

THE STANDARD

NO. 168---VOL. VII, NO. 12.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1890.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

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

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

TERMS:

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

Advertising thirty cents per agate line.
All letters and communications should be addressed and all checks and drafts be made payable to "The Standard."

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

The correct filling of orders is evidence of receipt of remittance.

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

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

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

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

Sample copies sent free on application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL. A Review of Professor Huxley's Attack on "Progress and Poverty" in Recent Issues of the Nineteenth Century—Denouncing the Single Tax Movement—Haytians Hold Fast to Land—"Uncarned Decrement"—The Reform Club's Tariff School—Mr. Vinton on Steel Rails—A Landlord's Organ—Free Trade Article in the Tribune—Partisanship vs. Partisanship—Future of Organized Labor—Farm, Stock and Home Once More.

LAISSEZ FAIRE. E. J. Shriver.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. Sarah Millin Gay.

STEEL RAILS NEED NO PROTECTION. Lindley Vinton.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

PERSONAL.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM. Professor Huxley Again—Property in Land.

THE FREE TRADE FIGHT. What Does This Mean?—Some Edifying Figures—Captain Codman Active—Teaching Political Economy.

BALLOT REFORM. Now for the Governor—Maryland's New Bill—Washington Has the Reform.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. An Editor That Hears One Side Only—The Negro and the Land—The Single Tax Letter Writing Corps.

SOCIETY NOTES.

SINGLE TAX NEWS. Single Tax Platform—"Cat Congressman McAdoo Saw"—Under the Paw—Mrs. Flint's Property—The Position—A New Single Tax Cartoon—Considering the Brooklyn City Tax Assessments—Activity in New York State—A Circus at Milford, Mass.—Experience a Good Teacher—A Good State Organization in Colorado—The Jerseyman Conditionally in Favor of a Conference—Ignorance of the Single Tax in Virginia—Active Work in Chicago—A Farm Laborer Spreading the Doctrine Among Farmers—A Noble Conversion in St. Louis—Father Huntington in Nebraska—The Beauties of the Protective System Illustrated in California—"Dollars Look Large" in the Golden State—News from Over Half the States of the Union—Activity in Canada—From the Land of the Mikado.

EDITORIAL.

In the February number of the Nineteenth Century Professor Huxley had an article entitled "Natural Rights and Political Rights," in which he attempted to demolish the doctrines set forth in "Progress and Poverty" by showing that Mr. George bases his theory on the idea that men have a natural right to themselves and to the product of their toil. Professor Huxley then proceeded to rehash the familiar argument by which a certain school of thinkers has sought to demonstrate that there are no such things as natural rights. Professor Huxley insists that man has no more natural rights than a tiger, and that the only natural claim to possession is the power to take and hold.

If Mr. Huxley's article proves anything, it is just as fatal to the American Declaration of Independence as to the doctrines enunciated in "Progress and Poverty." If the doctrine of the natural and inalienable right of mankind to the earth that we inhabit can be dismissed with a sneer, the declaration that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," must go down before the learned professor's snort of "Fudge!" We fail to see why such an assault concerns single tax men any more than it does any of that vast majority of mankind whose faith in human rights is based on a conviction that there is such a thing as a moral law that either represents the will of God or the very constitution of things. Whenever the objections to the doctrines enunciated in "Progress and Poverty" have no other foundation than the idea that animates Mr. Huxley's article, and when our only opponents are those who insist on the idea that there is no sanction for "absolute right" outside of the unconscious acceptance by mankind of the accumulate experience of our race, the majority in favor of the single tax will be so overwhelming that we shall be able to give it the sanction of experience, and thus have a right to demand Mr. Huxley's support.

Whether they have thought it out for themselves, unconsciously inherited it, or got at it by mere intuition, the mass of mankind certainly does believe that there runs through the domain of morals—that is, of human relations—a law as certain and unvarying as any of those laws of the physical universe that science has brought to light. The people believe that the man who recognizes no higher moral obligation than that set forth by Professor Huxley ignores or defies a law that does not owe its existence or sanction to its discoverers, any more than the law of gravitation owes its existence to Newton, or that of evolution to Darwin. The law of the proper relation of men, one to another, and of all men to the earth that they inhabit, grows clearer as the race advances in civilization and in knowledge. In fact civilization is but the gradual approximation to obedience to this law. It is an evolution as entirely controlled and directed by pre-existing law—by whomsoever or whatsoever made, not made by man—as the law that regulated and controlled the development of Mr. Huxley from an anthropoid ape; if there be any such law. The common experience of mankind certainly supports this assumption more fully than it supports the theory of

the origin of the human species accepted by Mr. Huxley, in the absence of that material witness, "the missing link." To us Mr. Huxley appears just as blind, because he does not see a thing so plain, as we should appear credulous to him for believing in something that eludes his chemie tests and appeals to faculties higher than touch and sense. Such differences as to premises never have been and never can be settled by argument.

How can such a dispute affect the question of the single tax? Whether the law of proper human relations is the unconscious codification of the accumulate experience of the race, or the ordinance of Almighty God, it is the ascertained law, running counter to which brings about misery and confusion. If experience be accepted as its highest sanction, then experience clearly demands a change in methods and systems that have failed to realize the hopes that have inspired all previous efforts for bringing happiness and prosperity to the human race—efforts that ought to have succeeded if accepted principles are true. If Mr. Huxley does not see this, he merely offers new evidence that he has devoted so much time to the lower animals and plants that he has given but slight attention to the relations of men. He has afforded abundant evidence of this in his recent controversy with Mr. Gladstone. Owing to his ignorance of political economy, a science of which he does not even know the terminology, Professor Huxley's article in the February Nineteenth Century is of no account as an attack on the practical plan proposed by Henry George for remedying admitted wrongs, though it is a pretty serious blow at Professor Huxley's own reputation as a man of sound reasoning powers.

The truth is that Professor Huxley's recent performances have done a great deal to destroy the popular respect for men of science. People are beginning to see that a famous scientist can display ignorance and stupidity. The reason for this is probably found in the tendency of the study of the physical sciences to produce an arrogance that looks with contempt on all intellectual effort in any other direction. Professor Huxley, for instance, appears to have followed the processes of evolution so nearly back to the germ that he has concluded that "the shaping potency behind the egg" is, after all, a somewhat trifling thing, which a chemist may, perhaps, some day capture in his laboratory and imprison in a glass jar. Mr. Huxley certainly feels that he so nearly "knows it all" that the undiscovered remainder is too insignificant to warrant the tremendous hypothesis of God. Inflated by the supposed possession of such overwhelming knowledge, the learned professor jauntily enters new and unfamiliar fields of study and inquiry with the happy conviction that any doctrine or argument, the truth of which is not immediately apparent to his great mind, is necessarily not merely false, but preposterous. We do not know what they call this in England, but our American aptitude for slang has long ago given us a term describing Professor Huxley's condition, and the vulgar call it "The Big Head."

In the March number of the Nineteenth Century Professor Huxley again wrestles with Mr. George in an article

entitled "Capital—The Mother of Labor." We present elsewhere a careful abstract of the article, and we hope that every reader of THE STANDARD will study it carefully, and that all who can do so will obtain the magazine and read the whole article. The Nineteenth Century is republished in this country by the Leonard Scott publishing company at 29 Park row, New York, and single copies may be had for forty cents. We know of no entertainment that any single tax club could offer its members equal to that which the reading aloud of this article would afford.

Before attempting to consider Professor Huxley's astonishing performance, it may be well to recall the character and object of the book that he attacks. "Progress and Poverty" is an inquiry into the causes of a condition of affairs that no sane man disputes. Seeing the enormous increase of the productive power of the human race for the satisfaction of its natural and acquired wants, Mr. George seeks to find out why it is that poverty persists in the midst of abundance, or the ability to procure abundance, for all. He naturally took universally known facts for granted. He did not deem it necessary to devote a chapter, for instance, to proving that without food man, as now constituted, cannot exist. Neither did he attempt to write a text book in which every term used in political economy and all the minutiae of the science should be discussed.

In prosecuting his inquiry Mr. George sought, so far as possible, to accept the current doctrines, and he made no new definitions. He merely sought to make existing definitions so clear that they should really limit and define meanings, and thus avoid the confusion arising from the use of one term in different senses. He says (chap. 2, p. 26): "It will be my effort throughout, as any term becomes of importance, to clearly state what I mean by it, and to use it in that sense and no other. * * * I shall not attempt to attach arbitrary meanings to words, or to coin terms, even where it would be convenient to do so, but shall conform to usage as closely as possible, only endeavoring so to fix the meaning of words that they may clearly express the thought." Having this intent, and never losing sight of it, Mr. George proceeded to consult the best authorities in political economy as to the sense in which the terms land, labor and capital should be used; and, having once formulated a definition, he kept his promise and used the word in one sense, and one sense only. He did not invent the formula that "land, labor and capital are the three factors of production." That is a fact accepted by all economists. Neither did Mr. George, as we have said, make his definitions. He formulated the common understanding among the best political economists when he said that "the term land necessarily includes, not merely the surface of the earth, as distinguished from water and the air, but the whole material universe outside of man himself. * * * The term land embraces, in short, all natural materials, forces and opportunities, and, therefore, nothing that is freely supplied by nature can be properly classed as capital."

He in like manner defined labor as including "all human exertion; and hence human powers, whether natural or ac-

quired, can never properly be classed as capital."

When he came to define capital, he quoted Adam Smith's original definition, and in the main accepted it, as corrected and modified by McCulloch, Ricardo, Mill and others, and thereupon declared that "such articles of wealth as in themselves, in their uses or in their products, are yet to be exchanged, are capital; such articles of wealth as are in the hands of the consumer are not capital. Hence, if we define capital as wealth in course of exchange, understanding exchange to include, not merely the passing from hand to hand, but also such transmutations as occur when the reproductive or transforming powers of nature are utilized for the increase of wealth, we shall, I think, comprehend all things that the general idea of capital properly includes, and shut out all it does not." Now, to a scientist, like Mr. Huxley, it must be apparent that it is not important that these definitions shall be the best possible ones, so long as they are closely adhered to in the argument, and the terms defined are never used in more than one sense. If Mr. George, instead of "land, labor and capital," had used the x , y and z of algebra, his argument would have been as sound, though less intelligible to the mass of readers. It was manifestly with this thought in his mind that Mr. George said, "nor is the definition of capital I have suggested of any importance;" and Professor Huxley violates courtesy and the rules of honorable controversy when he tears the sentence just quoted from its context, and uses it to create an impression that Mr. George attached no importance to an essential step in the train of reasoning by which he reached his conclusions.

It must also be borne in mind that the specific object of Mr. George's inquiry was to ascertain why the men who work and assist largely in production obtain so small a share of the values that they produce. Though we do not remember that he defines the term production in so many words, the whole argument of "Progress and Poverty" indicates that it can be defined as the process by which men obtain the things that satisfy their desires. Men do not make things for the sake of making them; but in order that they may have such things for their own use or to exchange for other things that they desire. Men work in order that their desires may be gratified, and where the demands for a mere animal existence are easily gratified and the new desires that come with civilization have not yet arisen, men do very little work. That is, as Mr. George says, "men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion." The object of production is the gratification of human wants, and the older economists, who made a distinction between "useful" or productive and non-productive labor, regarded that exertion which was directed to the procurement of food and shelter as the only truly productive labor. Adam Smith thus begins his introduction to the wealth of nations:

The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessities and conveniences of life, and which it annually consumes.

Further on in this same introduction he says:

Among the savage nations of hunters and fishers, every individual who is able to work, is more or less employed in useful labor, and endeavors to provide, as well as he can, the necessities and conveniences of life for himself or such of his family or tribe as are either too old, or too young, or too infirm, to go a hunting and fishing.

Bearing these things in mind, it is impossible to read Professor Huxley's article without amazement at his display of ignorance. It almost seems that he had never heard of political economy before he saw "Progress and Poverty," and that

he did not take the trouble to read that book before attacking it. His chief contention is merely one as to words. He picks a foolish quarrel with accepted economic definitions of terms, because their economic meaning differs from the meaning of the same words in common speech. He thinks he is fighting Henry George when he is assailing all political economists of reputation, from Adam Smith down. He constantly uses and plays upon the word "production" and with as little understanding of its only possible economic meaning as a Digger Indian. It is so with every other term. He opens his article with an allusion to the first deep drawn breath of a new-born infant and speaks of the nervous power or "work stuff" with which it starts life as derived from its mother, and then goes on to speak of this and of the sustenance it derives from its mother's milk as "vital capital" which later on the grown man, if a savage, must draw from roots, seeds, plants and various kinds of animals. From what other sources, if any, the civilized man draws his "vital capital" the professor does not think it worth while to say. If it pleases Mr. Huxley to invent the word "vital capital" to describe the vital energy that the child, through its assimilative power, draws from its mother, and the man from food, no one need specially object, but if Professor Huxley imagines that he has stated any new truth or presented any old truth more perspicuously, he is woefully mistaken. Practically he has, with a comical air of profound wisdom, in a roundabout way, declared that a child has got to be born before it can go to work, and that it must have food after it is born or it will starve to death. That is all that his "vital capital" theory amounts to. It did not require either a scientist or a political economist to teach this. It is a knowledge that man shares with the lowest order of animals that Professor Huxley has yet discovered. This part of his foolish article has no more to do with the economic question as to whether labor is paid out of capital, or out of its own produce, than it has to do with the influence of the moon on the tides.

Hear the learned professor again on "production." The savage does not, he declares, contribute to the production of what he gets. His labor is devoted to destruction. The same is true of the less savage Esquimaux. "They may expend more labor and skill; but it is spent in destruction." Passing over the absurdity of all talk by a great scientist of the "destruction" of matter, what a revelation we have here of Mr. Huxley's ignorance of political economy! Recall what we have quoted above from the "Wealth of Nations," where Adam Smith specifically describes hunting and fishing as production, and regards nations existing by such means as having the largest proportion of their people engaged in productive labor. Read Adam Smith's very first sentence declaring that "the annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessities and conveniences of life, which it annually consumes," and see what becomes of this preposterous attempt to discriminate between "productive" labor and "destructive" labor. The savage consumes the products of his hunting and fishing, and we civilized people consume the greater part of all the products of our more complicated system of satisfying our wants.

Professor Huxley is equally absurd when he talks of the raising of sheep and cattle. He admits that some labor enters into the domestication, rearing and protection of animals, but points to the great difference in the labor and care required in different localities and situa-

tions, in absolutely blissful ignorance of the fact that this difference in the amount of labor required is one that finds exact expression in land values. If he had formed even the faintest conception of the argument he is attempting to combat, he would have known this, and have seen that his attempted argument had been anticipated and met, leaving him in this, as in all other cases, no other controversy than a quarrel with a definition.

When it comes to land Professor Huxley is simply grotesque. He has evidently never even heard of any politico-economic definition of the term, and he flatly refuses to call anything land that cannot be plowed or hoed. For instance, he seems to have got it into his head that Mr. George speaks of the soil as "a producer," whereas Mr. George has always insisted that land is the passive factor in production, the real producer being, as Adam Smith also declares, labor, whether aided by capital or not. Mr. Huxley then goes on to insist that "the statement that land, in the sense of cultivable soil, is a producer, or even one of the essentials of economic production, is anything but accurate." He thus attempts to prove this statement: "The process of water culture, in which a plant is not planted on any soil, but is merely supported in water containing in solution the mineral ingredients essential to that plant, is now thoroughly understood." How absolutely petty this is! Even if the experiment were successful, what of it? In what political economy, unless it be that of some of the physiocrats, did Mr. Huxley ever find the term "land" so limited as to include only cultivable soil? Does common speech, or any known dictionary, warrant such a definition? What right has he to thus juggle with a parenthesis in order to mislead, while he pretends to discuss "Progress and Poverty," a book in which the definition of the term, as used by the author, is clearly given and invariably adhered to? What does his acre of fresh water rest on but land? How could anyone get at it but by traversing land? If the surrounding land were monopolized, how could anyone, without paying the monopolist for the privilege, get to the pond to plant or reap a water crop? What are the mineral ingredients that the water holds in solution but earth—that is, land? The argument and illustration are trifling and insincere—mere word juggling. He invents a new term, "vital capital," and uses it to thimble-rig with when discussing capital in its economic sense. He protests against an economic definition of the term land that differs from the meaning of the word in common speech, and then attempts to limit the meaning of the term, himself, when using it for one of his trick performances.

By way of further illustrating his ignorance of the meaning of the word land, Professor Huxley says:

In the arctic regions, again, land has nothing to do with "production" in the social economy of the Esquimaux, who live on seals and other marine animals.

If the shores of the various northern seas along which the Esquimaux roam, which ordinarily Professor Huxley would call the Land of the Esquimaux, were subjected to private ownership, we should soon find that land would have something to do with the social economy of these queer people. An illustration of this was given this winter along the shores of Lake Champlain. The failure to gather New York city's usual ice supply on the Hudson made ice gathering a great industry on these northern waters. The lake, of course, belongs to the state, and the ice is taken by whomsoever may choose to cut it, but the agents of the Hudson river ice companies, who

went up to White Hall, Putnam, Ticonderoga and other points, speedily discovered that the shores of Lake Champlain belong to private parties, and they have to pay roundly for level storage ground and for access to the only crop we have found it profitable to raise on water in this country.

Of course this argument is unnecessary, because the term land, in political economy, includes water; but it is perhaps of some value as showing how utterly unimportant is such a distinction as Professor Huxley attempts to draw.

It is needless, however, to multiply instances. Mr. Huxley has not the slightest conception of the meanings of the terms "land, labor and capital," as used in political economy, and he apparently believes that Henry George invented the formula, and is the only man who has ever attempted to explain it.

In one place the inclusion by Mr. George of "mineral products" in his list of examples of wealth is cited to show that the enumeration contradicts the definition that excludes coal, copper and clay unworked, from wealth. He apparently has absolutely forgotten the perfectly explicit definition in which Mr. George includes these natural resources within the term "land"—a definition that Mr. Huxley has no right to forget or ignore in an argument based upon it, and in which the term "land" is never used in any other sense.

In another place Mr. Huxley quotes a declaration by Mr. George that, while a fertile field or a rich vein of ore may give its possessor advantages equivalent to the possession of capital, "to class such things as capital would be to put an end to the distinction between land and capital." "Just so!" ejaculates Mr. Huxley; "but the fatal truth is that these things are capital; and that there is really no fundamental difference between land and capital!" Remember this is a great scientist; yet his method does not differ from that of the irate old man who, with a logic worthy of Mr. Huxley, shouted at his evolutionist son, while the latter was at home from college: "Your grandfather may have been a monkey, sir; but I want you to understand that my grandfather was a man." There are fundamental differences between land and capital obvious to the most careless thinker. Capital may be increased or diminished—land cannot. Capital can hide itself from the tax gatherer. Land cannot. Capital, in its economic sense, is invariably the result of the application of human labor to natural resources. Land is the economic term for those natural resources. Does Mr. Huxley imagine that he can abolish these essential differences by protesting against them in a loud voice? Why have political economists used two terms if one would have done just as well?

We might multiply instances of his ignorance and conceit in his attempt to deal with the land question, but the record of a great man's folly becomes wearisome. He makes the same desperate fight against the economic definition of wages that he does against all other definitions not found in the dictionary that he keeps for his private use. He finds, manifestly to his surprise, that Adam Smith declared that "the produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor," and further declared that "in that original state of things which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labor belongs to the laborer." Any reference to "an original state of things" as a basis for argument seems to infuriate Mr. Huxley—that, is if some one else makes the reference—and he promptly declares that "the whole passage exhibits the influence of the

French physiocrats, by whom Adam Smith was inspired, at their worst." He then attempts to settle the matter by declaring that it is nonsense to call anything wages other than the stipulated amount paid by an employer to the employed. He ignores the fact that the economic meaning of the term includes the reward of labor, however obtained. If he will permit one to cite the Bible, even as an illustration of early English, he will find in the declaration that "the wages of sin is death" proof that the narrowing of the meaning of the term is a corruption, and that the broader economic meaning is the older. Furthermore, Mr. Huxley, in his petty word mongering, does not see that if he succeeded in his contention, he would merely force the political economists to invent or discover a new term to describe what they mean by wages, and this could in no way affect the argument. By way of further exhibiting his utter confusion of thought, Mr. Huxley insists that the money that constituted part of the employer's capital becomes the laborer's capital as soon as it is in his pocket, "as he goes home" to expend it for food and rent or in the payment of his weekly bills to the grocer and baker. Here, again, Mr. Huxley thinks he settles a question by his simple *ipse dixit*. In one part of his article he insists that natural resources must be capital because they form part of a man's stock capable of yielding revenue, yet he now insists on calling capital money that is in the hands of the workman for the express purpose of procuring articles for consumption—or, as Professor Huxley would say, destruction—by himself and family, with no possibility that it will yield a revenue to its possessor.

It is probably a waste of space to follow this melancholy exhibition further. In his attempt to refute Mr. George's declaration that wages are drawn from the products of labor and not from capital, Mr. Huxley makes an exhibition of himself that is almost distressing. He utterly ignores the self-evident historical fact that labor preceded capital and created capital, in the economic sense. He sets up the absurd theory that labor adds nothing to the value of materials on which it is employed until the process of manufacture is complete. He takes up the case of a partly finished ship—only needing caulking, and says: "Suppose the shipbuilder's capital to fail before the vessel is caulked, and he cannot find another shipbuilder who cares to buy and finish it: what sort of proportion does the value created by the labor, for which he has paid out of his capital, stand to that of his advances?" Again, after quoting a reference in "Progress and Poverty" to the great St. Gothard tunnel, Mr. Huxley says:

Suppose that as the Swiss and Italian halves of the tunnel approached to within half a kilometer, that half a kilometer had turned out to be composed of practically impenetrable rock—would anybody have given a centime for the unfinished tunnel? And if not, how comes it that "the creation of value does not depend on the finishing of the product?"

Here again it becomes necessary to remind our readers that it is the great scientist that is talking in order to justify the waste of space in answering such silliness. Think of a scientist compelled to base an argument on the practical impenetrability of rock to the instruments of modern engineering, or on a supposition that, so long as ships are used at all, a builder who had exhausted his capital would find a ship, that only needed caulking, to have no value beyond the sum that could be obtained from the sale of her timbers as junk. So long as trade and commerce continue no such a thing is possible. If nobody wanted a ship the labor would be wasted whether the ship

were caulked or not. If there existed any active demand for ships the uncaulked ship would fetch a price that would cover the cost of labor on it up to that point.

Mr. Huxley evidently knows as little of the processes of production as he does of its objects. If finishing the product is necessary to the creation of value, value is a long time in getting created. Men get out iron ore and coal, and they are paid for doing it. The man who pays them sells these materials for the money that he pays out in wages. Other men turn them into salable pig iron, but pig iron, if it goes no further, is of no use. It is not finished, but it will command money or finished goods in exchange. So with every other step in the process of making useful articles of iron or steel. Until the last step, nothing is finished, yet labor adds to value at each stage of the process, and this added value is always conferred by labor before any wages are paid. It is so with every other manufacture. Does Professor Huxley consider wheat a finished product? On the other hand, does he deny that wheat has a value, and an easily ascertained value, measured either by money or its equivalent in finished products, long before it leaves the baker's hands for what he calls "destruction?"

Take the article throughout, and it is simply such an amazing exhibition of confusion of thought, ignorance of facts, incapacity to comprehend distinctions and of overwhelming conceit as has rarely, if ever, been made by any man able to gain access to the pages of a reputable review. That this exhibition should have been made by a man famous the world over as one of the greatest of scientists is at once astounding and distressing. It is likely to raise some painful inquiries as to the writer's mental condition, or some curious questions as to the amount of intelligence and mental training requisite to the acquisition of a reputation as a great scientist. In this way it is a remarkable article, but as an attack on "Progress and Poverty," or a defense of the existing system of taxation and land tenure, it is hardly worthy of respectful consideration.

