

A STATEMENT FROM DR. MGLYNN.

Archbishop Corrigan having seen fit to publish a statement giving letters and parts of letters relating to me, I now supplement his publication with such documents concerning the censures upon my course as I have been able to lay my hands upon, accompanying them with some necessary explanation.

The letter of August, 1882, from Cardinal Simeoni, to which Archbishop Corrigan refers, I am not now able to find, but it is true, as he states, that this letter complained of my land league speeches as "containing propositions openly contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church." The doctrines thus stigmatized were those I have held and taught before and since—namely, that all men are equally entitled to the use of the general bounties of nature, including land, as well as sunlight, air and water, and that human laws ought to be so changed as to conform to this dictate of natural justice. I affirm that, while acknowledging the right of exclusive ownership in all that is produced by human industry, I would at the same time compel those who enjoy exclusively a larger or a choicer portion of the bounties of nature to pay to the community an equivalent in the way of taxation to the full amount of the rental value.

It is absolutely false, although stated by Archbishop Corrigan on the authority of Cardinal McCloskey, that I "recognized my errors and confessed to be sorry for them." On the contrary, in my interview with Cardinal McCloskey I reaffirmed the doctrine and explained it, and defended it from his misunderstandings and misapprehensions. He said to me: "You wish to divide the land of Manhattan Island into little bits and give every one of us a bit." I told him that I desired to do nothing of the kind, and gave him his first lesson in the new political economy, assuring him that, to secure the equal rights of all to the land of a community, it would not be necessary to disturb the present holders of land from the occupation thereof, but only to change our methods of taxation so that no taxes should be levied on buildings or improvements or any other products of human industry.

I told him substantially that I knew my theology well enough not to sin against it ignorantly, and that I loved my religion too well to sin against it wilfully. I voluntarily promised to abstain from making land league speeches, not because I acknowledged the right of any one to forbid me, but because I knew too well the power of my ecclesiastical superiors to impair and almost destroy my usefulness in the ministry of Christ's church to which I had consecrated my life.

It is true, as Archbishop Corrigan states, that a second letter came in September, 1882, before Cardinal McCloskey's letter had time to reach Rome. This letter is as follows: Most Eminent, Most Reverend and Most Worshipful Sir—

In consequence of information received from various parts about the scandal caused by the priest Edward McGlynn of your city by his violent speeches in defense of the Irish land league, in which he has defended propositions openly contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church, and has used language utterly unbecoming in an ecclesiastical, the holy father has just now commanded me to write to your eminence to suspend the above mentioned priest, McGlynn, from his sacred ministry, unless you should judge such measure excessive considering the various circumstances, which you on the spot are better able than any one else to appreciate in your well-known prudence.

While executing with this letter the venerated command of the holy father, I am sure that in any case your eminence will not fail to use those means which you shall judge most opportune to reduce McGlynn to sound counsels and to desist from the course of action which he has recently followed to the surprise and scandal of all those who have at heart the principles of justice always taught by our holy religion.

In the meanwhile I most humbly kiss your hands.

Your eminence's most humble and most devoted true servant,
JOHN, Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect,
D. Archbishop of Tyre,
Secretary.

Rome, From the Propaganda, 12th Sept. 1882.
To the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinal JOHN MCCLOSKEY, Archbishop of New York.

It is true, as Archbishop Corrigan states, that in May, 1882, another letter complained of me to Cardinal McCloskey. This letter was as follows:

SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE PROPAGANDA, SECRETARY'S OFFICE.
ROME, MAY 10, 1882.

Most Eminent, Most Reverend and Most Worshipful Sir—

Last year I had occasion to write to your eminence about the priest McGlynn, who in certain meetings held to favor and aid the Irish land league, had uttered propositions contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Monsignor Corrigan, in the name of your eminence on the 11th of September, 1882, wrote to me that the aforementioned priest "acknowledged his errors, professed due contrition for them, and promised to abstain in future from all such meetings." Although I have not seen any public retraction from him to repair the scandal publicly given, yet I had hoped that he would have kept the promises made to his archbishop; but instead I find in a Boston journal that he has again spoken in one of these meetings, and although he has not used the fiery language of last year, yet he has shown himself very much inclined to favor the Irish revolution. Your eminence knows full well how terrible are the passions aroused by political and national aspirations and how difficult the proper exercise of his ministry must be for a priest who not only abandons himself to such passions, but seeks by voice and example to maintain and foment them among the people. I therefore beg you to again forbid to the Rev. McGlynn this kind of life and declamations, since I am sure it all results in injury to souls, to the salvation of which he has dedicated his studies, his talent and his life itself. Meanwhile I most humbly kiss your hands.

