is opposed to the late theory of the former on the