It is, as we have pointed out, a philological rather than an economic argument. If the economists had used the word procurement in place of production to describe the process by which human wants are satisfied, and had declared that the essential factors in procurement are (1) the physical universe; (2) the exertion of human energy, skill and ingenuity in utilizing physical forces and modifying substances; and (3) such unconsumed portion of the result of the application of the second to the first as can be used to facilitate and promote the further procurement of things demanded by human desires; Professor Huxley could not, on the lines he has chosen, have found a single objection to the theories propounded in "Progress and Poverty." He finds, however, that the first of these essential factors is entitled land, that the second is called labor and that the third is called capital. He declares that these are not the right names for these factors; that this is the first time he ever heard of such terms being applied to them; that the definitions are not accurate according to his pocket dictionary—which contains blanks for the casual insertion of such new terms as "heterogeneous evolution" and "vital capital"—and that he first discovered them in skimming through the pages of a book by Henry George, who is a radical, and therefore wrong in all things. Having thus reached a conclusion he concluded to sit down on the whole thing, and put an end to it. The result might be appropriately summed

up in a head line frequently found in our comic newspapers over the record of some disastrous result of ignorant overconfidence—"He didn't know it was loaded."

Advocates of the single tax have no cause to lament such attacks as this by Professor Huxley. They merely arouse interest, provoke thought and pave the way for wider and more thoughtful discussion. Even when they come from those better equipped for such a controversy than this eminent biologist, they have the same result. The stupid adhesion of conservatism to existing institutions and methods never does more than check the march of human progress. The solemn denunciation of all change by pompous and self-opinionated professors of omniscience has lost all force with thinking people. The historian Freeman well says:

When statesmen who pride themselves on a certain air of dignified infallibility make light of a question or a movement, when they scorn it, when they snub it, when they call it "sentimental," when they rule it to be "beyond the range of practical politics," we know, almost as certainly as we know the next eclipse of the moon, that the question will be the most practical of all questions before long.

This has already been proved as to the great question thrust on the attention of mankind by "Progress and Poverty." The pages of the Nineteenth Century, and of most other serious publications in England and America, attest this. The emergence of Professor Huxley from his laboratory, to grapple with a problem of which he has not the faintest comprehension, is a striking evidence that the land question has penetrated the remotest recesses of thought and stirred the two extremes of society—for Professor Huxley goes to nature for his science and to the duke of Argyll for his politics. The latter once tried his hand at demolishing Henry George. His friend, the scientist, unwarned by the duke's experience, has rushed to his fate. If our friends in England seize the opportunity he will return to his laboratory a sadder but wiser man, and thenceforth leave political economy to define its terms and draw its deductions unchallenged.

If the New York Press is correctly informed as to the McKinley tariff bill, that measure is vastly worse than most persons expected it to be. The changes in the agricultural schedule are manifestly based upon an insolent confidence in the economic ignorance of farmers.

The Tribune is very much disgusted with the action of the assembly preventing the setting up of a printing office in states prison, with the convicts as compositors. Its Albany correspondent denounces the action taken as a curious instance of the cowardice of the legislative committee, due to "craven fear of that modern political boggy—the labor union vote." How the Tribune does hate printers! In its wrath it has forgotten that it is the great champion of the "interests of American labor."

The Evansville Indiana Journal devotes more than a column of its editorial page to a denunciation of the single tax movement, especially dwelling on the disastrous results that such a system would inflict on farmers. It quotes one very wise farmer, who, speaking of the claim that society confers a value on land, said: "Take a piece of land near Evansville. It cannot possibly, by any system of valuation, be made to produce more than so much, whatever the crop may be. What nonsense it is to talk about society—increased of population—conferring value on it, as farming land. It is too far from the city to plat into lots or to use for market gardening. Therefore what has a large population to do with its fertility?" This is a sample of the old

farmer's "wisdom." No one has ever claimed that a large population would increase the fertility of land, and it could have no effect on the value of land situated as that described except by giving it a nearer market. If the land does not have this advantage, its value, aside from improvements, would be very small, and the farmer owning it would find that when the taxes of Indiana were levied on land values alone that the more valuable land in and about Evansville would pay taxes in proportion to its value, while the farming land referred to would pay lower taxes than it now pays. This has been explained a thousand times, but it will doubtless require many more thousands of explanations to drive it into the heads of such wise farmers and editors.

According to the Port-au-Prince correspondent of the New York Sun, the United States government has failed in its ambition to possess St. Nicholas Mole as a coaling station. The correspondent states the Haytian attitude thus:

If there is one thing that a Haytian would spill his precious blood for, it is to prevent any alien gaining possession of one foot of his beloved land. The first article in their constitution declares that only Haytians can possess land on the island. This article is adhered to in a most jealous manner, and they would be very loath to cede any of their land to a foreign nation, even if she be one as friendly as the United States has proved herself to be. They say that our country could have it before all others, but they don't quite think that even we can get it.

Hayti's jealousy of alien land ownership is wise, whether it be directed toward governments or individuals, and perhaps the aspect of Haytian civilization would be more hopeful if the inhabitants of the island went a little deeper into the land question. When the Haytian blacks rid themselves of their white masters they unwisely retained the seeds of a new slavery in the land system which had existed under the old slavery. If anything can rouse the Haytians from their present lethargy the institution of a just and natural system of land holding will set them fairly on the road to prosperity.

A correspondent of the North Wales Guardian talks of the "unearned decrement," and he wants to know whether the people who demand that the government shall take the increase of land values are willing that the government shall reimburse those who hold land that has decreased in value. The mere question shows that the correspondent does not know anything at all of the single tax. The single tax proposes to take for public use the whole, or nearly the whole, of the rental value of land. When the annual rental value is high the tax will be high; when the value falls off the tax will fall off; when there is no such value there will be no tax.

The Reform club's school for the study of the tariff question starts off well and promises to become an important agency in preparing men for the successful discussion of the one great national issue now before the American people. Such work tells.

Mr. Lindley Vinton's article on Protection and Steel Rails contains the announcement of a tremendous fact that cannot fail eventually to transfer the iron manufacture of the world to the United States, and to force the iron manufacturers out of the ranks of the protectionists.

What kind of science does the Popular Science Monthly represent? Is it a fixed and finished science that feels no need of further investigation? Does it include political science? Is the Monthly a magazine open to the discussion of controverted subjects, or is it an organ of

some fixed body of political opinion? These questions are naturally suggested by the editor's declaration, in a letter printed elsewhere, that he has "never knowingly published anything directly favoring the doctrine of the single tax." We do not deny the right of the proprietors to make their magazine an anti-single tax organ, if they so desire, but *Popular Science Monthly* seems to be a queer name for such an organ. Better call it "The Landlord."

One of those present at the meeting calls our attention to the fact that the *Morning Journal* did give prominence to the great meeting of the Knights of Labor in behalf of ballot reform, and he sends clippings which demonstrate that the *Journal* should not have been included in the papers which *THE STANDARD* declared had failed to appreciate the importance of the demonstration. As a matter of fact, the *Journal* is more apt to pay attention to the movements of organized labor than most of the daily papers.

We call particular attention to a letter to the *New York Tribune* demanding free sugar, reprinted elsewhere. It is an admirable argument for free trade, for the considerations urged in behalf of the removal of the tariff on sugar will apply with equal force to the removal of every duty on raw materials that enter into American manufacture. How such an article ever got into the *Tribune* is a mystery.

PARTYPHOBIA VS. PARTISANSHIP.

The *Emporia News* sarcastically declared, some weeks ago, that the people of Kansas have "prohibition, protection and an army of saints," and everything that is supposed to make people contented and satisfied with their condition and surroundings, and yet it says:

Somehow there is discontent, grumbling and dissatisfaction. Not a farmer comes to the office to settle up arrears and renew his subscription but has a tale of woe to rehearse in the ears of the business manager. They all have the same story. Pressed with debts, prices for anything. Never saw the like. Don't know what is going to become of them. Joined the farmers' alliance in hopes that a saving could be made in the purchasing of a few groceries and some necessities. And so the story runs—and so it appears that in spite of all that our legislature and our congressmen have done for us, our farming communities are more discontented and discouraged, more pinched by debts and duns, more hedged in by encroaching poverty, though surrounded by enormous crops, than at any time in their experience.

Whether these hard conditions are due to the political policy Kansas has supported the *News* says "makes no difference whatever." It is enough for it to know that protection has not "put a dollar in the pocket of a Kansas farmer," while prohibition has not lightened his burden. "What, then?" it asks:

What's to be done? Aye, there's the problem. Evidently not the things we have been doing. A change of programme is necessary. Who is to make the change? They who are to profit by it, the farmers of the state, and of all the states. As to what it will be, they must say, after they shall have got together and considered ways and means. It is now their time to talk. The hour has struck when they should sit down on doctrinaires and humbugs, and stand up for their rights and for reform.

Why does the editor of the *Emporia News* continue to be an editor if this is all he has to say concerning a distressing condition of affairs that he describes so feelingly? It does matter, and matter tremendously whether the political policy that the people of Kansas have persisted in supporting is responsible in whole or in part for the wretched condition in which they find themselves. It is the business of the editor of the *News* to study this question and not to attempt to shunt it off on a lot of farmers, who will probably bring to its consideration prejudiced and uninformed minds and merely muddle things more. This, however,

is the fashion of a large body of people who seem to imagine that political questions can be solved by other than political methods.

The *Saturday Globe* of this city, which would be an almost perfect democratic paper if it could rid itself of an unreasonable partisanship, recently took the *Journal of the Knights of Labor* to task for declaring, in effect, that there is practically no difference of principle or sentiment between the two great political parties, but that both are simply struggling like hungry swine for access to the "swill trough of office and patronage." This really shocks the *Globe*, and it indignantly asks the *Journal* if it conceives "that Mr. Cleveland was merely squealing for 'swill' when, in possession of the presidential office, and knowing that he had only to glide on, selfishly acquiescing in the continuation of notorious abuses to be re-elected, he nevertheless, against advice and remonstrance, sat down and penned the immortal message of '87 demanding the liberation of our industries and of our industrial classes from the grinding system of federalist monopoly taxes?" The *Globe* continues:

The *Journal* has no right to mislead its constituency, already too long misled, by such inconsiderate disquisition as this. The emphatic declaration for free trade at Atlanta—the single tax resolution being nothing else than that—shows that the Knights of Labor are doing some pretty decided thinking on their own part, and that they are not disposed to trifle with the questions of the day, or to be trifled with in regard to them.

We cannot fully share the hot indignation with which the *Globe* resents the *Journal's* uncomplimentary comparison. The *Journal* is published in Philadelphia, and considering the performances of the so-called "democrats" of that city at the last state election we think its comparison will pass so long as no protest is entered on behalf of the other party involved. There are democrats and democrats. There are democrats who join the *Globe* in applauding the courage and devotion of Grover Cleveland, but the men against whose "advice and remonstrance" Mr. Cleveland acted still call themselves democrats, as does also one David B. Hill, who defeated Mr. Cleveland and was rewarded with re-election by the votes of a majority of those calling themselves democrats in this state, aided by some fifty or sixty thousand republicans, whose votes were given to Hill, according to the *New York Tribune's* brazen confession, in return for votes for Harrison for President.

Nevertheless, the *Globe* is in the main right. The article in the *Journal* of the Knights of Labor reflected a sort of partyphobia which many men pride themselves on showing, and which is at times as effectual a bar to rational and necessary political action as the most senseless partisanship can be. The Kansas farmer and the Philadelphia Knight of Labor, in their disposition to "rise superior to parties" and to ignore the effects of party policies in bringing about conditions against which they protest, display folly instead of wisdom. No political party was ever immaculate in the eyes of those who really knew it. All political parties are, however, composed of men who, to quote Senator Walthall of Mississippi, "are very like folks." Political parties are differentiated, not by the character of the men composing them, but by their progress and tendencies. There are but two of them, and in the long run there never are more than two that amount to anything. One of them at present demands a continuance of the fiscal policy that is responsible for the existing conditions. The other attacks and opposes that policy. Which shall triumph?

That is the only practical question that the people of this country can decide by their votes for the next few years. Those

who are satisfied with existing conditions can, by voting the republican ticket, vote for the continuance of the tariff policy of that party. Those who are not satisfied can, without becoming democrats or surrendering their opinions, vote for a change by voting the democratic ticket, and in no other way can they do anything to affect a change. Those who are uninformed or indifferent can play base ball, go to Europe or organize a "farmers'" or a "laborers'," or some other kind of third party, and play at politics for their own amusement or gratification. Any of these courses may prove pleasant or profitable, but none of them will have anything whatever to do with settling the great problem that the American people are now facing.

THE FUTURE OF ORGANIZED LABOR.

In the next issue of *THE STANDARD* will appear the first of a series of three articles on "The Future of Organized Labor," by Mr. James Bartley of Amsterdam, N. Y. Mr. Bartley is an earnest and enthusiastic friend of labor organization. He thinks that he has discovered wherein the methods adopted by bodies of workmen for enforcing their demands have failed, and now he proposes a new plan of operations.

We have no doubt whatever that Mr. Bartley is right in his declaration that the great labor movement of a few years ago was of vast importance in educating wage earners into a knowledge of their rights and an appreciation of the wrongs inflicted upon them. *THE STANDARD* has always held that, so long as existing conditions are permitted to remain, the most that can be accomplished by labor organization is the amelioration of hardships. On the other hand, it has also insisted that so long as these hardships continue organization for their amelioration is proper and necessary. Our only controversy with any of the labor leaders, as such, has arisen through the disposition of some workmen to substitute mere industrial organization for political action, in seeking a cure for existing evils.

In publishing Mr. Bartley's articles we do not indorse his proposal, but merely submit it to our readers and to friends of organized labor for their consideration and discussion. We shall ask some of the best known leaders of the labor movement to read the articles and give their opinion concerning the probable effect of the measure urged by Mr. Bartley, and we also solicit brief letters from our friends on the same subject.

"FARM, STOCK AND HOME" ONCE MORE

Farm, Stock and Home, published at Minneapolis, continues to devote considerable attention to the single tax, but it still deprecates the policy of the single tax men in insisting that no other tax shall be levied except one on land values. It believes in taxing land values, but thinks that other property ought also to be taxed, and it appears to doubt that the abolition of taxes on production will cheapen goods to consumers. It acknowledges that it is open to conviction, but says it cannot see how the people at large are to be benefited by simply taxing land values, and exempting all other property.

We are confident that if *Farm, Stock and Home* will study the question further, it will see for itself why land values alone should be taxed. Without going elaborately into the question, let us point out to our contemporary a few primary facts that it cannot but admit. It certainly recognizes the fact that a tax on products tends to restrict production and increase prices. If a high tax were laid on shoes for instance the price of shoes would be enhanced, and it would take more of the products of a man's labor to

buy a pair of shoes than it now does. The result would be that he would wear his old shoes longer, have them patched and half-soled more frequently, and, if the worst came to the worst, go barefoot. This is manifestly true of every other commodity.

Having thought this matter out thoroughly, and conceded, as it must, that taxation of products tends to decrease production and enhance prices, let our contemporary apply precisely the same course of reasoning to the taxation of land values. If it will do this, it will be compelled to acknowledge that such taxation does not make land scarcer or dearer, but, on the contrary, tends to force it into the market and lower its purchase price, thus making it easier for men needing land to obtain it. The reason for this is that the total quantity of land is fixed, whereas there is practically no limit to the amount of production resulting from human labor. If *Farm, Stock and Home* will seriously consider this essential difference between the tendency of taxes on land values and the tendency of taxes on labor products, it will see just why single tax men insist that the full application of their system will ultimately abolish involuntary poverty.

Everything that exists in the shape of wealth is the result of the application of labor to natural resources. Men can obtain nothing whatever except from the storehouse of nature. The extent of that store can neither be increased nor diminished by his efforts. The storehouse may, however, be locked up by private ownership, and men thereby be prevented from obtaining access to it, and thus be forced to labor for inadequate reward or denied the opportunity to labor at all. It is this closing up of natural resources that throws men out of work and causes them to compete one with another for the opportunity to produce, thus forcing down wages and making tramps, while it enables a small class of men, through their monopoly of natural resources and their power of exacting tribute from workers for the privilege of access to them, to accumulate vast wealth without any labor on their own part.

Now, these possessors of natural resources, all of which are included in the term land as used by political economists, exact from those who seek to use them all that they can compel such users to pay; and they are enabled to exact a higher price than they would otherwise be able to obtain through the very fact that they hold, on speculation, large quantities of land in absolute idleness, to which men desiring to use it cannot obtain access. The first effect of the transfer of all taxation to land values would be to render it difficult or impossible for such persons to hold land out of use. Their own interests would compel them to seek to get rid of it, and men perforce willing to pay the tax would thus obtain access to it without the payment of any purchase price. Whether this would be immediately the case or not, it must be clear to our contemporary that the tendency of such a system would be at least to greatly reduce the price charged by present owners for allowing people, anxious to improve such opportunities, to obtain permanent possession of them. This fact, if once clearly comprehended, will show our contemporary that the tax on land values cannot be transferred as taxes on commodities are.

It is, of course, true that the user of land must pay the tax on it. What *Farm, Stock and Home* forgets is that he now pays such tax, but he pays it to the landlord either in the shape of purchase money (generally involving the continuous payment of interest) or as

direct rent. Under the system that we propose he will pay this to the government, or his landlord will pay it to the government, if the landlord shall still exist, and all other taxation will be abolished, thus enabling every user of land to retain a much larger proportion of his net product.

It is the landlord, as such, who must pay the tax on land values and he cannot transfer it to the tenant. Of course, if the owner and the user are one this may, at first glance, seem to offer no relief, and it certainly will offer no relief if the expectation of the holder is simply to cultivate land in such fashion as to afford him a living, looking to its increase in value for his prospective profits. Such a holder of land is essentially a landlord in interest, and the single tax will not benefit him in that capacity, but as a user it will give him every encouragement to increase the productivity of his land and enlarge his improvements without a fear that he will thereby increase his taxes; hence it will tend to destroy the speculative spirit, even among users of land, and gradually eliminate the whole landlord class that now stands between the producer and access to natural opportunities. We hope our contemporary will consider these suggestions carefully and point out wherein they fail to meet the doubts suggested in its article entitled "The Fruits of Single Tax."

Laissez Faire.

Mr. David A. Wells has lately published a work on "Recent Economic Changes," which is remarkable chiefly for its studied avoidance of the part played by land as a factor of production; carried so far that nowhere within its pages can be found a hint that any portion of the produce goes toward the creation of economic rent. That a man should be less ready to accept new ideas at sixty odd years of age than he was when a quarter of a century younger, is not an uncommon phenomenon; and so we should not be surprised, but only regret, that Mr. Wells should be less ready to learn from others how men may be secured in their right of industrial freedom, for the attainment of which he hopes, than he was to liberate himself by his own thinking and observation from the superstition that natural prosperity can be ensured by governmental interference. So far he traveled the road of freedom, but like many another good man, his ideas had become so set on the name of freedom that he lost its essence. The sign posts that led him along that road had all been inscribed "Let industry alone to work out its own salvation;" and when in the midst of the road he found an artificial obstruction—the power of land monopoly—the legend on those sign posts had not taught him that the way must be cleared if its spirit were to be followed. The dogma of doing nothing, which had become greater than the faith of true non-interference with natural law, forbade removal of the obstruction; and so the disciples of this creed must needs deny its existence and follow the road aside, with vehement assertions that they are still marching in their old direction. This has been the creed to which Mr. Wells has pinned his faith in the past, and a newer one finds him with a mental anatomy so set and fixed that it is no longer ready to receive fresh impressions as it was when he abandoned the advocacy of a protective tariff to urge the establishment of commercial freedom. We can hardly expect him to go a step further with us now, and work for an extension of this freedom through the single tax, but we have a right to look for recognition by any one who has so long studied political economy of the universally accepted law of economic rent. And of this there is not one trace in the most ambitious work which he has yet produced; perhaps because its admission would be fatal to the grotesque

Atkinsonian gospel by which so strong a mind appears to have become bewitched.

As a collection of curios, the book is interesting; a record of patient grubbing for unrelated facts, rendered valueless for practical deductions by the failure to link them together in accordance with the laws to which they owe their occurrence, and by which their effects are modified. He tells us, for example, of the enormous saving in productive power accomplished by such agencies as the Suez canal, the discovery of natural gas and the modern railroad system, and cites manifold instances of like economies, such as are produced by improvement in manufacturing processes. He recognizes that the expansion of trade which theoretically should have followed these advances in civilization, actually has followed them—that although profits everywhere have so diminished as to apparently discourage the production of wealth, more and more wealth is every year being produced and exchanged. Yet, as he is not wholly blinded to facts by Mr. Edward Atkinson's figures, to which he so often acknowledges indebtedness for many of his own conclusions, Mr. Wells admits that these years of unparalleled progress have likewise been years of unexampled depression, and narrowly escapes falling into the "overproduction" labyrinth—of accounting for the paradoxical state of things by the insane theory that mankind suffers increasingly from pauperism and commercial disaster because it is producing more wealth than it can use. Some passages indicate that this ridiculous conclusion is at least latent in his mind; as where it is suggested that a man who has been in the habit of wearing one shirt a week "is not likely to wish to use seven immediately, even if he can buy seven for the price that he formerly paid for one." But if it cost no more effort to produce seven shirts than one, it would make no difference to anybody if six of them were destroyed, or at least thrown away, as soon as made. Mr. Wells tells us how the efficiency of a man's labor in pin making has been increased five hundred fold in a single century, and infers that there may be some derangement of economic processes by such development as this. But if it were confined to this one industry—assuming men free to labor as they will—and the rest of the world did not need or could not buy the increased number of pins, there would remain a surplus, it is true; but the pin makers would be no worse off, because the quantity that they could dispose of would still bring them as many comforts in exchange as before, and as they had expended for producing the larger quantity no more labor than had formerly been necessary for production of the quantity which they were still able to sell, they could in no way be sufferers. While if the increase in productive power were common to all employments—as in practice it is—the question involved would be still simpler, as larger quantities of everything would be exchanged at lower money values and the imaginary excess that nobody is supposed to want would be a matter of perfect indifference to everybody.

But all this is elementary, and has been expounded so often that a professional economist, such as Mr. Wells is universally considered to be, should not get fogged about it as he appears to have been. The school to which he belongs has long insisted, and rightly, that improvements by means of which the world could obtain more comforts with the same labor, or the same comforts with less labor, could not but in themselves benefit mankind, but has wrongly assured us, as Mr. Wells now assures us, that the coincident evils which he so vividly depicts in the earlier chapters of his book, are only "in the nature of 'growing pains.'" What a feeble explanation it is to one who has seriously followed that earnest statement of the unprecedented depression of the last quarter century! Disassociated from the central cause of land monopoly, how utterly meaningless and contradictory the

several phenomena become. We are told that capital is more essential to production than ever before, and that yet, although being constantly destroyed through many of its natural forms being made useless by introduction of new processes, that its returns are rapidly diminishing. Ignoring totally the existence of any division of products except that into interest and wages, the *non sequitur* is at once drawn that since production grows more effective yearly and capital receives a smaller percentage of interest, therefore wages must receive more; and nevertheless it is pointed out that the number of men at any time available to perform labor is steadily increasing by reason of reduced mortality and consequent extended duration of life. In other words, a smaller proportional supply of capital meets with lower rewards, and a larger supply of labor with higher rewards.