One of the results of this letter was the following note from Vice-General Quinn:

CATHEDRAL FIFTH AVENUE,
NEW YORK, MAY 21, 1882.

Rev. Dear Sir: The cardinal requests me to inform you that it is his wish that you would not attend the league meeting this evening.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM QUINN, V. G.

Rev. Dr. McGlynn.

The meeting referred to was the meeting at Cooper Institute, to be addressed by Alexander Sullivan, the newly elected president of the league. I should add that I had manifested no intention of attending that meeting. Similar letters were sent to other clergymen.

In answer to Cardinal Simeoni's letter of

May, 1882, I wrote to Cardinal McCloskey as follows:

Your Eminence: I have received the copy which you sent me of the letter of the 10th of May from the cardinal prefect of propaganda. I regret very much that the cardinal prefect has found new cause for displeasure in a report in some Boston journal. The meeting must have been that held in this city in February last, which was not a land league meeting such as I had voluntarily promised you not to attend, but was for the relief of people suffering from famine in Ireland, and was held by a union of Irish county societies under the name of the Irish confederation of America. I find in a journal an account of the sending of the money raised at that meeting, with a letter of Bishop Nulty showing how it was used to relieve distress in Ireland. I inclose this article and beg you to consider it a part of the letter. It speaks for the relief of distress I alluded to the injustice which is the cause of it, and urged the duty of redressing such injustice. In this I thought I was but favoring that demand for justice to Ireland which was made by O'Connell and the bishops and priests of Ireland, and by many of our own, especially Archbishop Hughes, and which has been, I think, a commonplace in St. Patrick's day's sermons.

I shall henceforth refuse to take part in any such meeting, even though it be for charitable objects.

To satisfy the apparent desire of the cardinal prefect I shall cause to be published in a Catholic journal a statement that will show that I inclose any report or interpretation of my words contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

The archbishop states truly that on May 26, 1882, Cardinal McCloskey suggested that I might if I chose take a summer vacation in the form of a trip to Rome, and thus have an opportunity of making in person a more satisfactory explanation to the cardinal prefect of propaganda. As this suggestion was made through Archbishop Corrigan I sent to him the following letter:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH,
NEW YORK, June 1, 1882.

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop: I send by this post a letter to Cardinal McCloskey, such as he desired you to ask from me.

I do not desire to avail myself of the cardinal's permission to take a summer vacation in the form of a trip to Rome. My absence at this time would cause a serious interruption and derangement of efforts and plans for the further diminution of the debt of this church. This urgent duty and also the very subject matter of this correspondence impress upon me with peculiar emphasis and in more senses than one the value of the maxim that charity begins at home. I am, most reverend and dear archbishop, very sincerely, your obedient servant in Dom.

EDWARD MGLYNN.

Most Reverend Archbishop Corrigan.

In fulfillment of my promise to Cardinal McCloskey I caused to be published on July 1, in the New York Tablet, the following:

Dr. McGlynn was asked for an expression of his views on the Irish land question and said: "I think the land question by far the most important of Irish questions, and that the blessings expected from home rule would prove to be in a great measure illusory if home rule should not bring with it the settlement of the land question on the lines of strict justice. This would consist in no reassigning the land to the state, but in the land being shared thereof fairly, proportionately to the benefits it has received from the state or community. This would be the justice that consists in rendering an equivalent, or a *quid pro quo*, and that underlay the original grants of land by the state in view of military or other service to be rendered as an equivalent. And this was acknowledged in principle by the legislation of Mr. Gladstone laying new burdens on the land."

The doctor further remarked that this view, as he understood and held it, would secure all the better to individuals their rights of property, and therefore had nothing in common with communism or socialism as condemned by the Catholic Church; and that he, of course, condemned and repudiated any report or interpretation of his words of this kind contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He declared that he was in full accord with the fathers of the church as to the rights and duties of property, and quoted the following interesting passages:

St. Basil, in Sermon, Sup. Linc. xii., 18: "Quid quid praeparandum est spectacula prohibere adveniens ad praeparandum quod ad communem usum ordinatur, nullus sanctorum, qui communis quae praeparatur ad usum sanctorum esse."

St. Ambrose Sermon 64 de Temp.: "Proprium nemo dicit quod est commune. Plusquam sufficit sumptus, violenter oblatum est."