The data on which all this fine theory is based are as illusory as the deductions. Lost in Mr. Atkinson's mazes of percentages, our author finds that the per capita consumption of most articles has increased, and, therefore, concludes that the income of the masses is increasing. A graphic way of showing him how little this proves might be to ask him whether he considers that a per capita increase in the consumption of champagne would indicate that the laboring classes or the idle classes had a larger amount to spend on luxuries. That the per capita production of wealth, and, therefore, necessarily the per capita consumption (since in these days we do not build pyramids or other such "fixed" forms of capital), is increasing, no one disputes. The real question is, How are the resultant comforts distributed? and this Mr. Wells's one-sided statistics totally fail to show. Nor is it much more accurate to say that interest is low, on the strength of figures that show a low average dividend rate on the par value of railway shares, for the most part selling at a discount and representing no real capital whatever, but only the value, actual or anticipated, of public franchises, and even these at a gross overvaluation. Interest is falling and wages are slightly rising all the time, but in no such ratios as Mr. Wells would have us believe, and not as the results of the causes which he suggests; but that other channel into which the produce of labor flows, the economic rent so strangely omitted by this economist of ours, as steadily grows and always at the expense of both capital and labor—so long, at least, as natural opportunities are treated as private property. Daily observation rightly teaches us what Mr. Wells cannot see, blinded as he is with this juggling of labored, but imperfect, calculations; that it is the rich who are growing richer and the poor who are yearly receiving a smaller proportionate share of the annual produce. It is strange to find a really scientific thinker appealing to returns of income tax, so often has their utter inadequacy for scientific purposes been demonstrated, and when we are shown these pretty pictures of how wages have risen even while the cost of living has decreased, we have only to point to the admitted state of affairs in which it is daily harder to find employment and ask for explanation less contrary to facts. That explanation single tax men have no trouble to find in the power which ownership of land confers upon some men to live upon the labor of others, to grant or deny the right to labor at all, and not least of all, to diminish the number of useful things that the world might be enjoying by holding land out of use and forcing men to use less productive land than is called for by the present population and state of the arts.

Mr. Wells sees part of this truth. He repeatedly mentions the comparative prosperity of the British masses under the conditions which they enjoy of partial "industrial and commercial freedom;" he particularly cites as one of the causes of economic disturbance the attempted interferences of human with natural law,

by taxation upon industry, and yet—because he will not—he cannot look a little further and see the root of what he calls at the outset an "unprecedented disturbance and depression of trade," in which profits have disappeared and millions have been thrown out of employment, even while more wealth is being produced every year with less expenditure of human force than ever before.

The world is worse off, even temporarily, because the Suez canal has been built and some of its old tools in the shape of sailing vessels have to be thrown aside. Does the farmer feel poorer as he tosses into the junk pile a scythe that his new mower has displaced? If paper bags can be bought cheaper than we have been used to making them at home have we not so much money or labor set free to use in getting something else that we want besides paper bags? Provided always that the field is left open to us wherein we are free to buy our goods or employ our labor. There is Mr. Wells's stone wall, at which he stops; and lest he may have to climb it, conveniently forgets that part of the standard political economy which teaches that land is an essential factor of production and that its share of product is called rent, never even mentioning the latter in his book except in its relation to dwellings. Even here he minimizes it as not of sufficient importance to be considered in his analysis of cost of living as compared with wages, seemingly oblivious to the fact that at the points where labor is most effective in the production of wealth, it is house rent which eats up a third of the laborer's share of the product. He can see that industry thrives best where it is freest; but that it would be better still to remove all its burdens and place them instead upon the privileges through which a few at once fatten upon and throttle the energies of their fellow men—that is a new dispensation—and he will not even consider it by a casual mention of the economic axioms upon which it is based. It is as though one should write a book on the history of physiology and leave out all mention of Harvey's discovery of circulation of the blood; and with all due respect to the prominence of the author, and the work he has put into it, this book is equally absurd.

E. J. SHRIVER.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON

AND THE ABOLITION MOVEMENT. (FOURTH PAPER.)

"Two, only, of the twelve founders" of the New England anti-slavery society were visible at its twenty-fifth anniversary festival—Mr. Garrison and Oliver Johnson. Two younger men, late comers into the cause, seemed in no "festal mood." T. W. Higginson said: "Tomorrow may make this evening only the 'sound of revelry by night' before Waterloo;" and Theodore Parker said by letter, "Absent in body, I send you a word as a sentiment for the festivity: *The triumph of freedom in America*—peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must." This sentiment in nearly the same words was repeated in resolutions at the Massachusetts disunion convention held shortly after. A national convention of the same character was given up, and the work of the abolitionists greatly curtailed by the financial panic of 1857. The disunion sentiment—which T. W. Higginson had called the "secret of anti-slavery"—was greatly developed, however, by the Dred Scott case and by the progress of events in Kansas. In the following year that struggle transferred itself to the floors of congress, President Buchanan recommending the admission of the state with the LeCompton constitution, that adopted by the bogus legislature, and establishing slavery. The two houses disagreeing, a conference committee adopted the English bill which provided for the admission of Kansas if her people would accept the LeCompton constitution with a large land grant, and for the refusal of admission until her population should number 94,000 if she declined. Kansas promptly

spurned the bribe and disregarded the menace by more than 10,000 majority.

In both sections the political revolution was recognized. Jefferson Davis "entreated Mississippi to make ready for the contest and alter over its old arms." Seward spoke of the "irrepressible conflict;" Lincoln, of the house divided against itself, the government which could not endure, half slave and half free. Yet the north was not united and Mr. Garrison pointed out the weakness of its position. "Now, throughout our mighty north, you know we have settled one thing—that slavery shall not be one of our institutions. . . . We abolished it because of its inherent injustice and immorality; . . . no man is allowed to be a slaveholder here. Tell me . . . why not? . . . If you say God has not authorized me to hold a slave here, then I say, he has not authorized it at the south. There are not two Gods—one for the north and one for the south—but one God, and if he makes it immoral to hold slaves at the north, he makes it no less immoral to hold slaves at the south. Before you reject a single doctrine I have laid down you have got to burn every northern state constitution. . . . I do not wonder that the north is driven to the wall by the south in this controversy. Against such glaring contradictions, such a shuffling morality, the slave holder has the argument." The inconsistency of the republican party increased as it caught sight of the White House, and many of the abolitionists were severe in their criticism of its leaders, including Mr. Lincoln. With the justice and moderation so conspicuously his and so generally denied him, Mr. Garrison judged the man and the party; he said: "My hope is in the great republican party, not where it stands, but it has materials for growth. . . . I say, that between the democratic and republican parties, under the constitution of the United States, in regard to slavery where it is now established, there is not a hair's breadth of difference. . . . But in regard to the component parts, the men who make up the parties, there is a great difference. The republican party is only *pro tempore* . . . the men who compose it will, I trust, take a much higher position and give at last a firm support to the only rational, consistent and victorious doctrine in this conflict with the demon of slavery—'No union with slave holders, governmentally or religiously.'" An event was imminent which "drove to its highest pitch the wave of anti-slavery sentiment in the north." Mr. Garrison seems to have understood it at once: "The particulars of a misguided, wild and apparently insane, though disinterested and well-intended, effort by insurrection to emancipate the slaves in Virginia, under the leadership of Captain Brown, alias 'Osawatimie' Brown, may be found on our third page. Our views of war and bloodshed, even in the best of causes, are too well known to need repeating here; but let no one who glories in the revolutionary struggle of 1776 deny the right of the slaves to imitate the example of our fathers." Mr. Garrison had met Brown at Theodore Parker's, and they had "discussed peace and non-resistance together, Brown quoting the Old Testament against Garrison's citations from the New;" but of his plans Mr. Garrison was totally ignorant. The republicans who were held responsible for the affair at Harper's Ferry, fearing that their chances of success at the next presidential election were ruined, tried to shift the responsibility upon the shoulders of the abolitionists, but the character of John Brown and his deed were soon generally understood. As Mr. Garrison said, "those who know him personally are" convinced "that he possesses a deeply religious nature, powerfully wrought upon by the trials through which he has passed; that he as sincerely believes himself to have been raised up by God to deliver the oppressed in this country, in the way he had chosen, as did Moses in relation to the deliverance of the captive Israelites." Few, however, wholly agreed

with Mr. Garrison. "In recording the expressions of sympathy and admiration which are so widely felt for John Brown, whose doom is so swiftly approaching, we desire to say, once for all, that judging him by the code of Bunker Hill, we think he is as deserving of high-wrought eulogy as any who ever wielded sword or battle-ax in the cause of liberty; but we do not and cannot approve of any indulgence of the war spirit." "I am a non-resistant, a believer in the inviolability of human life under all circumstances. I, therefore, in the name of God, disarm John Brown and every slave of the south. But I do not stop there; if I did, I should be a monster. I also disarm, in the name of God, every slave holder and tyrant in the world." But all could see that "the sympathy and admiration now so widely felt for him, prove how marvelous has been the change effected in public opinion during thirty years of moral agitation, a change so great, indeed, that whereas ten years since there were thousands who could not endure my lightest word of rebuke of the south, they can now easily swallow John Brown whole and his rifle into the bargain. In firing his gun, he has merely told us what time of day it is. It is high noon, thank God!"

The south hurried to fortify herself, enacted stringent laws against the free negroes, mobbed and expelled northern residents and visitors. Mr. Garrison described this state of things in a pamphlet called "The New Reign of Terror." "Though the end is not yet," said he in the *Liberator*, "surely it cannot be far distant—for the battle waxes to the ate, and all the signs of the times are indicating that a great revolution is at hand."

In April, 1860, the democratic party split at the national convention in Charleston, and the northern wing, adjourned to Baltimore, nominated Stephen A. Douglass for president. The republican party in Chicago, in May, nominated Abraham Lincoln and elected him in the following November. "For the first time in our history," said Wendell Phillips, "the slave has chosen a president of the United States. . . . Lincoln is in place, Garrison in power." South Carolina seceded, and was quickly followed by the Gulf states. The old, miserable, compromising spirit swept over the north; in panic she again abased herself, in the federal legislature, in the peace congress, in the press, by the lips of the republican leaders. Anti-slavery meetings were mobbed by the "respectable" classes with all the violence of 1835. (Mr. Phillips was especially marked for attack.) One cowardly concession after another invited the south to return; she was left without an excuse for secession. But her instinct taught her the inevitable trend of events, and her answer to the north was the shot which struck Sumter. "At last," as Mr. Garrison had said, "the covenant with death is annulled and the 'agreement with hell' broken." "The south," wrote Mr. Thompson, "has reversed your motto, and has hoisted the banner of 'No union with non-slave holders!' Thank God for it!"

This sagacious observer had seen that the election of Lincoln had placed the anti-slavery cause in "a new, a critical and a trying position." "You have now," said he, "to make genuine converts of those who have as yet been baptized only into the faith of non-extension, and whose zeal is in that direction mere *white man-ism*." To this work the abolitionists addressed themselves, often discouraged by the temporizing attitude of the republicans; trying to strengthen the president's hands for emancipation; pointing out the folly of his plans for compensation and colonization, his bids for the border states; yet speaking and writing hopefully of the ultimate outcome.

To those who said, "What of your peace principles now?" Mr. Garrison replied, "The peace principles are as benignant and glorious as ever. . . . If they had been long since embraced and carried out by the people, neither slavery nor war would now be filling the land with vio-

lence and blood. . . . The war must go on to its consummation; and among the salutary lessons it will teach will be the impossibility of oppressing the poor and the needy, or consenting thereto by entering into 'a covenant with death' without desolating judgments following in its train." And in harmony with these sentiments, he spoke at an anti-slavery picnic: "Oh, Mr. President, how it delights my heart when I think that the worst thing we propose to do to the south is the very best thing that God or man can do! . . . Yes, we will make it possible for them to be a happy and prosperous people, as they never have been, and never can be, with slavery. We will make it possible for them to have free schools, and free presses, and free institutions, as we do at the north. We will make it possible for the south to be 'as the garden of God' under the plastic touch of liberty, and for the nation to attain unparalleled glory, greatness and renown."

Abolitionists were now "respectable;" Mr. Garrison was gladly listened to and his strongest words applauded. He was even invited to lecture before a college society! Yet the anti-slavery sentiment of the country was not strong enough in the opinion of President Lincoln to warrant the issue of the emancipation proclamation till January 1, 1863. Special preparations were made in Boston to celebrate it. "The impressive watch meetings held in the colored churches on New Year's eve were followed by meetings in Tremont Temple, extending through the day and evening, and a grand jubilee concert in Music Hall was announced for the afternoon. . . . The day wore on without tidings of its issue. . . . The painful uncertainty about the president's action marred the otherwise perfect enjoyment of the great audience until a gentleman announced from the floor that the proclamation had been issued and was coming over the wires. The storm of applause which followed and relieved the pent up feelings of the listeners, culminated in nine rousing cheers for Abraham Lincoln, followed by three more for Mr. Garrison, who occupied a seat in the gallery, and the concert then proceeded to its triumphant finish."

"Surpassing even this scene was that at the evening meeting at Tremont Temple, to which a copy of the proclamation was brought just prior to adjournment and read with startling effect. . . . amid a wild burst of cheering Frederick Douglass stepped forward and led the multitude in singing, 'Blow ye the trumpet, blow!' with the chorus, never more fitting than then, 'The year of jubilee has come!'"

Gradually the border states emancipated their slaves, and on the last day of January, 1865, the thirteenth amendment to the constitution forever abolishing slavery in the United States passed the house of representatives, as it had before passed the senate. In April came the fall of Richmond. Mr. Garrison considered chattel slavery extinct, and the ratification of the thirteenth amendment by the states merely a matter of form. He therefore resigned the presidency of, and his membership in, the American anti-slavery society at the annual meeting in May, and thenceforth showed his interest in the negro race by supporting the manifold movements in their behalf springing up in all parts of the north. The *Liberator* ended with the year.

Here we must reluctantly separate our readers from Mr. Garrison. His great life-work done, recognized at last as a true prophet by his converted countrymen, honored by a regenerated government, resting under a constitution no longer "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," proud of a flag washed clean of the blood of enslaved millions, his latter days were full of interesting incident and illumined to the end by the clear light of his beautiful spirit. He died May 24, 1879.

His children speak of his "fortunate" career, a fitting term to apply to that of

of a man whose every word and deed through a long life proved the truth of his claim:

My country is the world;
My countrymen are all mankind.

SARAH MIFFLIN GAY.

STEEL RAILS NEED NO PROTECTION.

A number of manufacturers of steel rails have appeared before congress, and a number of others have been interviewed in reference to the proposed reduction of the tariff on steel rails from \$17 to \$10 a ton. They state that such an arrangement would be fatal to the steel industries of the United States. It seems to me this is as good an illustration as we will ever get of the determination of those enjoying the opportunities afforded by the tariff to enrich themselves at the public expense, to hold on to all they have as a matter of principle without reference to the need of the duty demanded. The United States is to-day a larger manufacturer of rails than any other country. In ordinary times the capacity for production is equal to the demand. The only countries in Europe which can be classed as exporting countries are England and Belgium, all the rest of Europe importing more steel rails than it exports. The condition of manufacturing in England and Belgium, therefore, only needs to be considered with reference to the possible effect of any reduction in the tariff rate. In all of the discussions by the steel men they attempt to put the daily wage as the only determining element in the cost of production.

The elements that are necessary to determine the comparative ability of two countries to compete are the cost of materials, the cost of labor per ton of product, interest and business management.

The materials are ore, fuel and spiegeleisen. The only ores that can be used by the Bessemer process are those low in phosphorus. Of these ores England has a very limited supply, and last year she imported about four million tons. There is not a sufficient supply in the kingdom for the demands of her steel works. She must, therefore, find her ores in other countries, and these are available to her in constantly diminishing quantities, and at rapidly increasing prices. Her largest source of supply has heretofore been Spain. The mines from which she has drawn are becoming more and more exhausted, and each year she is compelled to go further for her ores, and to pay higher prices. Our system of taxing iron ore has been the only assistance she has had in keeping these prices down by taking us out of the market as possible purchasers. The only fuel with which these ores can be smelted is coke, as England has neither charcoal nor anthracite coal. But only a limited portion of England's coal supply is available for coking. Coal suitable for making coke for smelting iron must contain no sulphur and must have a small amount of ash. The conditions for making furnace coke are found only in what is known as the Durham district. This supply has been drawn upon ever since England began smelting iron with coke, and in spite of the low wages paid, the cost of producing a ton of coke had risen in 1880 (as given in the history of England's iron manufactures in the United States census) to \$3.50 per ton. It has now risen to \$6 per ton. The better seams of coal have been exhausted, and to-day it is mined from seams not more than two feet in thickness, in which the miners work lying on their backs at a temperature that is scarcely endurable, and at such a disadvantage as to cause a very high cost of production. It is due to these conditions that we find pig iron in England as high to-day as in the United States. This is not a temporary condition, but, being due to the failure of the supply of material, it is a condition which will be aggravated and not ameliorated. In the United States, on the other hand, the supplies of ores suitable for making Bessemer steel are practically inexhaustible. The principal obstacle heretofore has been the very high cost of trans-

portation. By building special barges and powerful steamers this has been greatly reduced within the last few years. For fuel we have the best of coking coal in practically inexhaustible supply throughout the entire Allegheny range, and we have the anthracite coal of the east, and the block coal of Indiana, which can be used without coking. The cost of coke in the United States is from \$1.25 to \$1.75 per ton.

The importance of fuel cost has been overlooked, but when it is remembered that it takes a ton and a sixth of coke to make a ton of iron, and that we have an advantage of nearly \$6 per ton, the hopelessness of English competition is plain.

In rolling the rail from the ingot our natural gas is not only much cheaper than coal, but it saves a large amount of labor in the case of firing and removing the ashes. While the cost of labor per day in the United States is higher than in England, it was the testimony of those who examined into the question at the time of taking our census that the labor cost of a ton of rails was no greater in the United States than in England. One of the largest iron masters in England is quoted as saying that with our better business management and more intelligent labor we are beating the Englishmen and turning out double the production in rails for the same sized plant.

Ten years ago the difference in rates of interest gave Englishmen a very great advantage. This margin is rapidly disappearing, as money can be had in New York city practically as cheap as in London. The price of steel rails in England to-day is as high as it is in the United States. Should the tariff be entirely removed, only during times of excessive demand would any rails be shipped from England to this country, and then only for use near the coast. The cost of transportation is ample protection for Chicago iron against Pittsburg. No Englishman can to-day lay down a rail at Chicago in competition with the Chicago steel works. Since England's supply of materials is limited, and her production cannot be largely increased except at a vastly increased expense, should she attempt to enter our markets to the extent of supplying ten per cent of our demands, it would cause the price to rise in England far beyond the price at which rails could be profitably made in this country. The only purpose steel men have in attempting the retention of the present duty of \$17, or even of the rate of \$10, which it is proposed to put into the new bill, is to enable them to increase the price up to the full cost of importation, with duty added in case the country should see a revival of railroad building such as we had in 1880. It is not a question with them as to whether they shall maintain a business which will give them a ten or twenty per cent profit, but whether they shall give up a law which will enable them to make a profit of one hundred per cent whenever the demand becomes sufficient for them to unite and demand the last dollar that the law will permit. Nothing better shows the folly of hoping to get for the country at large the benefit which is supposed to be derived from nourishing an infant industry. The infant has grown to manhood, but never yet have we heard it voluntarily offer to yield to those who have supported and nourished it the first concession.

LINDLEY VINTON.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Columbus, Ohio.—Suppose the single tax unlimited has come into effect in the United States. Land has been assessed for taxation upon its selling value. The owners of vacant land who have been holding it upon speculation and with no intention of using it, knowing that the tax will be increased as each increase in value appears, and that for their purposes it is absolutely valueless and certain to remain so, decide that they will not pay the tax. The owners of adjacent improved property seeing that considerable land will thus be thrown upon the market and that the inevitable consequence must be a great decline in the value upon which the assessment was based, conclude that they also will refuse to pay the tax as assessed. They attend the tax sale and buy their property in, if it sells as low as they think it should, and clearly they will buy it in at far less than the value upon which the assessment

was based. In short, the land of the United States is to be sold for taxes, that a fair valuation upon which to assess may be reached. The owners of vacant land who have no intention of using it do not bid of course, the single tax preventing them from realizing any future profit, and those who do bid buy no more than they can at present use. There being vacant land all over the country, even to valuable city building lots, mines, and spots of natural fertility, I shall not attempt to say what prices are realized. There would certainly be offered at such a sale an absolute infinity of land so far as use by the present population of the United States is concerned. However, we will assume the sale progresses until it is concluded, not through lack of land offered but through lack of bidders. The men who have means take what they want. There are left vast areas of good land which poor men desire to use, but as their desire signifies nothing to the various sheriffs, sales close. The owners of vacant land or improved land from which no tax can be raised are left in legal possession with no taxes to pay.

In "Progress and Poverty" it is said: "In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. No owner of land need be dispossessed, and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold. For rent, being taken by the state in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership." Will you please point out to me how, in a community where all the land is owned, though relatively little is used, the single tax will give men who have only the power to labor access to land as a matter of right? How will the single tax free land?

H. L. McCLEES.

In some colleges it is, or used to be, the custom to apportion rooms among students by competition, the student who would pay most into a class fund being entitled to first choice of rooms for the current year, the student who would pay the next highest sum being entitled to second choice, and so on. Now, let us suppose a college building in which there are a great many more rooms than there are students. If one room be just as desirable as another, no room will command a premium; but if some rooms are more desirably situated than others, there will be a competition for them which will give them a value. And if the desirableness of these rooms varies, the premiums will vary. The students will bid for choice until the most desirable rooms, of which there are enough for all, are reached; then bidding will stop, unless some student wants all of these rooms, or unless he wants so many that when he is supplied there will not be enough of such rooms left for the other students. If that be the case the bidding will go on and all the rooms will command a premium except those of which there are still a greater supply than there are students to take them. No student would be left in possession of rooms or suite of rooms with no premium to pay, unless there were unappropriated rooms equally desirable.

Precisely so it is in the world. There are more locations for living and working than there are people to occupy them, and these places vary in desirableness, partly from natural and partly from social causes. Under a system of common ownership, he who paid the highest premium would take the most desirable place. When of the remaining land there was enough for all, bidding would stop and no land but such as was better than that would have value. If any one took more than he needed for use he would produce a tendency which, if intensified by the same conduct on the part of others, would result in the extension of demand to land of lower desirableness; and if this tendency were perpetuated the demand might extend to and include the very poorest land, in which event no one could get any land without paying a premium for it. When land is bought once for all and taxes on it are low, demand does extend very nearly to this point; because, since it is obvious that normal demand will increase with growth of population, and therefore that land for which there is now no demand and no real value will be in demand and have a real value, land is appropriated to be held for a rise. But when the value of land is paid into the public treasury at frequent intervals, demand cannot reach this point. It will, in such case, never go much if any beyond the point of demand for actual and immediate use.

In a community where the single tax prevailed, all the land would not be owned if relatively little was used. It would not pay to own land without using it, for land which was not in demand for use would not be in demand at all. If any one chose to appropriate any of it because it was free, that would make no difference so long as any land equally desirable was not appropriated; but just as soon as demand extended to less desirable land, as it would when all above was appropriated, the more desirable land, whether in use or not, would have value, and be subject to the single tax. The fact that this would be so would discourage the tak-

ing up of any land by anybody except for use. People are not inclined to take the trouble to appropriate things that promise no profit, and still less inclined to hold fast to them when to do so is to incur positive loss. The single tax will free the best unused land by imposing on any one who attempts to keep it out of use a penalty commensurate with the injury he would do. It would not make all land free to the occupant, for land better than the poorest in use would be taxed in proportion to its superiority. But it is not desirable to make all land free to the occupant; that would give to the occupants of better lands greater returns for the same labor than the occupants of poorer lands would get, and out of that condition landlordism in its worst forms would grow. To make all land free to the occupant is to give to some members of the community the very advantages that breed poverty in the midst of wealth.

Your notions of the practical operations of the single tax are very much confused. The tax would fall on the market value of land as it does now, the only difference being that it would be a much higher tax and that houses and all other products would be free. If an occupant refused to pay the tax he would be proceeded against as delinquent tax payers are proceeded against now; that is, his property, not merely his land, would be sold to pay the debt he owed to the community. If he thought the tax too high, he would make his appeal to the assessors, who would be compelled to reduce it if it was higher than the tax on other land equally valuable. If the land was too valuable for any use to which he could put it—as for example, if it was in demand for city lots and he was a farmer—he would abandon it for land less valuable, though for his purpose not less useful. If he was not using the land at all, but only holding it for a rise, he would see that the continuous high tax would make all hope of profit futile, and he would abandon it altogether rather than pay the taxes.

In consequence of the abandonment of large areas of unused land, the owners of improved property would, as you seem to see, find it more profitable to take up the abandoned lands for use than to pay the high tax for the land they already occupied, and this would bring down the value of the occupied land. It is only another way of stating the well understood fact that the single tax would tend to lower the value of all land. The value of all land is regulated by the value of the poorest in use, and if the single tax destroyed the value of the poorest in use, as it would, the value of better land would decline. But there would not necessarily be any moving from improved land to vacant abandoned land; the fact that such removals could be made and would be profitable would tend to press values downward just as certainly as if the removals actually took place.

There would be no such thing as tax sales to ascertain values. Values would be determined by appraisements based upon actual dealings in land, and tax sales would be for no other purpose than to collect taxes that had been duly imposed and not paid. Nor would tax sales be confined to sales of the land; they would cover any kind of property which the person taxed might own. It is not proposed that the single tax shall be paid by land. No tax is paid by land. It must be paid by products of labor. The land a man owned would determine the amount of his tax according to its value, but the tax would be paid in labor products.

It is true, as you say, that under the single tax an infinity of land, practically, would be open to use free of taxes; but it is not true that this land would be equally desirable. Some of it would be very desirable, and as there would be less of that kind than was wanted for use, it would be very valuable. Whoever got that land would have to pay into the public treasury what it was worth. But whoever got any of that of which there was more than there was any demand for would have no tax to pay. And stupidity itself could not imagine anything more absurd than that mere laborers could not, as a matter of right, get access to land of which there was more than there was any demand for.

When sales of land stop, "not through lack of land offered, but through the lack of bidders," value stops; and when value stops, land becomes as free as the waters of the ocean. The owners of such land would be in legal possession, and they would have no taxes to pay. But the reason they would have no taxes to pay would be because the land had no value, and the reason the land had no value would be because there was plenty of other land equally desirable—that is, equally useful and equally accessible—which nobody owned and which any-

body could appropriate. As soon as such land had all been appropriated, and users were forced upon poorer land, the former land would have a value and would yield a tax according to its value. The single tax would always offer free land to the mere laborer and it would be the best land that was out of use. But not that alone; it would offer to the mere laborer the very best land of which he was competent as a mere laborer to make appropriate use, for the tax he would have to pay for such land would be paid out of the product which such land would yield him in excess of the product of equal labor applied to free land. A farmer could not use a few square feet in Wall street to the advantage that it could be used by a banker; but the opportunities of the farmer and the banker would be equalized, and each would get the same net returns for the same labor, if the banker were compelled to pay in taxes the difference between the value of his working place and the value of the farmer's working place.

The Hon. Chauncey F. Black, president of the democratic society of Pennsylvania and of the national league of democratic clubs, has issued a circular calling on all such bodies to celebrate on April 13 the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. The circular stoutly assails the general policy of the republican party, which Mr. Black rightfully regards as the direct descendant of the old federalist party, and specifies in particular the tariff measures of the present administration as iniquitous and undemocratic.

The state circuit court at St. Louis has declared unconstitutional the anti-trust law of Missouri. The case will be carried to a higher court.

A Kansas City hotel clerk, who had signed the petition of the enrolment committee, received shortly after a copy of THE STANDARD, which he threw into the waste basket without reading. The contents of that basket always go to the furnace room, where it is used for fuel; but in this case THE STANDARD was saved from the flames by the engineer, who fished it out, read it, and became interested. He then sent it to a friend of his to read. Result: The engineer is now a single tax man and his friend is very near one. Moral: Lightning strikes in all sorts of places.

PERSONAL.

George W. Bell of Montesano, Washington has published an open letter, in tract form, addressed to the legislature of that state, asking them to keep possession of the "tide lands," until such time as the people will need them, and then to lease them at a rent based on their value, to whoso may want to use them.

H. L. Shannon of Medicine Lodge, Kan., noticing that the editor of the Wichita Eagle is interested in the labor problem, calls his attention to "the single tax ideas of Henry George," and hopes he will study them.

Judge C. F. Perry of Quincy, Ill., has an article in a late number of the Journal of the Knights of Labor, in which he points out the difference between single tax men limited and unlimited. He believes with Thomas G. Shearman that the only just system of taxation is a single tax on land values, exclusive of improvements.

J. T. O'Neill of Brooklyn has a letter in the Brooklyn Eagle condemning the attempts continually made by unscrupulous Irishmen to keep up the revengeful feeling so long entertained against England. Mr. O'Neill calls on all Irishmen who love Ireland for herself, and not for her influence in American politics, to imitate the example of Michael Davitt, who, in a recent speech, said: "Another great object of the confederation is to promote solidarity and united action between the industrial masses of Great Britain and Ireland, and this because the common enemy of Englishmen and Irishmen is the same—landlordism."

The South Water street commission merchants of Chicago are in rebellion against the rents they have to pay. Their complaint is put briefly thus: "The landlord takes all the profits." James Malcolm, writing to the Chicago Herald on the matter, says these merchants do not appear to understand the full force of the declaration they have made, and then points out that their remedy lies in the single tax.

"F. D. B.," in a letter to the California Christian Advocate, says: "The Pandora box opened by the single tax advocate would turn loose upon us evils worse than the wicked municipal bosses we now have." Joseph Leggett, a well known citizen of San Francisco, answers the gentleman by saying, practically, that "F. D. B." knows nothing about the single tax or he would not talk so.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

PROFESSOR HUXLEY AGAIN.

"Capital—the Mother of Labor" is the title of an article by Professor Huxley in the Nineteenth Century for March. It is an attack upon the foundation principles set forth in "Progress and Poverty." Professor Huxley begins by showing that the first act of the new-born child is to fill its lungs with air. This, he declares, is an act of labor which the child could not have performed but for the vital capital obtained from the mother and stored up in the infant's body. Here, as elsewhere, capital exists before labor is performed, and is necessary to labor. The inherited capital of vital energy may be called "work stuff." The mother made good the expenditure by drawing on the capital of food stuffs which furnished her daily maintenance. Thus the primary act of outward labor in the series which necessarily accompanies the life of man is dependent upon the pre-existence of a stock of material which is not only of use to him, but which is disposed in such a manner as to be utilizable with facility. The child is enabled to continue breathing by nourishment drawn directly from the mother's vital capital, and indirectly from the store in natural bodies accessible to her. The child pays for this capital by the labor of sucking, but as the value of work stuff obtained in the milk is far greater than the value of that labor, the operation involves a large profit to the child. Thus the child goes on living by consuming the vital capital of others and his labor is unproductive, says Mr. Huxley, apologizing, however, for the word "unproductive."

Next the professor supposes the child came to man's estate a wandering savage. The savage gathers the natural fruits of the earth to maintain his vital functions and contributes nothing to the production of these fruits. Indeed much of his labor goes to mere destruction. It would be improper to call hunting roots, fruits or eggs production.

Then Professor Huxley considers the purely pastoral man of Asiatic plains. He lives upon the milk, cheese and flesh of his sheep. If he have access to extensive pastures and is untroubled by beasts of prey or rival shepherds, his pastoral functions will demand hardly more labor than is needful to furnish exercise conducive to bodily health. The shepherd is a producer in a very limited sense. A ram and some ewes, left to themselves, would in a few years generate a large flock, and as far as the shepherd is concerned their increase under his care is largely unearned. If owners have no claim upon "betterments" brought about independently of their own labor, the shepherd would have no claim to at least nine-tenths of the increase of the flocks. Then who has such claim? Not the sheep, for they merely collect and distribute the material that goes to produce their growth. Ultimately we get back to the grass. Now, herbs and all other green plants stand alone among terrestrial bodies from the fact that under the influence of light they can build up out of minerals the substances which in the animal organism are used as work stuff. Plants are thus the sole producers of the vital capital which is the antecedent of every act of labor. Without plants the protein compounds, by which alone animal life can be permanently supported, can not be produced. The plant lends the capital that enables us to carry on the business of life.

Professor Huxley here declares: "The statement that land, in the sense of cultivable soil, is a producer, or even one of the essentials of economic production, is anything but accurate. The process of water culture, in which a plant is not 'planted' in any soil, but is merely supported in water containing in solution the mineral ingredients essential to that plant, is now thoroughly understood; and if it were worth while, a crop yielding abundant food stuffs could be raised on an acre of fresh water, no less than on an acre of dry land. In the arctic regions, again, land has nothing to do with 'production' in the social economy of the Esquimaux who lives on seals and other marine animals." The real producers are the minute green plants which float in the arctic ocean.

Thus, when we find set forth as an "absolute" truth the statement that the essential factors in economic production are land, capital and labor—when this is offered as an axiom whence all sorts of other important truths may be deduced—it is needful to remember that the assertion is true only with a qualification. Undoubtedly "vital capital" is essential; for, as we have seen, no human work can be done unless it exists, not even that internal work of the body which is necessary to passive life. But, with respect to labor (that is, human labor) I hope to have left no doubt on the reader's mind that, in regard to production, the importance of human labor may be so small as to be almost a vanishing quantity. Moreover, it is certain that there is no approximation to a 100 to 1 ratio between the expenditure of labor and the production of

that vital capital which is the foundation of all wealth. For, suppose that we introduce into our supposititious pastoral paradise beasts of prey and rival shepherds, the amount of labor thrown upon the sheep owner may increase almost indefinitely, and its importance as a condition of production may be enormously augmented, while the quantity of produce remains stationary. Compare for a moment the unimportance of the shepherd's labor, under the circumstances first defined, with its indispensability in countries in which the water for the sheep has to be drawn from deep wells, or in which the flock has to be defended from wolves or from human depredators. As to land, it has been shown that, except as affording mere room and standing ground, the importance of land, great as it may be, is secondary. The one thing needful for economic production is the green plant, as the sole producer of vital capital from natural inorganic bodies. Men might exist without labor (in the ordinary sense) and without land; without plants, they must inevitably perish.

The purely agricultural man must live on the remains of last year's crop while cultivating that of this year. That is, labor must borrow of pre-existent vital capital. The existence of man or any body of men depends on the production of food stuffs, directly or indirectly, by plants. The number of men that can exist a year upon a given area depends on the quantity of food stuffs produced by such area in that time. The most important elements in this production—sunshine, range of daily and nightly temperature, wind—are out of man's reach. Often, though not always qualities of soil, supply of water and the like may be affected by man's labor, and such labor may without harm be called production, if the term be not confounded with the production of food stuffs by a plant.

If the shepherd or farmer needs the help of other men he can pay for it in the products of flock or farm. The hired person can accept nothing less in wages than will make up to him the vital capital expended in the work which he gives in exchange. These wages are paid out of the capital disposable after the wants of the owner of flock or crop have been satisfied. There is a limit to the number of persons who can be maintained out of these resources. "Since no amount of labor can produce an ounce of food stuff beyond the maximum producible by a limited number of plants, under the most favorable circumstances, in regard to those conditions which are not affected by labor, it follows that, if the number of men to be fed increases indefinitely, a time must come when some will have to starve. That is the essence of the so-called Malthusian doctrine; and it is a truth which, to my mind, is as plain as the general proposition that a quantity which constantly increases will, some time or other, exceed any greater quantity the amount of which is fixed."

Professor Huxley next turns his attention to a community where pastoral life, agriculture and manufactures go on. He supposes three islands—one occupied by shepherds, one by farmers, and a third, utterly barren, by mechanics. The people of the last island could not exist for any length of time unless they came there provided with a stock of food which should be constantly replenished. But their only method of obtaining renewals of the food supply must be the exchange of their manufactured products for the food stuffs of the other two islands. But the manufacturers of the barren island must first obtain material to work on, and all the labor of the barren islanders will be vain unless the inhabitants of the other island want their manufactured articles. If nobody will exchange anything for the manufactured articles the labor of the mechanics is unproductive. The mechanic is dependent upon pre-existent capital up to the time his product is completed, and even later, until somebody wants the product.

Let us suppose that a, the timber, and b, the grain and meat and needful for the man's sustenance until he can finish a chest of drawers, have to be paid for by that chest. Then the capital with which he starts is represented by a plus b. He could not start at all unless he had it; day by day, he must destroy more or less of the substance and of the general adaptability of a in order to work it up into the special forms needed to constitute the chest of drawers; and, day by day, he must use up at least so much of b as will replace his loss of vital capital by the work of that day. Suppose it takes the carpenter and his workmen ten days to saw up the timber, plane the boards, and to give them shape and size proper for the various parts of the chest of drawers. And suppose that he then offers his heap of boards to the advance of a plus b as an equivalent for the wood plus ten days' supply of vital capital. The latter will surely say: "No. I did not ask for a heap of boards. I asked for a chest of drawers. Up to this time, so far as I am concerned, you have done nothing and are as much in my debt as ever." And if the carpenter maintained that he had "virtually" created two-thirds of a chest of drawers, inasmuch as it would take only five days more to put together the pieces of wood, and that the heap of boards ought to be accepted as the equivalent of two-thirds of his debt, I am afraid the creditor would regard him as little better than an impudent swindler. * * *

Again, the payment of goods in a lump, for the chest of drawers, comes to the same thing as the payment of daily wages for the fifteen days that the carpenter was occupied in making it. If, at the end of each day, the carpenter chose to say to himself, "I have 'virtually' created, by my day's labor, a fifth of what I shall get for the chest of drawers—therefore my wages are the produce of my day's labor"—there is no great harm in such metaphorical speech, so long as the poor man does not delude himself into the supposition that it represents the exact truth. "Virtually" is apt to cover more intellectual sins than "charity" does moral delicts. After what has been said, it surely must be plain enough that each day's work has involved the consumption of the carpenter's vital capital, and the fashioning of his timber, at the expense of more or less consumption of these forms of capital. Whether the a plus b to be exchanged for the chest has been advanced as a loan, or is paid daily or weekly as wages, or, at some later time, as the price of a finished commodity—the essential element of the transaction, and the only essential element, is, that it must, at least, effect the replacement of the vital capital consumed. Neither boards nor chest of drawers are eatable; and, so far from the carpenter having produced the essential part of his wages by each day's labor, he has merely wasted that labor, unless somebody who happens to want a chest of drawers offers to exchange vital capital, or something that can procure it, equivalent to the amount consumed during the process of manufacture.

Professor Huxley then ridicules the argument in "Progress and Poverty" directed toward proving that wages are the earnings of labor, not the advances of capital. He assails Mr. George's definition of wealth as "natural substances or products which have been adapted by human labor to human use or gratification, their value depending upon the amount of labor which, upon the average, would be required to produce things of like kind." Professor Huxley thinks a seam of coal cropping out on the surface is wealth, while still undisturbed in the mass, quite as much as is a fragment broken off or picked up by some one who wishes to use it for making a fire. The notion that the amount of labor involved in the production of an article determines its value he thinks absurd. An Esquimaux would not give a slice of blubber for the most elaborate ice machine.

Mr. George's definition of capital as that part of wealth which is devoted to the aid of production, or wealth in course of exchange, does not satisfy Professor Huxley, and he says some unpleasant things by way of ridicule. He thinks that it is absurd to suppose that while the part of the farmer's crop held for seed or to feed his help is capital, that kept for the care of his family is not. "Whether the man keeps the surplus grain for sowing more land, and the surplus cattle for occupying more pasture; whether he exchanges them for other commodities, such as the use of the land (as rent), or labor (as wages); or whether he feeds himself and his family, in no way alters their nature as revenue, or affects the fact that this revenue is merely disposable capital."

Professor Huxley affirms that there is no fundamental distinction between land and capital.

Is it denied that a fertile field, a rich vein of ore, or a falling stream, may form part of a man's stock, and that, if they do, they are capable of yielding revenue? Will not somebody pay a share of the produce in kind, or in money, for the privilege of cultivating the first; royalties for that of working the second; and a like equivalent for that of erecting a mill on the third? In what sense, then, are these things less "capital" than the buildings and tools which on page 27 of "Progress and Poverty" are admitted to be capital? Is it not plain that if these things confer "advantages equivalent to the possession of capital," and if the "advantage" of capital is nothing but the yielding of revenue, then the denial that they are capital is merely a roundabout way of self-contradiction?

He insisted that Mr. George's laborer gathering birds' eggs for food is dependent upon existing capital, the vital force stored in the eggs; that Mr. George's shoemaker working up leather into shoes must depend upon the pre-existent capital consumed in tanning and preparing the leather. Adam Smith's admission that the produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense of or wages of labor, and that before the seizure of natural opportunities the whole product went to labor, Professor Huxley dismisses as the result of Smith's thralldom to the physiocrats.

Professor Huxley quotes with disapproval from "Progress and Poverty" a passage designed to show that political economists who argue for the wage fund theory use "capital" in two senses, once as including only food, clothing, etc., and again as including only wealth employed in the production of more wealth—"wealth in the hands of employers as distinguished from laborers." The professor insists that the money carried home in the pockets of the laborer is as much capital as when it lay in the coffers of his employer. If the laborer puts a shilling a week in a savings bank the difference be-

tween him and the most bloated of bankers is only one of degree.

The idea that the laborer creates from day to day more than his wages, and thus does not even temporarily lessen capital, is very repugnant to Professor Huxley. He insists that the uncompleted article is usually not worth the wages that have been paid for it; that an uncaulked ship is little better than worthless; that if the central kilometer of the St. Gothard tunnel had been impenetrable rock the work would have been valueless. The professor closes thus:

I think it may be not too much to say that, of all the political delusions which are current in this queer world, the very stupidest are those which assume that labor and capital are necessarily antagonistic; that all capital is produced by labor and therefore, by natural right, is the property of the laborer; that the possessor of capital is a robber who preys on the workman and appropriates to himself that which he has had no share in producing.

On the contrary, capital and labor are, necessarily, close allies; capital is never a product of human labor alone; it exists apart from human labor; it is the necessary antecedent of labor, and it furnishes the materials on which labor is employed. The only indispensable form of capital—vital capital—cannot be produced by human labor. All that man can do is to favor its formation by the real producers. There is no intrinsic relation between the amount of labor bestowed on an article and its value in exchange. The claim of labor to the total result of operations which are rendered possible only by capital is simply an *a priori* iniquity.

PROPERTY IN LAND.

"Property in Land" is the title of an article by Sir George Campbell, K. C. S. I., M. P., in the February issue of the Westminster Review. Sir George opens with the assertion that there is no difficulty in making out that for the utilization of the earth some kind of private property in the soil is indispensable. Some things in the succeeding pages of his essay lead us to suppose that he means here possession rather than property. Indeed, he says, only a sentence or two further on, that the presence of improvements upon land seems to necessitate the recognition of a "possessory" right. He affirms that what is called in question is not such possessory right, but the right to the unearned increment. The expenses of the community were met in early times by a rate on the land privately held, in proportion to its extent and value. The present land titles of England is the feudal title of the conquerors, not the old Saxon allodial title. Nationalizers and reformers do not seek to take away land and improvements, but only to tax the unearned increment. The only questions are how much special tax should be put on the unearned rent and what is to be the rate of compensation when, in particular cases, the land is taken for public purposes. According to the "law of the lawyers," the public has no right in commons and open spaces; only the feudal lords and the commoners have. Most of the commons have been stolen. Sir George thinks that when the public has had the use, or any use, of land from time immemorial, it should not be deprived of such use except for overruling public purposes.

He denounces the injustice of the law of fixtures by which improvements made by a tenant become the landlord's property. He thinks the fraud by which the burdens on feudal lands was shaken off is not so old that the burdens might not be reimposed without injustice. The present land taxes represent what is left of those burdens. But it is an absurdly inadequate tax on the unearned rent. Under the pretext of localizing imperial revenue rates are very much relieved with some popular applause. The result is that ordinarily the tax payer pays three halfpence in taxes for every penny taken off his rates while the land owner is very specially relieved. The separation of the tax on unearned rent from other taxes must be made, or in the end "the unearned rent will either escape all special taxation or will be confiscated."

This would be Sir George's treatment of agricultural land. He thinks the government would hardly go beyond commutation of modern burdens. But in the case of urban land there must be special treatment. The enormous value of such land depends upon the growth and enterprise of the local community and upon the greed of the land speculator. He would levy on urban land not only the national tax such as is laid on other lands, but a municipal tax on ground rents, and where for purposes of monopoly land is held out of use, he would tax it on its value add not on its present "rent or no rent." He declares, that this is done in America, though it is certainly not a general policy in this country. Improvements to lands in the municipal area he would assess upon the owner, not the occupier. Some levy on urban ground value is a growing demand that must be satisfied in some shape. He would

not pay monopoly rates to land holders whose land is taken for public purposes.

Sir George seems to think that some form of municipal ownership of land will be necessary to the solution of the problem presented by the ill housed poor of great cities. No workman can have a garden at the present rental of suburban land. Even in country towns where good land close by rents for £1 and £2, land when required for residence is run up to £20, £30 or £40 an acre.

Sir George then talks of land tenure in Ireland. Here dual ownership exists, the landlord owning the unearned rent, the farmer holding possessory right and improvements. He reminds his readers that this is the normal condition of affairs in Europe and Asia. The unearned rent is the public fund appropriated by the state or by the assignee of the state, the feudal Jagbeerdar. That is a right to which no individual has any economic claim, and which an individual only holds by service grant from the state, or quit service, as in England, because he has long held it. Sir George deprecates seeking at vast expense to get rid of the dual ownership in Ireland and present the unearned rent to a new set of privileged land owners. It is advocated, he declares, not on grounds of justice, but with the hope of ridding the country of the agitation about rent. He doubts whether the forty-nine years' purchase will prove satisfactory, and suspects that at the end of the period public feeling will not be favorable to a privileged landholding class of modern creation. It is not the tenants but the organs of the landholders who press for land purchase. "Don't purchase," urges Sir George, "or if we do purchase, let us keep the unearned rent as the public fund for which God designed it, and don't let us give it away to people who are to pay not a farthing, but to get it for nothing forty-nine years hence." He thinks the dual ownership founded deep in the nature of things, and that the best way to settle the Irish land question is to pay down a comparatively small sum to compensate the landlords for giving a certain margin of privilege to the tenants, and so avoid future troubles. If one-fourth the estimated fair rent were struck off the farmer might pay the rest with ease in all seasons.

HE TOILS NOT, BUT TAKES ALL!

Memphis Appeal.

If one man hold, unimproved, an acre of ground in the heart of a city of 100,000, every block that the remaining 99,999 people strike upon an anvil, every brick they put into a new house in that community, every dollar they place in a new enterprise, every drop of sweat that falls from their brows in building up their individual fortunes, every newcomer who remains to increase the population, make that one man just that much richer. He need not exert himself a particle. When he hears the early morning whistles calling the laborers to their task he may rejoice, because he knows that those laborers, in working for themselves and their employers, are also working for him, though he pays no portion of their wages. He holds on to his unimproved property because it grows more and more valuable as human effort around him increases. He will not relinquish his holding. He will not sell his ground that others may improve it. Such a man, and such men, stand in the way of progress. It is in spite of them that cities grow and thrive.

But they will tell you that a man may do what he will with his own. A very good doctrine as a rule, but every man owes something to the community in which he lives. He may not maintain a nuisance on his premises. Why, then, should he maintain premises that are nuisances to the public eye, that would be improved and become beauty spots if transferred to other hands? Is it not for such a man to oppose his fellow citizens in a movement to enhance the welfare of the community unless he have better argument to offer than his mere indisposition to contribute to the general welfare. Memphis has suffered too long from those who are content with the rise in value of the portion of God's bare green earth they own. It is they who have put the workingman at a distance from his work, because there is so much unimproved land about that rents have become a cruel burden to the poor. It is they who have forced thousands into suburban life, when there is room for thousands within the city's present limits. We have therefore the extraordinary spectacle of the refusal of these men to permit the suburban population to be counted in the census, though it is due to them that the suburban population exists. They have forced thousands to live outside the city, yet they hold with vise-like grasp their own suburban possessions. They object to extension because their taxes may be slightly increased, though they must be conscious that if the census report show Memphis stagnant, the value of their property will be decreased. The part they are acting is not the part of good citizenship.

THE SON OF HIS FATHER.

Once a Week.

William Lloyd Garrison is tall, and slim, and gray, and bald. He has amassed a considerable competence out of wool and is of a decidedly literary turn of mind. He has one of those weakly voices so often associated with extreme respectability, which mars the effect of his public speeches, but he has plunged headlong into the free trade movement, and he is the son of his father.