St. Augustine, Tract VI. in Joan.: "Quod habet villa sit mea et illa tua, et ex iure imperatorum."

Clement 1., ex dilectionis, 12, 4: "Communis sunt omnia quae sunt in hominibus, omnia sunt debita, propter magnitudinem dei dixit hoc esse suum et adus istud, et sic inter mortales facta est divisio."

The substance of the above quotations is that the rich falsely claim as their own that which is common: that a person holding more than is necessary for one's subsistence takes from the poor that in which justice belongs to them; that the service of property is in the state; that all things in the world should be used in common; that if this is mine or that is yours it is so through sin.

I shortly after received the following letter:

452 MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK, July 2, 1882.

Reverend Dear Doctor: The cardinal has received a copy of this week's Tablet containing your promised statement. He desires me to ask whether you accept this article as a correct exposition of your views.

He also thinks it well to call attention to the fact that the passages attributed to St. Ambrose and St. Clement are commonly considered spurious, and that St. Augustine, in the passage alluded to, is arguing *ad hominem* that heretics can allow no right to church property. I am, reverend dear doctor, very truly yours, in Christ, M. A. CORRIGAN, Conductor.

I answered as follows:

New York, July 3, 1882.

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop: I had sent for a copy of the Tablet, with the intention of sending the promised statement to the cardinal archbishop, and had just received it when I received your letter. I inclose for the cardinal a slip from the Tablet containing the statement. I am responsible for the article, and I accept it as a correct exposition of my views. I am responsible for making the quotations from the fathers to illustrate the truth that property, especially in land, has its duties as well as its rights. But beyond this I leave all responsibility for the passages (omitting purposely to translate them) to the authors themselves and to the *corpus juris*, and to the eminent writers by whom and by which the passages from St. Clement and from St. Ambrose are accepted as genuine. I remain, most reverend dear archbishop, with best wishes, very sincerely, your obedient servant, EDWARD MGLYNN.

Most Reverend Archbishop Corrigan.

Before going further, I would state that among those who denounced me to Rome for my land league speeches were Bishops Gilmore of Cleveland, and Chatard of Indianapolis, the former the author and the latter the apologist of the famous or infamous Cincinnati pastoral letter, which was in a great measure a deliberate thesis against Thomas Jefferson's declaration of independence.

Other bishops, as opportunity offered, did

not fail to manifest their intolerance. I will illustrate this by a letter, which shows that on flimsy pretenses they would interfere with the right of a priest to address public meetings that could not be said to be even of a political character. On the 15th of March of last year, I went, at the request of Archbishop Corrigan, to Washington, to recommend to President Cleveland Brig.-Gen. John Newton of the engineers for promotion to a vacant major-generalship. On my return I found a letter from Archbishop Corrigan, which, though marked "private," I here publish. I feel myself no longer under any obligation of secrecy, since while I was keeping silence the archbishop published a long series of letters concerning me, all of which by their very nature should have been considered private. The following is the letter referred to:

Private: 452 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, March 18, 1882.

Rev. Dear Doctor: The bishop of Brooklyn has called to direct attention to the inclosed circular, in which you are announced to speak at a meeting presided over by Henry Ward Beecher. As the meeting is to be held in his diocese, the bishop objects vehemently to a Catholic priest publicly appearing in such company, inasmuch as he conceives that great dissimulation and scandal will be the result. At his request I make his views known to you, and I am forced to say that I too would feel humiliated to find a priest of the archdiocese openly associating with a man of such unhappy reputation as Mr. Beecher, and even Howard Crosby, who only last year insulted us all by saying that our country would rise in its might against Romanism and crush them into the sea, because we simply asked that our poor children be permitted, according to the constitution, to worship God with liberty of conscience.

I am, Rev. dear Doctor,

Very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

I answered the foregoing letter as follows:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH,
NEW YORK, March 17, 1882.