THE FREE TRADE FIGHT.

TEACHING POLITICAL ECONOMY.

THE REFORM CLUB TO TEACH POLITICAL SPEAKERS HOW TO DISCUSS CURRENT QUESTIONS.

The Reform club's school for the study of the tariff question designed to arm its pupils with arguments for future campaigns, held its first session on Friday night last at Cooper union, when E. Ellery Anderson and William T. Crossdale explained the purposes of the school to the considerable class assembled. Eleven more meetings will be held at the same place. Here are the dates, speakers and subjects:

March 21, Sources of Correct Information, T. G. Sherman.
March 28, Wool and the Tariff, J. De Witt Warner.
April 4, Iron and Steel, Lindley Vinton.
April 11, Tin, Lead, Copper and Brass, E. Ellery Anderson.
April 18, Clothing and Carpets, James W. Osborne.
April 25, Raw Materials, E. P. Wheeler.
May 2, Shipping, John Codman, Gustav H. Schwab.
May 9, Tariff in its relation to Manufacture of Products, Read Gordon.
May 16, Tariff and Labor, Louis F. Post.
May 23, Tariff and the Farmer, Walter H. Page.
May 30, Protected and Unprotected Industries, W. T. Crossdale.

CAPTAIN CODMAN ACTIVE.

HE OPPOSES THE SHIPPING BOUNTY BILL AND SUGGESTS A SUBSTITUTE.

Captain John Codman has just returned from Washington, whither he went to oppose the pending bounty bill which looks to the payment of thirty cents per ton for every 1,000 miles sailed by American vessels engaged in the foreign trade. The friends of the bill declare that in ten years this measure will swell our foreign tonnage to 3,500,000 tons, half the tonnage of Great Britain's mercantile fleet. To this Captain Codman replies that estimating that the ships in question will average five miles an hour for nine months in the year, the bounties to vessels aggregating 3,500,000 tons, would amount to more than \$34,000,000 per year. Captain Codman says that Mr. Farquhar, chairman of the committee on merchant marine and fisheries, to which committee the bill has been referred, has declared that it is not a party measure. From this Captain Codman has hopes that the iniquitous bill will be treated on its merits and defeated.

Captain Codman has suggested as a substitute for the bounty bill a measure permitting United States citizens to buy abroad and sail under our flag vessels exceeding 3,000 tons burden; admitting free of duty all materials that enter into the construction of ships, and providing for moderate payment to vessels carrying our mails abroad. Captain Codman would pay to vessels of American construction for such service not more than the British government pays for like service.

Appropos of Captain Codman's attitude, it is interesting to note that the Boston executive business association, which includes various bodies of associated tradesmen, has voted in favor of free ships by a ballot of 32 to 6.

The report of the committee of the Pan-American conference on communication on the Atlantic, recommends that aid be given one or more lines of steam navigation between the ports of the United States and those of Brazil and Rio de la Plata under the following conditions:

The companies receiving government aid shall establish a fast bi-monthly service between the ports of the United States, Rio Janeiro, Montevideo and Buenos Ayres, and the vessels shall have the accommodations and capacity necessary for the transportation of freight and passengers, and shall carry the mails.

These steamships shall only touch at one port of the intermediary countries on the trips to and from Buenos Ayres, but during the quarantine season they shall only discharge mails and passengers and shall not embark anything subject to infection. In the countries of clearance and ultimate destination they may touch at two ports.

The speed of the fast steamships shall be at least sixteen knots per hour, and they shall be of not less than 5,000 tons, and a time schedule of arrivals and departure from the ports shall be established in conformity with the speed required.

The committee also recommends aiding an auxiliary line of freight steamships which shall sail twice a month, making not less than twelve knots an hour and touching at ports of the United States and Brazil. The United States of America and the republic of Brazil shall pay one-half each of the amounts paid to these vessels, taking into consideration the contract of the existing line with the latter government. The contracts shall last ten years.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

THE TRUTH INADVERTENTLY ADMITTED TO THE COLUMNS OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.

"The call for cheap sugar. Effects of an abolition of the tariff," is the heading placed by the New York Tribune over the following admirable free trade argument published in a recent issue of that paper:

To the Editor of the Tribune—Sir: With sugar on the free list in England, the average

consumption of 1889 was seventy pounds per capita. If the population of this country is 65,000,000, on the same basis we should have consumed 4,550,000,000 pounds. Our actual consumption was about 3,000,000,000 pounds. If sugar was as cheap here as in England, our consumption per capita would be greater than that of England. The per capita cost of sugar in England on the basis of a per capita consumption of seventy pounds was \$2.10, while the per capita cost here on the basis of a per capita consumption of fifty pounds was \$3.50. With free sugar, therefore, the per capita consumption could be increased to 116.23 pounds without increasing the per capita cost. Or, in other words, with free sugar it would not cost the consumers in this country a thing more if they consumed 116.23 pounds per head than it now costs them to consume fifty pounds per head. For the cost of 250 pounds of sugar here for a family of five persons, 583.13 pounds can be purchased in England; or, if sugar is placed on the free list here, a family of five persons can consume 250 pounds and then save \$10 for other necessities of life as compared with the average cost of sugar in 1889. My statements are all based upon wholesale prices in both countries.

If the per capita consumption was 100 pounds, the total consumption would be 6,500,000,000 pounds, an increase of 3,500,000,000 pounds, or 1,750,000 tons of freight for our railway and shipping interests. If in the distribution of our sugar supply the average haulage from the seaboard is 600 miles, at one cent per ton per mile it would add \$10,500,000 to the earnings of our railway system annually without any increase whatever in the price of sugar to the consumer. In addition to this sum, the increased freight for our ships, the storage, transshipment and handling and the cost of labor employed in the manufacture of barrels must be taken into consideration fully another 10,500,000. The entire cost of the labor in refining 6,500,000,000 pounds of sugar is less than \$10,000,000. The total value at seven cents per pound is \$455,000,000, and yet refining it will not give employment to more than 12,000 persons. There are not more than twenty-five independent sugar refining establishments in this country. The capital required to refine 6,500,000,000 pounds will not exceed \$35,000,000.

The profit in refining at one-eighth of a cent per pound on 6,500,000,000 pounds is \$8,125,000, or more than twenty-two and one-half per cent on the capital employed. Freight from Europe at \$2.50 per ton secures to the refiner here a clear profit of an eighth of a cent per pound over and above the cost of refining in England, France or Germany, plus the foreign refiner's profit, plus the cost of importing other than freight, plus the importer's profit. In England 4,000 persons are employed in sugar refineries; 70,000 are employed in manufacturing confectionery, jellies and preserved fruits. It is safe to say that for every person thrown out of employment by placing sugar on the free list, twenty will be added in the manufacture of confectionery and preserved fruits, etc. With sugar on the free list, more persons will be employed in the manufacture of confectionery and preserved fruits for the Mexican and South American trade alone than are now employed in all the refineries in this country. Beyond all doubt, not less than 100,000 men and women would find employment in refining and handling sugar and in kindred industries more than are now so employed, if sugar is placed on the free list. If the republican party destroys the sugar monopoly after the cowardly action of the last Democratic congress, it will do more to justify its claim to the support of the masses than can be done at the present time in any other way. Placing sugar on the free list, both raw and refined, will do more to popularize the republican party than the whole party of spellbinders can do from now until the close of the next presidential contest. It should be done in the interest of our industrial policy. It will be an indelible object lesson in every home in the land, not only to the father who provides, but to the mother and children, in favor of maintaining the continued supremacy of the republican party. The so-called democratic revenue reform press and party leaders cannot efface or destroy its effect. The policy of putting sugar on the free list is one which the democratic party, if be some mishap it is again intrusted with the control of legislation, dare not condemn or reverse.

If sugar is placed upon the free list it will compel the government of Canada to adopt the same policy. A refusal on the part of Sir John Macdonald to do it would severely strain British connection. It will therefore open the Canadian markets to the sugar refineries of the United States. Placing sugar on the free list will afford an opportunity to deal justly with those industries which need and deserve additional protection. It will strengthen, popularize and perpetuate our industrial policy. It will create an impenetrable wall against which so-called revenue reformers may bunt their brains without harming any one but themselves for years to come. It will inspire every republican in the land with renewed love for and devotion to his party, and with a determination to labor for its continued success. It will disarm our opponents and destroy their influence with the wage earner in a very marked degree. It should not be any half-way measure, but should include both raw and refined sugar. It is the refiners and not the producers of raw sugar who combine to rob the consumer. No valid objection can be offered to giving a bounty to the producer of raw sugar in this country, equal to the existing duty. No wise supporter of the policy of the republican party desires to embarrass by legislation the industrial development of the southern states. The removal of sugar duties is not in any sense a sectional policy. The actual cost of the duty upon the raw sugar required to produce 100 pounds of pure granulated sugar is \$2.20, but for every 100 pounds of refined sugar exported the refiner receives from the government a drawback or refund of \$4.60, or 50 cents per 100 pounds more than the duty paid on the raw material. The for-

eign consumers of our refined sugars, therefore, pay \$2.60 less per 100 pounds than the home consumers. Thirty cents per 100 pounds is a large profit in itself; on 3,000,000,000 pounds it would amount to \$9,000,000, or more than thirty-five per cent on the capital employed in refining it. On all sugar exported the refiners received the usual profit, in addition to the 30 cents per 100 pounds paid direct from the treasury of the United States. It is high time that our present sugar policy was abolished, root and branch, and this prime necessity of life secured to the consumers at the lowest possible cost.

Brooklyn. FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN.

SOME EDIFYING FIGURES.

Mr. Powderly in a recent letter from the anthracite region of Pennsylvania to the World gives some valuable figures as to wages. He says:

The miner is paid by the car, and from the proceeds he pays his laborer and all other expenses. In the Hampton mine the miner gets 87½ cents a car, and if he is allowed to work a full day loads seven cars. He pays the laborer \$2.10 a day. He is compelled to buy his powder from the company that employs him, and though he could get it for \$1.50 and \$2 a keg from retail dealers he must pay the company \$3 for every keg he consumes. He is docked so many cars a month, and having gone carefully over a number of miners' due bills I feel safe in saying that the docking will average one car for every sixteen that goes out. If the miner works a full day and sends out his seven cars of coal at 87½ cents a car he draws \$6.12½ a day.

When it is published that an anthracite coal miner receives so much money for one day's work it causes men in New York, as well as in Wisconsin, to believe that he ought not to grumble at short time now and then. But his expenses are never set forth, in fact I have never seen a reference to them in print; everything goes to show that he draws from \$5 to \$8 a day. Let us say that a full month consists of twenty-five days. The miner gets out seven cars a day, and at the end of the month his account will stand this way:

25 full days—175 cars	\$153 12
Out of which he pays:	
Laborer at the rate of \$2.10 a day . . .	52 50
Powder at \$3 a keg	36 00
Dockage for month	9 62
Smoking for month	65
Oil for lamp	2 00
Cotton for lampwick	20
Squibs to ignite powder	30
Waterproof paper	25
Snap for mining purposes	65
Wear and tear on tools for month . . .	75

Total expenses for month	\$102 32
Which deduct from	\$153 12

Leaves him as result of month's toil . . . \$50 80

From the foregoing statement it will be seen that with a full month's work the miner will have over and above his expenses but \$50.80. The Hampton is an ordinary mine, and is operated by the D., L. and W. company. The best mine, so miners tell me, owned by that company, is the Central. Both Hampton and Central shafts are in the limits of Scranton, on what is called the Hyde Park side of the city. In the Central the miner is paid at the rate of \$1.07½ per car, gets out six cars for a day's work when mining bottom coal and eight cars when mining top coal. Top coal is easiest to mine.

Computing the earnings of the miner at bottom coal prices it will leave him but from \$8 to \$10 more in the month than is paid in the other mine. Giving the miner his full month's wages at top coal prices, or at the rate of eight cars a day, and he will receive \$8.60 per day and a total of \$215 for the month. Out of this he pays:

For laborer	\$60 00
Powder	20 00
Dockage	9 00
Oil for lamp	2 00
Other expenses same as in other mines . .	2 25

Total	\$93 25
-----------------	---------

Leaving a balance for the miner of . . \$121 75

WHO GETS IT?

Boston Globe.

By a newly invented machine, now in operation in the new mill at Manchester, N. H., one girl is able to sew on 3,000 buttons in a day.—[Portland Argus.]

And yet we'll wager she doesn't get any higher pay for 3,000 buttons than she used to get for 300.

There's the whole labor problem in a nutshell. Civilization enormously multiplies the productive power of labor, but, somehow or other, the benefit of the increased production does not go to labor.

THE AMENDMENT IS ACCEPTED.

Rochester Times.

"What a ridiculous figure," says the Troy Telegram, "Leader" Sherman will cut when ballot reform is an accomplished fact." You mean what a ridiculous figure such "leaders" as he will not cut in the legislature when ballot reform is an accomplished fact.

THIS IS TRUE, SAD TO SAY.

Epoch.

Agent—I'd make you my janitor, only I must have a married man.

Applicant—Keep the place open for an hour and I'll fix that. It's easier to get married than to get a job.

NEXT NOVEMBER THEY WILL KNOW.
Boston Globe.

The democrats in the New York legislature stand alone among all democratic legislatures of the country in opposing ballot reform. We fear the New York democrats are making a large-sized mistake.

BALLOT REFORM.

THE ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF BALLOT REFORM.

First—All ballots shall be official and shall be printed and distributed at public expense.

Second—The names of all candidates for the same office shall be printed on the same ballot.

Third—All ballots shall be delivered to the voter within the polling place on election day by sworn public officials.

Fourth—Only official ballots so delivered shall be voted. The voter shall be guaranteed absolute privacy in preparing his ballot, and the secrecy of the ballot made compulsory.

Fifth—Voters shall have the right to nominate candidates by properly certified petitions.

NOW FOR THE GOVERNOR.

THE SAXTON BILL PASSES THE ASSEMBLY, AND WHEN THE SENATE CONCURS IN THE AMENDMENTS WILL GO TO GOV. HILL.

The Saxton bill was passed in the New York assembly on Thursday last by a vote of 72 to 51. The negative vote was solidly democratic, and only four democrats voted in the affirmative. They were Messrs. Brody, Kerrigan and Menninger, county democrats, and William Sobner, a Tammany man from the Tenth district of this city. The rural democrats voted in the negative. Mr. Sobner's vote was in accordance with a pledge given to the members of the Manhattan single tax club living in his district and to the Excelsior ballot reform league. (Great pressure was brought upon him to violate his pledge, but Mr. Sobner's convictions were on the side of his promise, and he refused to be bullied.)

In the course of the proceedings before the passage of the bill the amendment permitting the use of unofficial ballots in case a candidate had to be renominated, in place of one ineligible or withdrawn, was stricken out by a vote of 76 to 53, republicans in the affirmative, democrats in the negative. The Linton bill was offered as a substitute, and rejected, by a strict party vote of 68 to 55.

During the debate on the motion to strike out the amendment permitting the use of unofficial ballots in the cases above indicated, Mr. Peck, republican, who had refused to take part against the amendment in the judiciary committee, explained that he did not, at the time, understand the full significance of the amendment. He now did, and would vote to strike it out, as it seemed to him to open the door to fraud. Mr. Towne, republican, who had voted for the amendment, defended himself on the ground that it was useless to pass the bill in its unamended shape, as the governor would veto it. Why not make this concession and induce the governor to sign the measure?

After the passage of the ballot reform bill the Saxton corrupt practices bill was passed by a unanimous vote.

The assembly has 128 members, of whom 71 are republicans and 57 are democrats. In a full house, with all those absent on Thursday voting in the affirmative, with the 72 who voted for the bill, it would still lack the two-thirds necessary to pass it over the governor's veto.

The Steckler association, which is the Tammany Tenth assembly district organization, has obtained 4,000 signatures to a paper commending Senator Rees's vote against the Saxton bill and condemning Assemblyman Sobner's vote in favor of the measure. The Steckler association is largely composed of small shopkeepers in the Tenth assembly district, who have joined the organization with the hope of obtaining the good will of Civil Justice Steckler. These men and their friends have signed the paper in question.

Here is the vote in detail (all the yeas, save those in italics, are republicans):

Yeas—Messrs. Acker, Adams, Andrus, Ballantine, Barton, Bennett, Bradford, Brady, Bridges, J. Irving Burns, W. B. Burns, Christie, Crawford, Currier, Curtis, Davis, Decker, De Peyster, Deyo, Everett, Fish, Fitts, Gardener, Gibbs, Gretsinger, Groat, Guilford, Hoag, Albert Johnson, H. C. Johnson, I. S. Johnson, R. S. Johnson, Jones, Kerrigan, King, Kurth, H. J. Lane, Larmon, B. P. Lewis, R. J. Lewis, L'Hommedieu, Mase, Menninger, Miller, Mitchell, Mott, Nixon, J. K. O'Connor, Page, Pearsall, Peck, Peterson, Rhodes, Rose, Saunders, Sawmiller, Sellock, Shaffer, Sobner, Nelson Stevens, William C. Stevens, Stewart, Stranahan, Thompson, Tompkins, Towne, Treadway, Weed, Whipple, White, Willis, Mr. Speaker—72.

Nays—Messrs. Abbey, Blanchfield, Blumenthal, Boyce, George H. Bush, Robert P. Bush, W. G. Byrne, Thomas F. Byrne, Clarke, Connelly, Cooney, Coons, Cornell, Courtney, Dempsey, Dinkelspiel, Duffy, Endres, Gillice, Greene, Guenther, Haffner, Harwood, Henderson, Hitt, Kelly, Kill, O. F. Lane, Martin, McBride, McTernan, Monaghan, Mullaney, Nolan, J. J. O'Connor, O'Hare, Pealer, Rice, Riley, Sage, Schaff, Sweeney, Shields, Stein, J. H. Stevens, Sullivan, Sulzer, Townsend, Van Vranken, Webster, Wissig—51.

MARYLAND'S NEW BILL.

IT IS SOMEWHAT DAMAGED BY AMENDMENTS, BUT IS STILL A FAIRLY GOOD MEASURE.

The ballot reform bill passed the Maryland senate last week by a vote of 23 to 1, the negative vote being that of Senator Urner, republican, recently appointed naval officer at the port of Baltimore. He objected to the amendment which authorizes

the appointment of county supervisors of elections, who, unlike the supervisors in Baltimore city, appoint the judges of election and not the registrars of election. Had the amendment given county supervisors power to appoint the registrars as well as the judges, he would have voted "aye."

The bill which has passed the senate is the business men's bill with amendments. It was a carefully prepared law, based solidly upon the Australian system, with minority representation, and containing the feature of the New York bill providing an unofficial ballot for the guidance of voters. On the ballot party emblems not exceeding two and a half by two inches will be printed. Three amendments, which were adopted, weakened the bill. One places the appointment of the board of election supervisors in the hands of the governor instead of in the authority of the county commissioners for each county. A second authorizes the judges of election to appoint and admit as many election police within the rail as shall equal the United States officials within the said rail, and for the same length of time. A third permits a person of foreign birth "who cannot speak English" to select and bring with him a friend who may go with him to the rail, but not inside, and remain there until he has deposited his ballot. These latter two changes are serious defects, as they give large opportunities to ward workers and place all the advantages with the dominant party, which, of course, will control the machinery. At the last moment four counties—Harford, Carroll, Baltimore (Baltimore city is not in a county) and Garrett—were exempted from the provisions of the bill. Three of these counties give a democratic plurality of more than three thousand. The other—Garrett—is slightly republican.

Its fate there is questionable, for the managers have been controlling the house with little or no difficulty. The danger is that it may be further weakened by amendments. Even if it should pass there, it may encounter another obstacle when it comes to Governor Jackson. The governor is a close friend of Senator Gorman, and he had the nerve seriously to state in his message that the present ballot law in Maryland is satisfactory to the people, a statement that was contradicted and repudiated by all the democratic newspapers of the state. It is not thought possible, however, that he would court oblivion by vetoing an Australian bill.

WASHINGTON HAS THE REFORM.

The legislature of Washington has passed a bill by a practically unanimous vote establishing in the state the Australian system of voting. The vote in the senate was 23 to 1, and in the house 59 to 2. The minority vainly endeavored to amend the bill.

Senator John S. Wirt of Cecil county courteously writes in answer to a query from THE STANDARD:

The bill passed by the senate provides for an exclusive official ballot, printed at the public expense, delivered to the voter, within the polls, identified by the official indorsement of the ballot clerk upon the back thereof, and of course obtainable nowhere else. It is an honest law, having all the safeguards approved by experience. The ballot is printed with the candidates of various parties in groups and a symbol is allowed. The only objectionable feature adopted by the senate is a modified form of the provision of the Linton-Sheehan bill, allowing persons of foreign birth to bring a friend to the rail to assist him in giving his name correctly. If the senate bill is passed in the house, which is extremely doubtful, we will have in Maryland an honest law.

AND TIMES WILL BE HARDER.

A correspondent in Stockton, Cal., writes: "Hard times are before us. Rain and floods have drowned out our wheat, and hay without a market is our only resource. Here in California we are under the government of land and money monopolists and their boomers. We are finishing a \$300,000 court house. Within the past winter \$10,000 has been paid out of the county treasury for squirrel scalps, mostly for the benefit of holders of large tracts of land. This week the board of supervisors paid H. J. Corcoran \$500 to lobby in congress for a river commission, and took that \$500 out of the public treasury without warrant of law. We have a kind of socialistic, communistic government for the benefit of land grabbers, speculators and their understrappers."

IT WILL, IT WILL!

The Chicago Herald prints the picture of a stove which evidently has been invented to meet the wants of Kansas farmers. It is called "The Corn Burner." Molded on the door appears this legend: "The home market." There should be a motto on it something like this: "The tariff will provide."

REMEMBER!

Watertown, N. D., Journal.

Remember that protection to any industry, if worth anything, must be in cash or its equivalent; that the government has no cash except what it obtains from the products of industry, and that, therefore, protection to one industry must mean the plunder of another.

STICK A PIN HERE.

Indianapolis Sentinel.

The tariff is a tax.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

AN EDITOR THAT HEARS ONE SIDE ONLY.

To the Editor of The Standard—Sir: Some time ago I sent a communication to the editor of the Popular Science Monthly, in which I called attention to the fact that Mr. Herbert Spencer's letters to the London Times entirely ignored the single tax proposition. My manuscript was promptly returned with the usual printed form of declination.

Notwithstanding the editor's assertion that the land question was a good one to "leave alone," the next issue of the magazine contained Mr. Horace White's article entitled, "Agriculture and the Single tax," and, I think, another batch of Times letters.

I wrote again to Mr. Youmans, asking him if he would consider a manuscript embodying a reply to Mr. White. I said that none of the reasons in his formula were good and sufficient against the mere inspection of an article which he need not publish unless he saw fit. I received the following reply, the last paragraph of which was cited by a question in my own letter:

NEW YORK, Feb. 9, 1890.
H. J. Chase—DEAR SIR: Yours of February 4 is received, and since you are unwilling to accept our reasons for declining the proposed article, the only course left us is to decline it without a reason.

We have never knowingly published anything directly favoring the doctrine of the single tax. Truly yours, W. J. YOUMANS.

Of course I am unable to prove that my letter contained nothing to justify the tone which Mr. Youmans assumed, for I did not retain a copy; but I wish to call particular attention to this attitude of the Popular Science Monthly. This publication aims to interpret the principal phases of scientific investigation and speculation as they occur. Now nobody expects that such a magazine will throw open its pages to discussion after the manner of the North American Review or the Forum; but why has it "never knowingly printed anything directly favoring the single tax?" If it is urged that the magazine does not publish anything directly favoring spiritualism or Mormonism my reply would be, that every number does not contain articles directly attacking those beliefs. In every one of the three issues of the magazine for the present year there are articles and utterances against the single tax. In the March number, besides Mr. Wing's contribution, entitled "Origin of Land Ownership," the editor, in the course of a book review, strongly commends a scheme for the "capitalization of labor," whereby it is proposed to establish such a partnership between capital and labor as will insure the equitable sharing of both gains and losses. But nothing directly favoring a proposition to throw open the natural resources of this planet to all who dwell upon it. Nothing of that sort is to find its way into the columns of the Popular Science Monthly—not if the editor knows himself. It is but fair that all the readers of THE STANDARD should be informed of the attitude of a publication from which you have frequently quoted of late. It is right that they should know that there is good reason for supposing that its editor regulates his beliefs and speculations by those of Mr. Herbert Spencer, and that he considers himself bound to sneeze at stated intervals, whether the latter has taken snuff or not.

Salem, Mass. H. J. CHASE.

THE NEGRO AND THE LAND.

To the Editor of The Standard—Sir: I see that the so-called "negro problem," or "race problem," is being discussed in your columns. Just as long as the white land owner of the south can adjust taxation in such a manner that the darkey has to do all the farming and comes out at the end of the year in debt to the land owner, there will be a "race problem." The single tax will cure it.

Allerton, Iowa. D. D. SHIRLEY.

THE SINGLE TAX LETTER WRITING CORPS.

To the Editor of the Standard—Sir: The letter writing corps is now thoroughly reorganized, and reports coming in from time to time indicate that the members have taken hold of the project with all the enthusiasm of a first trial. The usefulness of this line of work is apparent in the number of letters it has induced requesting information as to the nature and scope of the single tax. While it is difficult for us to comply with all these requests as to furnishing literature, etc., we do what we can, and it is our intention, if these requests increase, to establish a sort of advisory committee, selected from among our correspondents, to whom we shall refer these requests for information, thus enabling the person asking information to get the ideas of a number of people on the subject, and it will also dis-

tribute the labor of correspondence somewhat. Some of the old members have dropped out owing to engagements of a local and pressing nature, but in most instances, these losses have been met by the addition of new recruits. The letter writing method of propaganda offers such a pleasant field for the employment of our spare time and thought, and is also a method in which everyone is useful, that we hope for a large increase in our membership in the near future.

L. E. SIMON, 7 Greenwood street, Cleveland, Ohio, March 5.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Badminton is an indoor game, resembling lawn tennis, and our swell woman annually revive it for Lent. It comes under the head of physical exercise, and is therefore allowable. I hear it whispered that one of the new physical culture exercises which certain fair dames and demoiselles are taking to preserve and improve their health and beauty, is one which would make you yell with laughter. Fancy twenty-five women in short blue or scarlet petticoats lying flat on their backs and slowly, solemnly kicking in concerted action. What a remarkable sight that must be. This is said to be most beneficial for the muscles of the back. I suppose the next exercise will be reversing conditions, lying flat on the face like Patience and kicking up the heels. Why not? Another exercise, which I saw myself, illustrates the lengths, or rather the heights, to which the modern woman will go in the pursuit of a new occupation. In the Berkeley gymnasium a tambourine was suspended from the ceiling by a cord. It swayed about five feet from the floor, and the habits of the place kicked at it with an ardor, enthusiasm and ambition which set bells a-jingling merrily.—[Clara Belle in St. Louis Republic.]

Two young men, giving their names as James Schoffer and George Matthews, and claiming to hail from Philadelphia, were arraigned in police court yesterday morning on a charge of vagrancy. The evidence showed that the men had constructed a hut on the Potomac flats, opposite the foot of Twenty-sixth street. Poles, grass, dirt and willow were the material used in the construction of the hut, and the officers who arrested the men say that it was warm and comfortable. They had built a furnace, and had all necessary cooking utensils. They might have remained all winter in their quarters had not a small boy named Kennedy interested himself so much in the novel house and its occupants. He played truant from school in order to be with the squatters, and when he was whipped for this, he gave the whole thing away. Judge Miller gave the defendants sixty days each, but it was stated that they had been endeavoring to find work, and then he said that if any one would give them employment he would release them. "The hut cost us nothing," said one of the young men, "and we thought we could live there very cheap. We couldn't find work, and didn't want to beg. It appears that poor people, no matter how honest, stand a poor showing in this world."—[Washington, D. C., Post, March 9.]

All the society folk in town and in good health went to Mrs. William C. Whitney's tea last Wednesday afternoon, in spite of the rain. It was called a tea, but it turned out to be almost, if not quite, the largest reception of the winter season, and certainly a most enjoyable one. It was given by Mrs. Whitney to celebrate the completion of her new ball room, which was opened Wednesday for the first time and lighted by electricity. The groups of globes were covered with pink silk gauze, through which the lights filtered softly, tinting the beautiful white and gold ceiling and sides of the room and the toilets of the guests. The ball room was formerly twenty-five feet long. It is now at least fifty with a polished parquet flooring of hard wood, and at the west end of it a new bay window in the shape of a horseshoe, its dome-shaped roof supported by mottled marble pilasters. Here, upon a raised platform, twenty men from the Metropolitan opera house orchestra, led by Nahan Franks, played all afternoon for the guests. Tea was served in the large mahogany dining room. It is doubtful if any private house in New York has a ball room that will compare with this one for beauty. Jack roses and smilax in garlands and old Gobelin tapestries that hung about were hardly needed to adorn it. Mrs. Whitney, who wore a gown of white surah silk, with diamond ornaments, received the guests in the drawing room. She was assisted by the most prominent society ladies of this city.—[New York Sun.]

Mrs. Dora Gerhold made a third and fatal attempt upon her life last Wednesday morning in her home, No. 519 East Twelfth street, by preparing a mixture of sulphur match heads and water and swallowing a tumblerful of it. She was removed to the German hospital, where she died. Sickness from consumption and inability to work were the causes which led the old woman to commit suicide.—[New York World.]

THEY ARE LIKE AUNT JEMIMA'S.

Boston Globe.
Farm mortgages out west are known as "protection plasters." No republican agriculturist's farm is complete without one.

SINGLE TAX NEWS.

SINGLE TAX PLATFORM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The single tax, therefore, would—

1. Take the weight of taxation off of the agricultural districts where land has little or no value irrespective of improvements, and put it on towns and cities where bare land rises to a value of millions of dollars per acre.

2. Dispense with a multiplicity of taxes and a horde of taxgatherers, simplify government and greatly reduce its cost.

3. Do away with the fraud, corruption and gross inequality inseparable from our present methods of taxation, which allow the rich to escape while they grind the poor. Land cannot be hid or carried off, and its value can be ascertained with greater ease and certainty than any other.

4. Give us with all the world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the states of our Union, thus enabling our people to share through free exchanges in all the advantages which nature has given to other countries, or which the peculiar skill of other peoples has enabled them to attain. It would destroy the trusts, monopolies, and corporations which are the outgrowths of the tariff. It would do away with the fines and penalties now levied on any one who improves a farm, erects a house, builds a machine, or in any way adds to the general stock of wealth. It would leave every one free to apply labor or expend capital in production or exchange without fine or restriction, and would leave to each the full product of his exertion.

5. It would, on the other hand, by taking for public uses that value which attaches to land by reason of the growth and improvement of the community, make the holding of land unprofitable to the mere owner and profitable only to the user. It would thus make it impossible for speculators and monopolists to hold natural opportunities unused or only half used, and would throw open to labor the illimitable field of employment which the earth offers to man. It would thus solve the labor problem, do away with involuntary poverty, raise wages in all occupations to the full earnings of labor, make overproduction impossible until all human wants are satisfied, render labor saving inventions a blessing to all, and cause such an enormous production and such an equitable distribution of wealth as would give to all comfort, leisure and participation in the advantages of an advancing civilization.

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

1. Each man is entitled to all that his labor produces. Therefore no tax should be levied on the products of labor.

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

THE CAT CONGRESSMAN McADOO SAW.

For years many of us who had preached the faith in and out of season, had stood derision and contumely patiently, hadn't struck anybody, had taken all the pains we knew to avoid giving offense, and generally, so we thought, acted as pretty fair average citizens, all the while sticking like burrs to the central truth and defending it as best we could—well, we always fancied the cat—our cat—was a good, solid, patient, quiet, get-there sort of cat.

We had never pictured him as a ragged, tawny, lep-eared, one-eyed, scrawny looking beast, scarred all over with the traces of a thousand fights, such as are other Thomas cats we wot of.

We knew he was a Thomas cat, of course. How? Well, we knew it. There was something about him that never allowed you to doubt it for an instant.

You know our cat is a beast of curious habit. He's a kaleidoscopic, vari-colored, dissolving view cat. You see him and then again you don't—that is some other fellow don't, and you tell him so, and you can prove it—and you set to work, and as you do, our Thomas kind of sidles up and sits right there in the club room and you can see him plainly, as he strokes his face—great, luminous eyes, and mottled gray coat and whiskers, wide mouthed and peaceful looking. Why, if you're not too vigorous in your struggle with the other fellow, you can positively hear him purr, and see his great tail wave gently, quietly, as he looks intently at you, and the glance fills you, as you talk on, full of mental grip and purpose.

We all along knew he was strong. Oh! yes, we never doubted that; why, Gilholy tried to get his picture, and there it hangs, in oils, on the wall of the Manhattan, with the legend, "Have you seen it?" to witness for me.

But I leave it to you, who have seen that portrait; does that cat show any signs of weakness? Not much!

There is something not altogether right about his left optic, but then, as I say, that's the cat Gilholy saw. Whether you or I or Lou Post or Billy McCabe ever saw such a cat, exactly, none of us have ever acknowledged. For there's the rub! Each and every Manhattanite has "seen" the "cat," and each one of them sees him in the way and wearing the looks of his then mood.

Now George Simon tells me, strictly on the quiet, that in the cold afternoons, when he had hard work to do in the clubrooms in the gloaming, before the gas was lit, just as the fires were started and he had sat down to smoke a cigarette, that he has seen our cat cavorting round that room in a way—well, you know Simon: he's musical, and French, and playful, and joyous, but plump and vigorous—and that's the cat Simon saw.

And then old Sam Picken. Now, you know Sam! He's a dry old pippin, and don't waste his words; quiet, and patient, and long suffering, and good humored—one of the evenest tempered men in the crowd. Well, Sam was down on his luck; he'd a pretty hard row to hoe some months back, and he told me that one night he had got into the club, and Simon had gone off for supper and left Sam all alone, and he sat there by the fire thinking and thinking how tough it was in New York this winter. There, right on the floor, opposite Gilholy's picture, sat a large mottled gray cat. Sam says he was big eyed and wise looking, and that he sort of motioned to him to look at the picture, as if to say, "Do you think that looks like me?" and that grin on his face, Sam says, made the whole room smile. Sam always did doubt that Gilholy really saw his cat. And then he seemed to grow and grow bigger and bigger, till he filled all the room, and his furry side came closer, closer to Picken's face; and Sam reached out and felt the strong muscles under his hand, and then he leaned his head—for Sam was weary—against the soft, warm fur; and the next thing Sam knew Simon's voice was ringing in his ears: "Say, Picken, why don't you light up the gas? You're in the dark, here." Now, that's the cat Picken saw and grabbed hold of, so he says; but then I have always thought that Picken—well, you know how it is yourself!

Now all these fellows tell you of a nice, good, handsome, soft mannered, well behaved animal; but I find that out among the Philistines the reputation of our feline is growing as a rough and tumble fighter.

Some of them simply get up and get as soon as they hear he's round; and it's lucky they cannot, most of them, see him approach until he gets within springing distance, or he would never get near them at all.

It astonished me the other evening to hear this yarn: One of our missionaries has been preaching for the past several months from behind the cigar counter of a hostelry not

over a hundred miles from THE STANDARD office.

He tackled all the Philistines, great and small, that fell in his way, and enjoyed a reputation as a straight-out, rampant, free trader, hard to beat in an argument, cool headed and logical, and the scalps of vanquished foes in debate hung numerous at his girdle.

Our missionary had a high respect for men, who, being young, had early cut their way to the front as ready debaters and good speakers in congress or the legislature, and chief among these heroes in his opinion, in the present day, stood Congressman McAdoo of New Jersey.

Some days ago our missionary friend was engaged in selling some "Perfecos" to a pleasant, active man, who in paying for his cigars said, "Pretty high-priced, these. They can be bought for much less in Havana, of this quality."

"Ah, yes," said our friend; "but if the cussed tariff was not?"

"Oh ho," interrupted the sharp looking, quick mannered customer; "you want tariff reform."

"No, sir! I want free trade."

"Ah, then, you mean tariff for revenue only."

"No, sir! I mean FREE TRADE."

As the conversation grew more animated, a bystander, who knew the strength in argument of our friend the single taxer, encouragingly remarked, "Give it to him, old man!"

"Now," said the stranger smilingly, "I presume, my young friend, from your pronounced advocacy of free trade, you must be a fellow democrat. Let me tell you just where our party stands on that matter."

"But," ejaculated our missionary friend, "I am not a democrat."

"No! Surely you can not be a republican?"

"Oh, no!"

"I trust sincerely you're not an anarchist?"

"No, not an anarchist."

"Socialist?"

"No, not a socialist."

"Well, what stripe of politics do you uphold? I cannot place you."

"Oh, easy enough to place me. I'm a single tax man—a follower of Henry George."

"Oh! that's your free trade, is it? Thank you! Good evening. I've tackled some of you fellows before—I want no argument with you people."

And he lit out.

"Say, Tom," said our missionary to the bystander, whom he knew, "who is that, any way?"

"Why, don't you know him? Thought you did, you were so stiff on your free trade. Why that's McAdoo, Congressman McAdoo, of New Jersey."

"Great Scott!"

Pst! Seat! Pst!!! Mi-a-a-ow!!!!

And that was the cat McAdoo saw.

A. J. STEERS.

UNDER THE LION'S PAW.

S. T. Shenandoah.—We are only a few in number, and are very poor, yet we wish to do all in our power for the cause. We have a small sum in our treasury, so we passed a resolution to send \$2 to the enrolment committee to help along—God speed you in your labors!—the good time we are so anxiously looking for. We are distributing as much of our literature as our circumstances will allow. We have been doing so for some time. We are distributing thirty-four copies of Justice, published by Henry George club, Philadelphia, every week, and our STANDARDS also as soon as we are through with them. We also bought one hundred copies of the "Master Workman," a small book by Mr. O'Neill, a very good work; so you see, even if we are silent, we are still working. The fact is no one dares to speak his honest thoughts here unless he has the means and is ready to leave the mining region. The corporations are ever ready to crush you, and many of the foolish workmen would crucify you also if you spoke against the beauty and goodness of protection. Many here have been protected so much that they have not got anything to eat. That has been the means of their seeing the cat; but it is too bad when nothing short of starvation will open their eyes to the truth. I have no doubt you have read Mr. Powderly's letters concerning the miners' condition. I believe that he could find worse cases here than he has described so far. More than one has told me that there was no bread in the house; neither had they a spoonful of flour to make any. We are all mortgaging our bodies to get a bit of bread. Our merchants know very well that many will never be able to pay for the goods they are consuming and they cannot carry them any more. We are paid every two weeks. I send you my last two

pay envelopes, so you may see a sample of the pay men are getting here now.

[The pay envelopes show that the writer of the above letter received on one occasion, for two weeks' work, \$3.96, and on the next, \$4.85.]

MRS. FLINT'S PROPERTY.

The refusal of Mrs. J. G. Flint, says the Milwaukee, Wis., News, heretofore to sell the little piece of land on Grand avenue, near the bridge, which she has inherited from her father, to Captain Pabst for less than \$50,000, and has just raised the price to \$60,000, is still one of the principal topics of discussion among the people of the city. The captain has offered her \$30,000 for it, but she wants \$20,000 more before she will consent to give him a quit claim deed. And the lady evidently has the best of the situation at present. She simply means to convey the idea to Mr. Pabst in a gentle manner that she does not wish to part with the property and has placed the figures so high that he will let it alone.

But this is only one side of the case. Captain Pabst wishes to erect a seven story building on Grand avenue, reaching from the river to his building on the corner of West Water and Grand avenue. He has secured titles to all the other lots along this strip of ground with the exception of the twenty-five feet front which belongs to Mrs. Flint. All of these lots are encumbered with a lot of tumble-down buildings, or more properly speaking, shanties, which by no means add to the imposing appearance of the neighborhood.

They are such shanties as can be seen in almost any part of the business section of the city. In fact, sights like these can be seen in every large city in the country. These buildings strike a stranger, as he crosses Grand avenue bridge coming from the Northwestern depot, with the idea that the men of this city have not the energy and pluck which characterizes the average western man. However erroneous this idea may be, the fact still remains that it is nothing unusual to see a tumble down shanty standing side by side with a four or five story building.

Investigation at the city treasurer's office shows that the assessor valued this twenty feet of land at \$14,000 and the building thereon at \$700, according to which the property is actually not worth one-third of the price asked for it. Although Captain Pabst has offered Mrs. Flint a very fancy price for the property—\$1,500 per front foot—the lady has the bulge on him, and he will either have to pay her the additional \$20,000 or \$30,000 or he will have to abandon his project of building a handsome building and the city of Milwaukee will have to go without another structure to advertise its enterprise.

From present indications it looks as though there were no immediate prospects for the sale being consummated. The intended buyer and the owner are as far apart in the price as they ever were. One of two things are certain: Either the assessor underestimated the value of the property or Mrs. Flint is asking an exorbitant price for it. This is clearly shown by section 1,052 of the assessment laws, which reads as follows:

"Real property shall be valued by the assessor, either from actual view or from the best information that the assessor can practically obtain, at the full value which could ordinarily be obtained therefor at private sale. In determining the value the assessor shall consider, as to each piece, its advantage or disadvantage of location, quality of soil, quantity of standing timber, water privileges, mines, minerals, quarries or other valuable deposits known to be available therein, and their value. Real property held under lease from any religious, scientific, literary or benevolent association, but otherwise exempt, shall be assessed to the lessee."

THE PETITION.

SINGLE TAX ENROLMENT COMMITTEE,
36 CLINTON PLACE,
NEW YORK, March 18, 1890.

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

Subscriptions toward the expenses of this committee's work for the week ending March 18, are as follows:

Through John Munnich, Brooklyn	\$19 00
E. D. Burling, Germantown, Pa.	3 10
Through Geo. E. Chase, Philadelphia	5 30
J. W. Greene, Louisville, Ky.	5 00
Through S. D. Guion (add.), Brooklyn	6 00
Through Isaac McCloskey, Santa Monica, Cal.	12 00
Through John H. Blakeney, Binghamton, N. Y.	6 00
Through William Owens, Piquetteville, Ill.	6 00
Through Joseph McGuinness, Brooklyn, N. Y.	7 50
Through G. A. Menger, St. Louis, Mo.	3 00
Through J. H. Gibbons (add.), East Saginaw, Mich.	3 00
"Cassius," New York city	7 00

Through W. J. Morrison, San Antonio, Tex.	5 70
Through John G. Hopkins, Middletown, Conn.	3 60
	\$81 30
Subscriptions previously acknowledged in THE STANDARD	3,007 05
Total	\$3,088 35

Cash contributions for the week are as follows:

J. R. Carret, Boston, Mass. (add.) . . .	\$1 05
Edward Twichell, Boston, Mass. . . .	1 00
Henry B. King, Augusta, Ga.	9 14
"Single Tax," Waltham, Mass.	1 00
C. S. Milton, Boston Highlands, Mass. .	5 00
Levy Dumas, Minneapolis, Minn. . . .	25
Arthur McElvane, Minneapolis, Minn. .	25
J. J. Byrnes, Minneapolis, Minn. . . .	50
William Hancock, Wyoming, Pa. . . .	1 00
Thomas Saelly, St. Augustine, Fla. . . .	1 00
"Bystander," New York city.	10
Adam Behny, Lebanon, Pa.	1 00
Thomas Walsh, Pittsfield, Mass. . . .	1 00
Isamar Zacharias, New York city. . . .	25
Benj. Zacharias, New York city. . . .	25
Mrs. Zacharias, New York city. . . .	25
H. Herman, New York city.	10
Benj. Buntin, New York city.	25
Wm. Russell, New York city.	10
Casper Jacobs, New York city.	10
E. Silverstein, New York city.	25
Oscar Chin, New York city.	25
Everett M. Blodgett, Chicago, Ill. . . .	1 00
Through G. L. Whitmore, Newburyport, Mass.	75
Dr. Henry L. Chase, St. Louis, Mo. . . .	1 00
J. B. Howarth, Detroit, Mich.	3 20
Chas. G. J. Cuiabach, Newark, N. J. . .	2 50
A. H. Suborn, San Francisco, Cal. . . .	1 00
R. M. Gubert, Seven Rivers, N. M. . . .	2 50
Through J. A. Haggstrom, St. Paul. . .	3 50
Wm. E. Rutan, New York city.	20
C. H. Verbeck, Grinnell, Iowa	30
J. N. Seburg, Mason City, Iowa	1 00
	\$41 94

Contributions previously acknowledged	601 31
Total	\$643 25
The enrolment now stands as follows:	
Reported last week	76,772
Received during the week ending March 18	533
Total	77,305

G. ST. J. LEAVENS, Sec.

THE ROLL OF STATES.

NEW YORK CITY.

A NEW SINGLE TAX CARTOON—A PLEASANT REUNION.

A. J. Wolf is showing with considerable pride a cartoon on the single tax question. It is fashioned after the cartoon printed in THE STANDARD over three years ago, which represented an agriculturist making a bare living, with a shadow developing in the dim distance; then the agriculturist dividing his product equally with the land owner, and so on. Through the series of illustrations, the landlord ever increasing the share he takes and the agriculturist ever getting out of his product but a bare living. Above the picture appears the legend, "He who pays interest on a mortgage pays rent," and beneath, "If the single tax proposition cannot convince you the sheriff will." Dan Beard drew this picture and presented it to the Manhattan single tax club, and George Brunswick has made a plate from it by the photo-engraving process, which he has donated. Mr. Wolf intends printing the single tax platform on the back of the picture, and, in order to cover expenses, will make a nominal charge for them. Those who want them to distribute will be able to get them in about a week at the rooms of the club.

Some of the members of the club have been invited to appear before the prohibition club of the Ninth assembly district, this Wednesday evening (March 19), at their hall, corner of Christopher and Hudson streets, and give their views as to the best method of dealing with the drink traffic.

Last Thursday evening the club had a "sketching party," for about an hour, which was a most enjoyable affair. Addresses, recitations and songs, by Messrs. McDonough, Henry Dublin, Van Veen, Steers, Simon, Kerr, and Mulligan followed, interspersed with piano recitals by Professor Carlo Brizzi. Among the professor's selections were: Fantasia sul "Ricoletto" (Verdi); improvisation, "Pensee a la Patrie" (Bizet); Caprice (Brizzi). Each number was enthusiastically endorsed, especially the professor's own compositions, which were pronounced exquisite compositions by musical experts present. There was a large increase in attendance over the entertainment of three weeks ago, and all said they had enjoyed a pleasant evening.

To-morrow evening there will be a lecture. There will also be music and recitations. Professor Brizzi will preside at the piano.

Thursday evening, March 27, there will be an informal dinner and a musical entertainment.

BROOKLYN.

THE SINGLE TAX MEN TO CONSIDER THE CITY ASSESSMENTS.

Edwin A. Curley and Robert Baker were the lecturers before the Brooklyn single tax club last Sunday evening. Mr. Curley spoke on ballot reform, and said that twenty-five or more of the K. of L. district assemblies of

this state intended sending delegates to Albany to impress upon the governor the absolute necessity of signing, in the interest of labor, the Saxton bill. Then Mr. Curley spoke on the Brooklyn rapid transit schemes. Mr. Baker also spoke on ballot reform.

A meeting will be held this evening, when the club will consider the matter of the city's assessments. A large attendance is desired.

Adolph Pottenkofer, Eighteenth Ward.—Our club, through a committee, the other evening presented a set of Mr. George's works to Rev. J. C. Jones, pastor of St. Thomas's P. E. church. The committee reported that they had a two hours' talk with the reverend gentleman, who said that at one time he was a "black republican," but that now he was a free trader and in favor of the Saxton ballot bill. He promised to read the books, and in the near future will attend one of our meetings.

S. D. Guion, Brooklyn.—I think the last idea of the enrolment committee, to maintain the bureau by small subscriptions, is a good one, and shall assist it all I can.