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop:

I received a telegram from Gen. Newton on Thursday evening conveying thanks for my intended journey to Washington in his behalf, but saying that his chambers seemed so slight that he could hardly wish me to go. I deferred the trip, and next morning I received a letter from him in the same sense. On further reflection I felt that I should go, to give him whatever additional chance my visit might, and to leave nothing undone to gratify my wish. I went on Sunday night, saw Gen. Newton and the president, and the result, though I should not like to generalize, was very gratifying to the general, and much more favorable than either he or I expected. I returned on Monday night at 11 o'clock, and then found your letter telling me of the bishop of Brooklyn's visit and protest against my speaking to the meeting of the Brooklyn Excise league. It pained me to learn from you that you would feel humiliated by my openly associating with Mr. Beecher, who was to preside, and even with Dr. Howard Crosby. But as you did not forbid me to go, probably doubting your right to do so, nor even advise me in such delicate circumstances to break my engagement, and as you marked your letter "private" I would have had to cause a public scandal by breaking so important an engagement without being at liberty to give the reasons. The scandal would have been much increased by the more or less accurate surmises as to the cause, and no doubt by the speedy publication of the true cause, which publication, no matter how great might be my reticence, would probably come about through the indiscretion of friends of Bishop Loughlin himself. I, therefore, determined to keep my engagement, and all the more readily, as I was confident both from general principles and from several past experiences of my own in similar matters that your apprehensions and those of the bishop of Brooklyn would not be verified. As a matter of fact, my presence on that platform drew from both Mr. Beecher and Dr. Crosby strong and eloquent testimonies in favor of the Catholic Church. My joining with these men was to promote the cause of law in the interest of morality and temperance, and in keeping with the spirit of the Council of Baltimore, which was quoted with great approval by Dr. Crosby. I felt that in doing this I surely was not making any compromise with alleged faults in Mr. Beecher's private character, nor with Dr. Crosby's utterances on the freedom of worship bill. Besides, we would do well to remember that a jury, after a long trial, failed to find the allegations against Mr. Beecher true, and that it is a wise maxim both in church and state and in society which says, "let them be evil." We should also remember that Mr. Beecher is to-day regarded as one of the greatest and most illustrious of Americans, and that his advocacy of any good cause is a tower of strength to the cause. As to the cause of law, it is probably lost a good deal of his capacity in the consequence of such meetings as that between him and me last evening, and that between him and Father Walworth a few weeks ago, in Albany, in the interest of the excise bill. I can conceive it as not impossible that a few friendly talks between us might remove his objections entirely. I may mention as pertinent to the subject that it was stated by leading physicians of the department of charities that the vacant commissionership in that department was offered by our Catholic Mayor Grace to the same Dr. Crosby.

I may be well in similar matters to remember the recent example of the pope, who sent to an arch-persecutor of the church the decoration of the order of Christ, and of whom the newspapers said a few days ago that he had sent a special courier to thank Bismarck for some complimentary remarks made in an after-dinner speech. I may mention that I took occasion to explain and justify this action of the pope at a recent meeting of the Nineteenth Century club, in answer to the not at all bitter remark of one of the speakers, who, regretting the non-fulfillment of the Christian hopes of peace in the world, said: "And the pope the other day sent the decoration of the order of Christ to Prince Bismarck, who is surely not the prince of peace." I sent a telegram to Bishop Loughlin last evening, before starting for the meeting, telling him that he would receive a letter from me to-day making explanations. The letter to him will consist of an extract from this letter to you, containing the whole of it except what relates to my trip to Washington. I remain, most reverend and dear archbishop, very sincerely, your obedient servant in Christ, EDWARD MGLYNN.

Most Rev. Archbishop Corrigan.

The next day I received the following:

452 MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK, March 18, 1882.

Rev. Dear Doctor:

I am very much indebted to you for your kindness in making the trip to Washington, and for your good offices in behalf of General Newton.

I am, dear doctor,

Very faithfully yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

In the part of his statement which Archbishop Corrigan marks "private" he says:

"Having resumed the practice of speaking in political gatherings, Dr. McGlynn was gently reminded, Aug. 21, 1886, of the impropriety of such conduct. I do not know if Mr. George's name had been mentioned at that time as a candidate for the mayoralty. As all events

my letter simply deprecated interference in politics in general, without thought or mention of any special party whatsoever."

The only political gathering that I can remember at which I spoke shortly before the date of Archbishop Corrigan's letter of Aug. 21 was the great labor demonstration on July 5, in Union square, in favor of Gladstone and Parnell, during the parliamentary election. I confess it did not occur to me that any one would at that late date hold me bound by the voluntary promise I had made three or four years before, since Rome itself had been forced to change its attitude toward the Irish question, and since even Archbishop Corrigan had at last deemed it politic no longer to oppose the movement in aid of the land of his parents.