NEW YORK STATE.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM ROCHESTER, POUGHKEEPSIE, OWEGO AND TROY.

Harry D. Gawne, Rochester.—The meeting of our union last Sunday afternoon, March 9, was a most interesting one, and was largely attended. Mr. D. Waters read an original story entitled "The Rich Man's Pigeons," which was well received. Then Mr. George Hibbard, a lawyer of this city, raised the question that the people believing in the single tax were in these discussions drifting away from the main issue which they at first advocated. Mr. J. Campbell showed Mr. Hibbard that, while we may discuss other questions in our meetings beside the single tax, that was the main question, and all others merely led to that.

On the evening of March 19 our union will hold its first anniversary. All friends of the single tax are invited to attend. Mr. Hume Cale, editor of the Evening Times, will speak before our union at its next meeting. Mr. Cale is an eloquent speaker.

Frederick S. Arnold, Poughkeepsie.—Our club continues to hold regular meetings every Thursday evening, and the attendance is increasing. Since last autumn two men who were formerly republicans have come to see the errors of their old ideas and are now become single tax free traders, while we can almost confidently affirm that the most of the converts across the tariff lines in our district during the last three years have been made through the appreciation of the truth in real free trade and the single tax.

A growing dissatisfaction among the workingmen with the present economic system which your paper has noted throughout the country makes itself felt in Poughkeepsie.

J. M. Wilson, Owego.—At a meeting of the single tax men of this village, held March 7, the Owego single tax club was formed and the following officers elected: President, Michael J. Murray; vice president, Joseph Ginnane; secretary, J. M. Wilson; treasurer, Patrick Ward. Seventeen persons placed their names on the roll and a number have expressed their intention of becoming members.

The club will contribute \$1 per month to the enrolment committee's fund. We are confident that we shall enable many to "see the cat" and assist the cause to attain the success which it deserves.

Henry M. Edwards, Troy.—Times are very hard here, and it is as much as I can do to get along. The workingmen I know are opposed to the single tax—poor fools!—and since I joined the single tax club here a number of them go elsewhere to get shaved. I don't regret that, but I do hate to see people jump into the soup with their eyes open.

H. B. Buddenburg, Buffalo.—Our club is growing rapidly and we are in a position to do more effective work than ever before.

The Buffalo central labor union and District assembly 46 K. of L. has publicly declared for a purely secret and official ballot, with no Hill attachments.

The president of a college here, an opponent of the single tax, read a paper before the Central labor union on Tuesday, March 13, on "Private property in land." When the single tax men present got at him they made a show of him. On Friday, Feb. 15, Dr. T. M. Cr. we read a paper on "The law of wages," and Rev. Robert D. Towne of Sherman, N. Y., delivered an address on the single tax. The reverend gentlemen is a member of our club; also editor of the economic department of the Illustrated Western New Yorker. Its proprietor, George M. Bailey, is also one of our members.

W. S. Rann, Buffalo.—At our next meeting, March 28, we are to discuss the eight hour movement.

MASSACHUSETTS.

A CIRCUS AT MILFORD—PEOPLE'S EYES OPENING—A SQUIB.

B. T., Milford.—Edward Fitzwilliam deliv-

ered a lecture here on the tariff on March 13. A day or two before he was to speak he sent a letter to the Milford Times challenging "any free trader, tariff reformer or mugwump" to dispute any statement he might make. The local question club thereupon gave him public notice that they would be represented. Levi H. Turner of Charlestown was to be the spokesman for the free traders, and when the time came for questions the lecturer got so badly beaten that the chairman, to save him, refused to allow Mr. Turner to ask any more questions. When the meeting broke up about fifty men promised Mr. Turner to take steps toward the formation of a tariff reform club. The Boston Globe says the Home market club—which Mr. Fitzwilliam represented—"will not be likely to pitch its tent in Milford again for some time."

George L. Whitmore, Newburyport.—I expect to attend the single tax convention in Lynn next month, where the single tax will be debated.

John Mulrooney, Plymouth.—While the number of those that believe in free raw materials are far more numerous than before the election of Harrison, the converts to real free trade are few in comparison. People's minds are opening. Many of those who were staunch protectionists last year are now, at least, "tariff reformers." This is a thoroughly republican district, but I doubt not that at the next election their majority will be considerably reduced. The iron industries of this town are about paralyzed and the woolen mill in which I am employed is not near as prosperous as it ought to be.

T. E. Devitt, Lynn.—We single tax men here are very poor, but we think the enrolment committee should be supported, so we have sent in our mite. Two years ago I laughed in a man's face who was attempting to show me that such as I would be benefited by the single tax; but I have since seen the truth of what was said to me.

C. K. C., Charlestown.—This little squib, taken from the college paper, the Dartmouth, shows that even in the halls of learning there is an appreciation of the real condition of society:

Lives of poor men oft remind us
Honest toil don't stand a chance.
When we work, we have behind us
Bigger patches on our pants.

NEW JERSEY.

CONDITIONALLY IN FAVOR OF A CONFERENCE—NEWS FROM OTHER PLACES.

J. A. Craig, Paterson.—The conference question was freely discussed at the club meeting on Monday evening last (March 10), and this was the conclusion we reached: We are in favor of a national conference, to be held in the city of New York on the return of Mr. George from Australia; such conference to be an informal one, having no other object or objects than a full and free discussion of the single tax-free trade movement and the method or methods best calculated to advance it. We would be opposed to any attempt to form a strong national organization, such as many seem to desire, on the ground that it is not necessary to the proper development of the movement, and would necessarily retard its progress; and we would be opposed to any attempt to commit the movement to the formation of a third party.

The club intends to give a dinner next month.

Mr. Vesser is making some progress with the Dutch translation of our single tax platform among the Hollanders. Many of them take to it very kindly and think it all O K, until it is explained that it means free trade. They can't stand free trade; some seem afraid of it, and have notified Mr. Vesser that unless he stops distributing such literature he will be liable to be put in the "lock-up." The movement moves!

J. Gros, Morristown.—The really poor here are only about five per cent of the population, so that we have not a single labor organization and cannot get up a single tax club. Later on, when the percentage of poverty increases, I suppose our labor will organize. That is the old story: Lock up the stable after the horse has been stolen. A few days ago I addressed the Farmers' alliance at the county fair. They listened to me quietly, but their resolutions were funny enough to make a dead man feel sorry that he cannot laugh.

P. Mesquelin, Jersey City.—I consider the idea of the enrolment committee—to get small contributions for the continuance of their work—a good one, and shall take great pleasure in assisting.

CONNECTICUT.

W. J. GORSUCH LECTURES AT BRIDGEPORT.

J. Romain, Bridgeport.—W. J. Gorsuch delivered an address before our social science club Sunday afternoon, 9th, on "How would the single tax affect wages." After Mr. Gorsuch's address several members asked questions, which he answered to their satisfaction. Mr. Gorsuch recited a poem, "A Thanksgiving story," which was well received.

James H. Payne, Bridgeport.—After Mr.

Gorsuch's lecture on March 9 we formed the Social science club, and elected a secretary and treasurer. We have engaged the hall in Studio building for Sunday afternoon lectures.

Alfred A. Curtis, Danbury.—We move slowly here, but expect to organize a club shortly.

PENNSYLVANIA.

A SUGGESTION—ACKNOWLEDGING THE JUSTICE OF OUR CAUSE.

H. O. Skinner, Reading.—Though not a resident here—my home being in Camden, N. J.—I am trying to co-operate with the single tax society here, and am preparing to visit the towns in this vicinity and address the people. As a traveling salesman, I often visit the towns between here and Lebanon. I have generally twenty minutes in a country store in each place, and have a chance to say just enough to get those present interested. They always want to hear more. Now, my idea is that all the towns between here and Lebanon could be visited and the people interested in the single tax. If my circumstances permitted I would take a regular circuit; but my purse is slim, and the best I could do would be to pay my own personal expenses. If the Reading club will interest itself, I think money could be raised for the rent of halls and incidental expenses. I have sent a number of signatures to the enrolment committee, among which are some of the most prominent men in this section.

William Hancock, Wyoming.—The public is becoming acquainted with our aims and methods. Our people have ceased making silly objections to our supposed impracticable theories, and acknowledge the justice and propriety of our demands. Less than two years ago not one follower of Henry George could have been found in this place; now I think fully one-half of our people are strongly inclined toward the cause of just taxation.

J. S. Backus, Garland.—We had Leo Miller here three nights. One of our new recruits furnished the hall for him free of charge. Miller is now working in this county (Warren) doing good for the cause. Times are hard and money scarce. The lack of snow this winter gives little employment to labor. All of this will tell in our favor, as hungry, idle men will have time to think and will be more ready to listen to the "gospel of the new crusade." If we only had the money to push the work we could make converts by the hundreds. I find the protective tariff is the greatest obstacle.

J. J. Smythe, M. D., Edwardsdale, Luzerne Co.—We are doing all we can for the single tax cause. Nearly everybody here has signed the petition. Next Wednesday evening, March 19, the Jefferson ballot reform club and our single tax club will hold a public meeting in favor of the objects represented by the clubs calling it. The speakers will be John L. Doyle, M. D.; Professor Gallagher, Walter Hobbs of the topographical union, and Louis S. Harris, miner, all of Wilkes-Barre.

S. P. Herron, Newcomb.—I have sent forty more signatures to the petition of the enrolment committee. I would like to send some money to help the work along; but this is a coal mining locality, and you know by this time what that means. One of our townsmen, a strong democrat, said to me that he had a crow to pick with me "because the single tax men were trying to crawl into the democratic bed and kick the cover off of them." I told him we only wanted to cover them more securely.

J. L. Babcock, Erie.—I intend to do all I can to forward the cause. I think the enrolment committee are doing noble work, and should be assisted to the utmost limit. The present outlook is good, even here in Erie.

VIRGINIA.

IGNORANCE OF THE SINGLE TAX THEORY—OPINIONS CHANGING.

Eugene Withers, Danville.—There is a dense ignorance in all this country concerning Henry George and his theories; and though I talk a great deal about both, yet it is only among the most intelligent that any success is met with, and that success as yet amounts only to this—that their minds are disabused of the absurdly ridiculous opinion that Mr. George is an anarchist. My main instrument in doing this is Mr. George's lecture on "Moses." After reading that they become convinced that a man who could give utterance to such sentiments as that lecture contains can by no possible means be an anarchist.

John T. Chappell, Richmond.—We have organized a single tax club in this city, which I think has come to stay.

GEORGIA.

EXPERIENCE A GOOD TEACHER—A CHALLENGE DECLINED.

Garratt Mahon, Savannah.—When I joined the K. of L. I knew that they were working for the same ends that Henry George was—man's inalienable rights to the soil—and if they had worked and educated themselves on the land question the order would have been better off. But experience is a good

teacher, and I think that we will get along at a rapid rate from now on.

William R. Boyd, Savannah.—I grow more hopeful daily of a general recognition of the correctness of our single tax theory, and see in it the germ of all good, a practical recognition of the rights of men.

I recently formulated a proposition and handed it to a friend opposed to the single tax: "Resolved, That private ownership of land is prima facie evidence of usurpation." I asked him to controvert it. He frankly declined after reading "Progress and Poverty," and is to-day a convert.

ILLINOIS.

AT WORK IN CHICAGO—ACTIVITY IN QUINCY—MORE ACTIVE WORK NECESSARY—MEETING AT DU QUOIN.

Warren Worth Bailey, Chicago.—Professor Petersen, the Swedish journalist, gave us a great treat Thursday night (March 13). He presented "The Single Tax in the Light of the New Church," and he did it so very well that "the cat" never appeared to better advantage. The meeting was unusually enthusiastic.

A letter from Bolton Smith, appealing for aid in carrying on the "patent inside" work which he has inaugurated, was read by the president and referred to a committee consisting of Messrs. Ripley, Wittier and Irwin, for consideration. The president expressed the conviction that Mr. Smith's scheme was one of the most important that have been conceived for the advancement of the cause.

This afternoon (March 14) a committee of our club, consisting of Judge Bangs, E. O. Brown, Jonathan B. Taylor and W. W. Bailey, waited on Mayor Cregier by appointment in relation to a memorial issued by our club, which we shall have presented to the city council next Monday night, calling attention to "grave inequalities and irregularities in the listing of property," through which "undue burdens" are placed "upon the homes and industries of the people," causing the "impoverishment of the masses, reducing their possible savings, increasing their hazards and crippling their activities," and asking for the appointment of a special committee of the city council "to examine the whole subject of local taxation, with a view to the ascertainment of all the facts connected therewith, and to the end that the inequalities which we stand hereby ready to demonstrate on paper can be corrected, and a just system substituted for present unfair and impracticable methods."

Mayor Cregier received the committee cordially and entered at once into a lively discussion of the matter involved. He said he quite agreed with the committee as to most of the points made in the memorial, declaring that the complaints were well founded and the abuses ought to be corrected. Judge Bangs was our spokesman, and he put our case so convincingly that the mayor, in concluding the interview, assured us of his interest, so that we anticipate the appointment of a special committee of the council which will carry out the work we have in view.

The drainage case has been argued in the supreme court, Mr. E. O. Brown filing a brief in behalf of the club and orally presenting the special assessment view. His argument was both strong and clear, and it is believed that the court will hold, as Mr. Brown so ably contends, that the sanitary district is a drainage district within the meaning of the law, and that therefore the levying of a general tax for the purposes of said district was unconstitutional. If the court so holds our victory will have been completely won.

Kirke La Shelle speaks next Thursday evening; Clarence P. Dresser March 27; Jonathan B. Taylor April 3; Dr. Henry Boulter April 10.

C. F. Perry, Quincy.—Mr. Charles H. Williams addressed our club, March 7, on "Some essentials of liberty." Mr. Williams, who is now in business here (his home), while attending a theological seminary in New York became personally acquainted with Mr. George, was frequently at his home, and was one of the committee who escorted Mr. George to Cooper institute when he received the nomination for mayor.

Added to these unusually good opportunities for an understanding of the "New Political Economy," the matter has been pressed upon him somewhat here, so he is pretty familiar with our principles; and, while he does not yet fully "see the cat," I think he will ere long.

On the evening of the 6th inst. a preliminary meeting was held of what promises to be a vigorous tariff reform league here. When the chairman, Mr. W. B. Powers (formerly a republican), said, "I believe free trade to be the most economical way of raising revenue for the government," the expression was enthusiastically applauded. The organization is to be non-partisan, but will, of course, be composed mainly of democrats.

W. H. Van Ornum, Ravenswood.—I believe the single tax movement has now reached a stage which calls for more active and positive work than ever before, when the scattered and disorganized forces can be brought together so that each man and woman may feel that he or she is in touch with his neighbor, and when all shall realize

the added power which comes from large numbers working together according to definite plans for a common purpose. I believe they can be reached; and if so, we have passed the time when we need to petition. We can begin to demand.

Robert Cumming, Du Quoin.—Mr. W. C. Bohannon of St. Louis was the speaker here to-day, March 9. His subject was "The cause of poverty and how it may be removed." For over two hours Mr. Bohannon held the attention of his audience. Judge Parks availed himself of the opportunity of asking questions. It is a pleasure to have such a gentleman ask questions and hear his comments. Mr. Bohannon acquitted himself with credit. At the close of the meeting I distributed a large number of copies of "Thy Kingdom Come" to every man and woman present, white and colored.

IOWA.

A FARM LABORER SPREADING THE DOCTRINE AMONG FARMERS.

Charles C. Lichtenberger, Ida Grove.—The other day I made use of a fine opportunity for disseminating the single tax. The Farmers' alliance organizer for this county called upon me to give him a list of works on the great social problem that he could recommend to the various alliances that he was organizing. Among the works I recommended were a full set of Henry George's books, which were accepted most readily.

F. W. Rockwell, Farmington.—I spoke at Selma, Iowa, Friday and Saturday evenings, March 7 and 8, to fair houses, and Sunday evening read Mr. George's sermon, "Thy Kingdom Come," from the M. E. pulpit. The community is intensely republican, and neither absolute free trade nor the single tax had ever been preached there, and so far as I learned Mr. George had never been heard of. I think some three or four see the cat pretty clearly, and a number more, among them several protectionists, are on the anxious seat. The seed has been sown.

I. Hagerty, Burlington.—I regret to state that I am likely to be useless to the movement for some weeks at least—causes (1), unjust taxation; (2), low prices for farm produce and consequent dullness in towns; (3), the "grip;" (4), and, worst of all, no winter's work in our trade (horse shoeing) on account of the weather—the last involving "yours truly" in debt.

MISSOURI.

NEWS FROM ST. LOUIS—THE TRUTH SPREADING—A NOTABLE CONVERSION.

Percy Pepon, St. Louis.—At the last meeting of the single tax league, Tuesday evening, Morris Morgan read an exceedingly interesting paper on "Money."

The bill for the abolition of the tariff and internal revenue system is still on for discussion in the mock congress, which meets every Sunday afternoon in the single tax league's hall.

W. J. Reese, of the Kansas City single tax club, visited us Sunday.

Two of the active members of this league, Messrs. Wolff and Zippert, have left the city, the former going to Omaha and the latter to Chicago. Our friends there will find them to be workers.

Professor John Fiske of Boston has concluded a series of historical lectures, delivered under the auspices of Washington university. Professor Fiske says the political issues are, first, free trade; second, the land question.

W. C. Bohannon is doing active missionary work. Saturday evenings he goes into the country and addresses meetings at neighboring towns with gratifying results, and he also conducts a small circulating library composed of copies of "Social Problems" and "The Land and the Community," which he makes a specialty of inducing clergymen to read.

I. N. Symonds, Benton Station, St. Louis.—Saturday night, 8th, H. Martin Williams delivered a lecture on free trade in Benton hall, after which questions were put to the speaker and answered. So much interest was manifested on the subject that we all felt sorry when the time came to close the meeting in order to allow Mr. Williams to catch the train that was to take him back to town. Our regular Saturday night meetings continue to be interesting.

E. F. Meyer, St. Louis.—The truth is spreading, and our league is increasing also. Father Huntington's magnificent lecture will set some people thinking of what makes the shoe pinch.

K. P. Alexander, Newburg.—I do not know of a single tax man in this town at present; but it will not be long before I will have company. H. Martin Williams of St. Louis is to be here shortly and will give the people a talk. Then will be my opportunity.

Frederick McIntosh, Kansas City.—The free trade idea is certainly gaining among the younger men whose politics have been in favor of the protective policy. The interference with legitimate business enterprises (coal mining as an instance) by the railroads in this vicinity is serving as a good

example for illustrating the relief to be obtained by some form of tax on the rental value of land.

Wm. W. Rose, Kansas City.—I have sent another instalment of eighteen petitions to the enrolment committee. Mr. W. S. Beard, one of the signers, is a notable conversion to our ranks, and will be, is now, a worker in good earnest, never missing an opportunity to proselyte. Mr. Beard is a capitalist, land owner and improver, and vice-president of the Avondale bank.

C. E. Thoms, Kansas City.—I meet with stubborn resistance among my fellow workmen when seeking for signers to the petition. But I generally succeed.

COLORADO.

THE WORK OF THE STATE ORGANIZATION—ENCOURAGING WORDS FROM BRAVE HEARTS.

H. C. Niles, Denver.—Our progress in the organization of our state association is very encouraging. We now have correspondents in twenty-seven counties out of fifty-five in the state. We have received letters from various K. of L. assemblies indorsing ballot reform and pledging political support to those candidates for the legislature who will explicitly pledge themselves to support a ballot reform bill which shall embody the essential features as published in THE STANDARD. We are much encouraged and hope to do some effective work.

F. H. Monroe, Denver.—The Denver single tax association is sending a recruit subscription of THE STANDARD to each county assessor of the fifty-five counties in the state and has, through the secretary of the state association, sent the following letter to each:

Dear Sir: The Denver single tax association is sending you THE STANDARD for four weeks. I hope you will give the reforms in taxation therein proposed your careful consideration, and if they seem wise in your judgment and experience that you will assess taxes in accordance with that plan as far as you can under our state laws.

Should your experience enable you to detect flaws in the plan you will greatly oblige us by communicating your objections.

HENRY C. NILES, Sec'y.

The replies are beginning to come in, and there are requests for further information on the subject and for literature explaining it. You can count us in for 1,000 of "The Single Tax Platform" in tract form.

H. B. Clark, Silver Plume.—We have not as yet felt the pressure of competition in labor; but a close observer can see that it is beginning to show itself, and it will not be so long before we begin to feel it. The miners think that free coinage of silver is all they

need. As the miners around here are worked mostly on the lease system, I tell them the benefit would accrue mostly to the mine owners in the shape of higher royalties.

Charles Ford, Denver.—The rapid advancement made by the single tax is a happy illustration of the greatness of its leaders. May the rapid progress continue in all its strength and vigor. I shall aid it to the full extent of my ability.

John J. McClermont, Aspen.—I have been deeply interested in the work of the enrolment committee since the start. I think it the important work of our movement, and shall help it to the extent of my ability.

NEBRASKA.

FATHER HUNTINGTON LECTURING AT OMAHA. S. T., Omaha.—Father Huntington was here last week and delivered a number of addresses to the working people in their shops, and to the general public at the Opera house.

C. F. Beckett, Omaha.—The single tax here is growing slowly, but its growth is sure.

CALIFORNIA.

THE BEAUTIES OF THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM—"DOLLARS LOOK LARGE."

D. A. Learned, Stockton.—Dollars look large to me just now, but something compels me to send a couple of them to the enrolment committee, so that I can show some appreciation of their arduous and thankless labors for truth and justice.

Jere D. Walker, Santa Ana.—A few days since I rode over the great San Joaquin ranch and saw some of our protected laborers. They were engaged in sheep husbandry, and were all Mexicans. Their houses were built of sod and sticks, and were a very poor protection. Their clothing was old and of poor quality. I asked my companion: "Supposing the tariff were adjusted so that wool would advance fifty cents, if he thought the wages of the Mexicans would advance in proportion." He replied: "Not a cent. These shepherds do not know there is a tariff and are hired as cheaply as possible." The shepherds do all the work in caring for and shearing the sheep. The tariff is for the landlord of the great ranch.

At the village of Justin the Chinamen are busily packing oranges. The man who hires them is loud-voiced for protection to American labor engaged in the orange business.

A large part of the labor engaged in the raisin vineyards of this state is Chinese. The landlords are nearly all protectionists.

Catarrh Cured, ONE CENT!

Do you take cold easily? Have you a cold in the head that does not get better? Is your throat affected? Are you troubled with a hacking cough? Do you have fits of sneezing until you think your head will fly off? Are the passages of the nose stopped up? Do you experience difficulty in breathing? Are you constantly hawking and trying to get up lumps of matter that form in your throat? Have you a pain above and between the eyes? Is there a secretion of mucous or lumps of matter in the nasal passages which must be either blown from the nose or drawn back behind the palate or hawked or snuffed backward to the throat? Can you hear noises in your head? If you have any of these symptoms you have CATARRH.

The long continued corruption of the air that is breathed passing over the foul matter in the nasal passages poisons the lungs and the blood. The vile matter that is swallowed during sleep passes into the stomach, prevents digestion, vitiates the secretions, and poisons the fountains of life. The patient becomes feverish; drooping of spirits; there is no desire to eat; the head becomes cloudy and life becomes a burden.

IF YOU SUFFER FROM CATARRH, or any of its symptoms, it is your duty to yourself and family to obtain the means of certain cure before it is too late.

This you can easily do, at an expense of ONE CENT for a postal card, by sending your name and address to Prof. J. A. LAWRENCE, 80 Warren St., New York City, who will send you FREE by return mail, a copy of the original recipe for preparing the BEST AND SUREST REMEDY EVER DISCOVERED FOR CURING CATARRH in all its various stages.

Over ONE MILLION cases of this dreadful disgusting and oftentimes fatal disease have been cured permanently during the past five years by the use of this medicine.

WRITE TO DAY for this FREE recipe. DO NOT DELAY longer if you desire a speedy and permanent cure. Address

Prof. J. A. LAWRENCE, 80 Warren St., New York.

These landlords appealed to and secured from congress a tariff upon raisins. This was granted upon the plea that it was for the protection of American labor. The tariff secured, the landlords employ the docile Chinamen, while hundreds of Americans in this section are out of work. Is not this deception?

Frances M. Milne, San Luis Obispo.—It was a pleasure beyond expression to my mother and myself to meet and hear Mr. George when he was in San Francisco.

MAINE.

F. D. Lyford, Lewiston.—The heaven is working in this section. I have sent twenty-five signed petitions to the enrolment committee.

Although the numbers of avowed tax abolitionists is not large, the number of people who are getting infused with our ideas, many of them without knowing it, is rapidly increasing. Times are hard, wages low and many unwilling idlers. Free trade is making long strides among the people of all classes. The Australian ballot law is an assured fact by the next legislature. With that, and Cleveland and free trade we will make the republicans hustle to carry Maine in 1892.

RHODE ISLAND.

Henry McIntyre, Pawtucket.—Our club is doing good work here. We would do better but we are very poor.

WEST VIRGINIA.

W. I. Boreman, Parkersburg.—We failed to get a bill through the legislature giving us the Australian ballot, but think that this coming winter will bring it. It is only a question of time. The bill proposed at this session was an excellent one, clean and good in every respect, but was defeated by the jealousy of the republicans. The congressional contest in this, the fourth, will be lively, as both sides claim a majority.

If any single taxer in this district, at Huntington, or in any town below here, (Parkersburg) will please write to us here we will try to keep him supplied with tracts and news during the campaign. Many men who do not wholly adopt our ideas, are in sympathy with us in our efforts to arouse the people to think; and if the politicians do not apologize and trim on the "protection" question we will wake a few of the sleepers.

OHIO.

Thomas Bentham, Shawnee.—Our club is not progressing as favorably as I could wish, but the few single taxers here are none the less earnest in their advocacy of the doctrine. We have antagonists on every hand, which is about as good as having friends. The discussion is on, and while we can be reasonably sure of making a convert now and then, we know that we will not lose a man. So we can say, and with reason, we're all right.

Alf. H. Henderson, Cincinnati.—At the last meeting of our club the Rev. Dr. Howard Henderson of Trinity M. E. church delivered an address on "Christianity and Labor." A large audience of ladies and gentlemen were present. As this was the inaugural meeting of its kind, we feel greatly encouraged. I would particularly impress on every reader of THE STANDARD here the importance of attending these meetings. We propose to hold one every Thursday evening at the club room, 3 Palace hotel.

I must take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the club for the work of our president, Mr. James Semple. He is ceaseless in his activity, and every member owes it to himself to do everything he can to hold up his hands.

INDIANA.

J. H. McIntire, Evansville.—Our city papers are taking a deep interest in the single tax, which is very encouraging. Our club is newly organized, but is growing fast.

TEXAS.

J. H. Hall, Osage, Coryelle Co.—I find that nearly all the farmers of this section entertain an idea that there is an injustice in their having to pay so much more tax on their improved land than do others who own just as good land and do not use it. They have come to this conclusion—that all land should be taxed according to its prairie value, and exempt all farm improvements.

KANSAS.

G. E. Smith, Germantown.—I have considerable good luck in getting signers to the petition, though it meets with a deal of opposition because of the free trade contained therein. Kansas is the banner protective state, because the farmers are not yet able to see that they are most all being "protected" off their farms. There is, however, a hopeful sign in the organization of the Farmers' alliance. It gives our men an opportunity to preach the single tax in the alliance, and through this means we can sow the seed.

MINNESOTA.

O. Seward, St. Paul.—Our ideas are spreading wonderfully fast and, as our great leader says, nothing can prevent their becoming the law of the land before a very great while.

NORTH DAKOTA.

W. Bradford, Ayr, Cass Co.—Crops have

failed two years in succession and our people are now on the bedrock. I am secretary of a tariff reform league, the members of which have at last become sufficiently interested in the single tax to ask for an explanation of what it means. We will tell them before long.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

W. E. Brakaw, Watertown.—Will you kindly call the attention of South Dakota single tax men to the fact that I have a single tax column in the Journal. If they will secure enough subscribers for the Journal to pay another compositor we can have a whole page for single tax matter. This is our chance to have a state organ.

MONTANA.

W. McKendrick, Marysville.—Among the names sent the enrolment committee are several, the publication of which would astonish the natives. One of them is a single tax free trader who holds office under the present administration. The situation is a very gratifying one to me.

NEW MEXICO.

P. H. Smith, Raton.—The Rev. J. M. Rife of this place has, I am proud to say, been converted to the cause, and I believe he will do more to spread the truth than has ever heretofore been done in this section, when he begins to speak of the single tax from his pulpit. I look hopefully to the future.

CANADA.

PETITIONING THE ONTARIO LEGISLATURE FOR A CHANGE IN TAXATION.

S. T. Toronto, Ont.—A single tax club has been organized here with Wm. Scott, chairman; A. C. Stanners, 1168 Queen street, west, secretary. Our plan of campaign has been a petition to the Ontario legislature, which will be presented during the present session, asking that the annual value of land as determined by assessment, be taken for public purposes in lieu of all other taxes under the control of the local government. The petition is being largely signed by laborers, landlords, mechanics, merchants, etc. The anti-poverty society endorse the petition, most of the members having signed it. We expect by this means to reach a large part of the farming community who would not otherwise learn of the single tax, as the petition itself is a good tract for beginners, being short, plain, and to the point. We are poor and need help to defray expenses of printing, rent, etc. Contributions will be promptly acknowledged by our secretary.

JAPAN.

THE TRUTH MAKES ITS WAY TO THE ORIENT.

E. T. Fries, Cincinnati, Ohio.—Henry George has started on his journey round the world, but his thought has preceded him. Who would have supposed that the single tax had reached Japan? Yet that it has is proven by the following extract from a letter written by the lady teacher of a mission school there, which through the kindness of the friend who received it I am permitted to send you.

Following is the extract:
SHONAI, YAMAGATA, KEN, JAPAN, Jan. 15, 1890.—Another subject that has interested me much lately is the "land tax." I have no doubt you have read a great deal about it, but I had heard very little of it until a few months ago. We in our mission have read Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," "Social Problems" and "Protection or Free Trade?" I never read anything that disclosed so much of the misery there is in the world, and but for the hope of correcting these evils, I should have felt it a waste of time and sympathy to hear of the condition of the working classes. But his scheme is so plausible and looks so reasonable, and if carried out would do more for the spread of the gospel than all the missionaries and preachers in the world. Mr. G. is of the opinion that the principal thing for which the nineteenth century will be noted, is for having produced such a man as Henry George. I know his scheme is very much despised by some people, but I believe it is generally by those who do not understand the subject, or by those land owners who fear they will lose their ill-gotten gains. Please tell me what you think of him. I see so much of the misery caused by oppression in this country, and it interferes seriously with my work, and I am satisfied that the land tax would settle the question. Day before yesterday I found a family of seven literally starving and freezing—three small children, an old woman of seventy, a young woman and two able-bodied men who are unable to get work. Hundreds of these people barely drag out an existence. They die so soon. I nearly choke when I sit down to my meals and think of the misery around me, and I cannot believe that a God of love ever intended that land should be private property.

BOTH OPPOSED, BOTH IN FAVOR.

Boston Globe.
Hon. William E. Russell has recently compiled some figures which show how much truth there is in the claim often made by republicans that the democratic party is as a rule opposed to ballot reform. These compilations have been read at ballot reform gatherings in other states, and are deserving of wide circulation.

In the legislature of Indiana 20 republicans voted for ballot reform and 33 against it. In the same legislature 79 democrats voted for it and only one against.

In Tennessee not a republican voted for it, while 17 voted against. There were 76 democrats recorded in its favor and five opposed.

In Kentucky both parties voted for it unanimously.

In Maine 26 republicans voted in favor of the reform and 115 against. Nineteen democrats voted in favor and none in opposition.

In Pennsylvania 23 republican legislators supported the bill and 87 opposed it. Forty-six democrats recorded themselves in its favor and only one against it.

In New Jersey it passed almost unanimously.

In the Arkansas legislature 25 republicans voted against the reform and none in its favor. Thirty-four democrats voted for it and 21 against.

In Illinois 51 republicans favored it and 13 opposed. Sixty-eight democrats voted "yea" and not one voted "nay."

From these figures it is very easy to see which party is opposing ballot reform.

Consumption Cured.

An old physician, retired from practice, having had placed in his hands by an East India missionary the formula of a simple vegetable remedy for the speedy and permanent cure of Consumption, Bronchitis, Catarrh, Asthma and all throat and lung affections, also a positive and radical cure for Nervous Debility and all nervous complaints, after having tested its wonderful curative powers in thousands of cases, has felt it his duty to make it known to his suffering fellow-men. Actuated by this motive and a desire to relieve human suffering, I will send free of charge to all who desire it this recipe, in German, French or English, with full directions for preparing and using. Sent by mail by addressing with stamp, naming this paper, W. A. Noves, 280 Powers' Block, Rochester, N. Y.

Stop that CHRONIC COUGH NOW!

For if you do not it may become consumptive. For Consumption, Scrophulous, General Debility and Wasting Diseases, there is nothing like

SCOTT'S EMULSION

Of Pure Cod Liver Oil and
HYPOPHOSPHITES
Of Lime and Soda.

It is almost as palatable as milk. Far better than other so-called Emulsions. A wonderful flesh producer.

Scott's Emulsion

There are poor imitations. Get the genuine.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

Four hundred and twenty pages, paper cover. Mailed pre-paid for 14 cents by the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society, 21 Cooper Union, New York City.

READ THE MASTER WORKMAN.

1 copy, 10 cts.; 10 copies, 80 cts.; 25 copies, \$1.75; 100 copies, \$6. Sent post or express. Address: HENRY J. O'NEILL, 221 Gordon Street, Allentown, Pa.

CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (Ld.), 104 Elm Street, cor. CANAL, N. Y.

Van Houten's Cocoa

"Best & Goes Farthest—Largest Sale in the World—Once Tried, Always Used."

PAINLESS BEECHAM'S THE GREAT ENGLISH MEDICINE PILLS EFFECTUAL WORTH A GUINEA A BOX

For Bilious and Nervous Disorders, such as Wind and Pain in the Stomach, Sick Headache, Giddiness, Fullness, and Swelling after Meals, Dizziness and Drowsiness, Cold Chills, Flushing of the Face, Loss of Appetite, Shortness of Breath, Constipation, Nervous Stitches on the Side, Disturbed Sleep, Nightmares, and all Nervous and Trembling Complaints, &c. THE FIRST DOSE WILL GIVE RELIEF IN TWENTY MINUTES. This is no fiction. Every sufferer is earnestly invited to try one box of these Pills, and they will be acknowledged to be "A Wonderful Medicine." "Worth a guinea a box." BECHAM'S PILLS, taken as directed, will quickly restore females to complete health. For a

**WEAK STOMACH;
IMPAIRED DIGESTION;
CONSTIPATION;
SICK HEADACHE;
DISORDERED LIVER;**

they **AUT LIKE MAGIC**—a few doses will work wonders upon the Vital Organs, strengthening the muscular system, restoring long lost Complexion, bringing back the bloom of youth, and arousing with the BLOOD OF HEALTH the whole physical energy of the human frame. These are facts admitted by thousands in all classes of society, and one of the best guarantees to the Nervous and Debilitated in that BECHAM'S PILLS HAVE THE LARGEST SALE OF ANY PATENT MEDICINE IN THE WORLD. Full directions with each box.

Prepared only by THOMAS BECHAM, Esq., London, Lancashire, England. Sold by Druggists generally. S. F. ALLEN & CO., 245 and 267 Canal St., New York City Agents for the United States, who, if your druggist does not keep them.

WILL MAIL BECHAM'S PILLS ON RECEIPT OF PRICE, 25 CENTS A BOX. But inquire first of your druggist. In ordering mention THE STANDARD.

CATARRH.

Catarrhal Deafness—Hay Fever—A New Home Treatment

Sufferers are not generally aware that these diseases are contagious, or that they are due to the presence of living parasites in the lining membrane of the nose and eustachian tubes. Microscopic research, however, has proved this to be a fact, and the result of this discovery is that a simple remedy has been formulated whereby catarrh, catarrhal deafness and hay fever are permanently cured in from one to three simple applications made at home by the patient once in two weeks.

N. B.—This treatment is not a snuff or an ointment; both have been discarded by reputable physicians as injurious. A pamphlet explaining this new treatment is sent free on receipt of stamp to pay postage, by A. H. Dixon & Son, 337 and 339 West King street, Toronto, Canada.—[Christian Advocate.

Sufferers from Catarrhal troubles should carefully read the above.—[Adv.

RAPID CURES

Of Coughs and Colds, Influenza and Bronchial complaints are effected by using **HALE'S HONEY OF HORE-HOUND AND TAR**, a pleasant and efficacious remedy, which does not contain opium or anything whatever injurious to the most delicate constitution, yet exerts almost magical power in all affections of the Throat and Lungs, soothing and allaying irritation and inflammation, and strengthening the Tissues, thus enabling them to endure the changes of the season, which are so severely felt at this time of the year. Ask your druggist for **HALE'S HONEY OF HORE-HOUND AND TAR** (full name), and **take no substitute.**

SOLD BY DRUGGISTS GENERALLY.

PIKE'S TOOTHACHE DROPS

Cure in one minute.

B. DOBLIN & CO.,

Successors to S. Fisher.

HIGHEST HATS GRADE

No. 552 Broadway, Morton House, N. Y. We aim to maintain the highest standard of excellence.

SINGLE TAX ORGANIZATIONS.

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

ARKANSAS.

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

CALIFORNIA.

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

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

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

LOS ANGELES.—Los Angeles single tax club. Pres., A. J. Gray; sec., Clarence A. Gray, rooms 24-25 Bryson-Bonebrake block.

SAN DIEGO.—San Diego single tax county committee. Every Monday evening, 139 10th st. Chairman, Geo. B. Whaley, Novelette book stand, 439 Fifth st.

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

COLORADO.

STATE.—Colorado State single tax association, room 14, Byers block, 15th and Champa sts. Pres., A. W. Elder; sec., H. C. Niles; treas., Geo. Champion.

DENVER.—Denver single tax association. Every Thursday evening, room 14, Byers block, 15th and Champa sts. Free reading room open every day, 9 a. m. to 9 p. m. Pres., G. H. Phelps; sec., F. H. Monroe, 2351 Marion st.

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

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

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

CONNECTICUT.

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

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

DAKOTA.

STATE.—South Dakota single tax association. Pres., Judge Levi McGee of Rapid City; sec., W. E. Brookaw, box 146, Bristol.

RAPID CITY.—Black Hills single tax league. Last Saturday in each month, Library hall. Pres., Judge Levi McGee; sec., Francis H. Clark.

MADISON.—Lake county single tax club. Chairman, Prof. E. H. Evanson.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

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

FLORIDA.

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

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

GEORGIA.

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

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

ILLINOIS.

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

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

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

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

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

INDIANA.

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

CLINTON.—Single tax club; Sunday afternoons, 3 o'clock, Argus office. Pres., W. V. Wells; sec., L. O. Bishop.

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

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

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

RICHMOND.—Single tax club. Pres., C. H. Schneider, 105 South Third st.; sec., M. Nichols, 923 South A st.

IOWA.

BURLINGTON.—Burlington single tax club. First and third Wednesday of each month, 212 Jefferson st. Pres., Richard Spencer; sec., Wilbur Mason, 220 Hedge ave.

DUN MOIR.—Single tax club. Pres., E. H. Allison, box 4; sec., J. Ballenger.

COVING TOWN.—Council Bluffs single tax

club; second and fourth Sunday of each month, 2:30 p. m., 724 Sixth st. Pres., Chas. Stevenson; sec., I. Kinahan, 898 W. Broadway.

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

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

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

KANSAS.

ABILENE.—Single tax club. Pres., C. W. Brooks; vice-pres., H. Charters; sec., A. L. Russell.

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

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS.—Louisiana single tax club. Second, third and fourth Thursdays of each month, at 305 Canal st. Pres., John S. Waters, Maritime association; sec., Geo. W. Roberts, 326 Thalia st.

MAINE.

AUBURN.—Auburn single tax club. Saturday evenings, room 3, Phoenix block, Main st.; reading room open every evening. Pres., Thos. Marsden; sec., W. E. Jackson, 122 7th st.

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

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE.—Single tax league of Maryland. Every Thursday evening, Druid hall, cor. Jay and Baltimore sts. Pres., Wm. J. Ogden; sec., J. W. Jones, 31 N. Caroline st. Baltimore single tax society. Every Sunday evening, 8 p. m., at Industrial hall, 316 W. Lombard st. Pres., J. G. Schonfarber; W. H. Kelly.

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

MASSACHUSETTS.

BOSTON.—Boston single tax league, Wells's memorial hall. Pres., Hamlin Garland, 12 Moreland st.; sec., Edwin M. White, 27 Pemberton square.

NEPONSET.—Single tax league. Every Thursday evening, 389 1/2 Neponset ave., Boston. Sec., Q. A. Lothrop, 43 Walnut st.

DORCHESTER.—Single tax club. Every other Wednesday evening, Field's building, Field's Corner. Pres., Ed. Frost; sec., John Lavis, 13 Leonard st.

ROXBURY.—Single tax club. Pres., Frank W. Mendum; sec., Henry C. Romaine, 250 Rugles st.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MICHIGAN.

STURGIS.—Sturgis club of investigation. Every Tuesday evening, C. Jacob's justice court room. Pres., Rufus Spaulding; sec., Thomas Harding.

SAGINAW.—Single tax club, rooms 413 Genesee av., East Saginaw. Pres., Edward L. Wegener; sec., Jas. Duffy, 303 State st.

MINNESOTA.

MINNEAPOLIS.—Minneapolis single tax league. Every Tuesday evening at the West hotel. Pres., C. J. Buell, 402 W. Franklin av.; sec., J. A. Sawyer, 309 Lumber exchange.

SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS.—Single tax club. Wednesday evenings, at 1809 E. Lake st. Pres., A. M. Goodrich; sec., F. F. Hammersley.

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

MISSOURI.

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

"Benton School of Social Science." Saturday, 8 p. m., 6839 Waldemar ave., St. Louis. Pres., Dr. Henry S. Chase; sec., Wm. C. Little.

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

KANSAS CITY.—Kansas City single tax club. Lectures Thursday evenings at 8 o'clock and Sunday afternoons at 3. Headquarters, cor. 15th st. and Grand av.; open every week day until 10 o'clock p. m.; the public cordially invited. Pres., H. S. Julian; sec., J. C. Williams, N. Y. Life building.

BERMANN.—Single tax committee. Pres., R. H. Hasenritter; sec., Dr. H. A. Hubbard.

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

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

RED BIRD.—Single tax league. Pres., J. S. Cahill; sec., J. Krawson, Red Bird, Mo.

NEBRASKA.

OMAHA.—Omaha single tax club. Sunday afternoons, Gate City hall, cor. 13th and Douglas sts. Pres., Rufus S. Parker; sec., Cyrus F. Beckett, 411 N. 23d st.

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

NEW JERSEY.

JERSEY CITY.—Standard single tax club. Business meetings every other Friday evening at the Avenue house, "Five Corners"

Pres., E. N. Jackson, 23 Magnolia av.; sec., Joseph Dana Miller, 267 Grove st.

NEWARK.—Newark single tax club. Pres., Herbert Boggs, 82 Broad st.; sec., M. G. Gaffney, 43 Warren place.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK.—Manhattan single tax club. Business meeting, first Thursday of each month, at 8 p. m.; other Thursdays, social and propaganda. Club rooms, 36 Clinton pl.; open every day from 6 p. m. to 12 p. m. Pres., Louis F. Post; sec., A. J. Steers.

HARLEM.—Harlem single tax club, room 3, 247 West 125th st. Business meeting every Tuesday, 8:30 p. m. Whist and social evening every Thursday. Pres., Eugene G. Muret; sec., Chas. H. Mitchell.

NORTH NEW YORK.—Single tax club. Every Tuesday at 8 p. m., at 2840 3d ave. Pres., James H. Small; sec., Thomas F. Foy.

BROOKLYN.—Brooklyn single tax club. Club house, 56 Livingston st. Open every evening. Discussions Wednesday evenings. Business meetings Friday evenings. Lectures Sunday evenings. Pres., Peter Aitken; cor. sec., Robert Baker, 884 Greene av.

THE EASTERN DISTRICT.—Single tax club. Each Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock, W. C. T. W. hall, cor. S. Third st. and Bedford av. Pres., John Britton; sec., Joseph McGuinness, 215 Ross st.

EIGHTEENTH WARD.—Single tax club. Meets every Tuesday evening, 8 p. m., at 253 Evergreen av.

BUFFALO.—Tax reform club. Every Wednesday evening, Central labor union hall. Pres., S. C. Rogers; sec., H. B. Buddenburg, box 190.

ROCHESTER.—Rochester single tax union. Wednesday, 8 p. m.; Sunday, 3 p. m.; 80 Reynolds's Arcade. Pres., J. H. Bluntach; sec., J. M. Campbell, 30 Charlotte st.

ALBANY.—Single tax club. Tuesday evening, 8 p. m., 68 Washington ave. Rooms open every evening. Pres., Alexander Gregory; cor. sec., James J. Mahoney, 2 Division st.

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

POUGHKEEPSIE.—Single tax club. Every Thursday evening, 8 p. m., 226 Union st. Pres., W. C. Albrow; sec., F. S. Arnold.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YONKERS.—The Jefferson club, 13 N. Broad way. Always open. Business meeting every Tuesday evening at 7:45. Pres., Fielding Gower; sec., Wm. Young.

OHIO.

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

CLEVELAND.—Cleveland single tax club. Every Wednesday evening, 8 p. m., 144 Ontario st., room 16. Pres., Tom L. Johnson; sec., C. H. Nau, room 25, Standard block.

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

COLUMBUS.—Central single tax club. Sec., Edw. L. Hyneman, 348 1/2 S. High st. Columbus single tax club. Meets Sunday at 3:30 p. m. Pres., H. S. Swank, 51 Clinton building; sec., E. Hullinger.

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

HAMILTON.—Hamilton single tax club. Every Saturday evening at 314 High st. Pres., Howard Rich; sec., Ambrose Strang, 742 E. Dayton st.

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

DAYTON.—Free land club. Pres., John Birch; sec., W. W. Kile, 108 E. 5th st.

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

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

MANSFIELD.—Mansfield single tax club. Pres., Dr. T. J. Bristol; sec., W. J. Higgins, 66 W. 1st st.

TOLEDO.—Single tax club No. 1 meets at 112 Summit st. every Sunday at 10 a. m. Pres., A. R. Wynn; sec., J. P. Travers.

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

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

OREGON.

PORTLAND.—Portland ballot reform and single tax club. 2d and 4th Thursdays of each month, Grand Army hall. Pres., E. H. Thompson; sec., S. B. Riggen, 48 Stark st.

PENNSYLVANIA.

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

SOUTHWARK.—Southwark tax reform club. Pres., John Cosgrove; sec., H. Valet, 512 Dunn st.

KENSINGTON.—Kensington single tax club. Every Tuesday evening, 8 p. m., 2901 Frankford ave., Philadelphia. Pres., James Wright; sec., Jno. Moore, 2188 E. Huntingdon st.

PITTSBURGH.—Pittsburgh single tax club. 1st, 3d and 5th Sundays at 2:30 p. m., 102 Fourth av. Pres., Edmund Yardley; sec., Mark F. Roberts, 140 24th st., S. E.

BRADFORD.—Single tax club, St. James place. Open every evening. Meetings Wednesday evening and Sunday afternoon at 3 p. m. Pres., Phil. D. Tanguay; sec., J. C. De Forist.

READING.—Reading single tax society Monday evenings, 402 1/2 Penn st. Pres., C. S. Frizer; cor. sec., Grant Nagle, 208 1/2 Third st.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POTTSTOWN.—Single tax club. Meetings 1st and 3d Friday evenings each month in Weitzendorff's hall. Pres., D. L. Haws; sec., H. H. Johnson, 530 Walnut st.

RHODE ISLAND.