The archbishop's letter does not "deprecate me interference in politics in general," and it does make express mention of Henry George. All this appears clearly from the letter itself, which is as follows:

452 MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK, Aug. 21, 1886.

Rev. Dear Doctor: [The introductory paragraph alludes to some of the priests of St. Stephen's church attending the ecclesiastical retreat, to which I also, as usual, had been invited.] During the retreat I hope you will think over your relations with Henry George (according to the newspaper reports), and I could feel much easier in conscience if you would leave aside anything that may be not unto edification in the Catholic priest. I mean anything that would seem even to coincide with socialism. I am, dear doctor, very faithfully yours, M. A. CORRIGAN.

Besides the hint given in the above letter of the archbishop, I received intimations coming from his intimates that there was danger of serious collision between the authorities of the diocese and myself because of my advocacy of the doctrines of Mr. George. Wishing to do all that I could to avoid a scandal, I asked Mr. George to call on the archbishop. He had volunteered to do so when I told him of the archbishop's reference to him in the letter of Aug. 21. On Sept. 29 Mr. George called upon the archbishop, with the following letter of introduction:

NEW YORK, Sept. 29, 1886.

Most Rev. and Dear Archbishop—I beg to introduce and to recommend to your esteem and kind attention my very dear and valued friend Mr. Henry George, whose published works have placed him in the front rank of American men of letters and writers on political and social science. Mr. George's genius and intellectual gifts do not exceed his gifts and graces of heart and character and his profoundly reverent and religious spirit. It seems to me a providential occurrence for which we should be thankful that the labor organizations have chosen for their leader so wise and conservative a man, and one so utterly opposed, as all his writings show, to socialism, communism and anarchy, as Mr. George is. I, in view of my rights and duties as a citizen, which were not surrendered when I became a priest, am determined to do what I can to support Mr. George; and I am also stimulated by love for the poor and oppressed laboring classes, which seems to be particularly consonant with the charitable and philanthropic character of the priesthood, by virtue of which I have gained everywhere its greatest triumphs. As in a recent letter you showed some anxiety about a Catholic priest even seeming to coincide with socialism, I have thought that I could not do better than to send Mr. George himself to you, as none other, so well as he, could prove to you the groundlessness of your fears by a frank statement, and by pointing out to you pertinent passages in his works. Very sincerely, your obedient servant, EDWARD MGLYNN.

Mr. George informed me that his efforts to explain his doctrines to the archbishop were wasted, and that he might as well have been talking to the marble of the cathedral, since the archbishop was entirely preoccupied with the idea of suspending me, and actually informed Mr. George that he had summoned his council to meet at 12 o'clock that very day for the purpose. He pressed to base his action on the Roman letters of four years before, and my alleged violation of my promise.

The next day I received from him a letter dated Sept. 29, which he has published, and in which occurs the following clause:

"As your bishop, I now forbid you in the most positive manner to attend the proposed meeting in Chickering hall on Friday night, or to take part in future in any political meeting whatever without the sanction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide."

I felt it to be my duty to disregard this prohibition, and on the day of the meeting I sent to the archbishop a letter which I cannot now find, in which I said that as I had made the engagement before receiving his letter, and had been very extensively advertised to speak, my failure to keep the engagement would precipitate a public scandal and be of grave injury to the cause, and would be in the nature of a breach of contract which I did not feel at liberty to make, and something very different from what it would have been if I had simply declined, when invited, to attend the meeting; that I therefore thought it better to keep my engagement, while assuring him that I would respect his prohibition during the rest of Mr. George's canvass.

The next day, Oct. 2, I received a letter from the archbishop, which he has published, and by which he suspended me from all sacerdotal functions for the space of two weeks. I religiously respected this suspension, and yet heard his vicar general, Preston, cast discredit on me by informing people of the suspension and circulating the false rumor that I had continued, in disregard of the suspension, to say mass.

In that part of his paper which he marks "seventh" the archbishop says:

"Next came the sad sight of a Catholic priest riding in an open barouche from Poll to poll on election day."

What law, human or divine, forbade me so to do? It was a somewhat unusual thing, yet I was impelled to it by a sense of justice to the noble cause Mr. George represented, as a partial offset to the influence of the widely-published political manifesto of Monsignor Preston addressed to the chairman of the Tammany hall committee on resolutions, and also as a much-needed protest against the denunciations which had been hurled from several Catholic altars against Mr. George and his party on the Sunday before the election; against the abuse of the confessional, in which men had been coerced from attending Mr. George's meetings by the threat of the refusal of absolution; and against the influence which the archbishop had brought to bear upon clergymen to induce them to do what they could to defeat the constitutional convention, which the best interests of the state and the convictions of a great majority of the people imperatively demanded.

The archbishop tells how I was again suspended by him on Nov. 26 because of a reporter's talk about me in the *Tribune*, and he

gives as a reason for the continuance of the suspension that I did not withdraw the main statement that private ownership of land is unjust.

The following is the archbishop's letter concerning the *Tribune* interview:

New York, Nov. 26, 1886.

Rev. Dr. McGlynn, Rector of St. Stephen's Church:

Rev. Dear Sir—This morning's *Tribune* publishes an interview in which you speak so offensively of our holy father, Pope Leo XIII. (although without mention of his name) that I am painfully forced out of me to have recourse to ecclesiastical censure to keep you within proper bounds. By to-morrow's steamer your words, as reported in the *Tribune*, will go to the cardinal prefect of propaganda, and making allowance for time to hear from him I hereby withdraw your faculties and suspend you from all sacerdotal functions from the date of this letter until the end of the present year.

At the same time I place the Rev. Dr. Curran in temporary charge of St. Stephen's church, conveying to him by another letter, of even date, all necessary powers to act as administrator, both in temporals and spirituals, for the time being and until further notice.

As the teachings of even the holy father seem to have no weight with you, I can only humbly beg God to grant you grace to recognize in time the error of your ways.

I am, rev. dear sir,

Very truly yours in Christ,

M. A. CORRIGAN,

Archbishop of New York.

The same day I sent to the archbishop by the hand of my friend, the Rev. Dr. Curran, the following:

ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH, Nov. 26, 1886.

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop: In your letter of this date you seem to have fallen into misapprehensions which I think it well to correct. The words in the *Tribune* are not mine. During my conversation with the writer for that paper he did not take a note. I did not mention the pope, nor think of him, nor of any utterance of his. What I did say could be summed up in the truism that prevention is better than cure. Very respectfully, your obedient servant in Christ, E. MGLYNN.

In my card in the *Tribune* of Dec. 3, which the archbishop calls a quasi retraction, but in which I really retracted nothing, I explained and affirmed what I had said to the reporter. I showed how the desire to do justice through social readjustments did not conflict with the true view of Christian charity, and I quoted from my recent lecture in Jersey City on "A Christian View of the Labor Question." It may not be entirely pertinent to give here a letter which that lecture called forth from Bishop Wigger of Newark, which was sent to me, with the indorsement as printed below, by Archbishop Corrigan. It is as follows:

SETON HALL COLLEGE,
SOUTH ORANGE, NOV. 13, 1886.

Your Grace—Will you kindly inform the Rev. Dr. McGlynn of St. Stephen's church, in my name, that for the future he is not to preach or lecture in my diocese? I do not at all admire the principles he holds concerning property, &c. Some of them are very strange, not to say heretical.

With great respect, I remain,
Yours very sincerely,
W. M. WIGGER,
Bishop of Newark.

To the Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan,

Archbishop of New York.

Rev. Dear Doctor—As the above note is sufficiently explicit, it is unnecessary for me to add anything to it beyond the expression of sincere regret.

Very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

I sent to Archbishop Corrigan a clipping of the card in the *Tribune* of Dec. 3. The next day I received from him the following:

452 MADISON AVENUE,
NEW YORK, Dec. 4, 1886.

Reverend Dear Doctor: His eminence, Cardinal Simeoni, by cablegram received this morning, orders you to proceed immediately to Rome. The words of the dispatch are: "Alumnus McGlynn immediate Roman praesentat. Cardinalis Praefectus." I am, reverend dear sir, very truly yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN.

Two weeks later I received the following:

NEW YORK, Dec. 18, 1886.

Reverend Dear Sir: Two weeks have now elapsed since you received the cablegram from Cardinal Simeoni directing you to report immediately to Rome.

I have not yet heard that you intend to obey this summons, and I now write to inquire specifically what you propose to do in the premises, as I wish to take such further action for the church of St. Stephen as I may deem proper in view of your presence or absence. I am, Rev. dear doctor, faithfully yours,

M. A. CORRIGAN, Abp.

Rev. Dr. McGlynn.

This I answered as follows:

NEW YORK, Dec. 20, 1886.

Most Reverend and Dear Archbishop: I find that I shall not be able to go to Rome. There are several personal reasons, any one of which must be sufficient. I have had reason to feel concerned about my health for some time, and my physician orders me not to undertake the journey. [Here follows other reasons.] You have not told me why I am summoned to Rome; but I can gather from your telegram to the *Tribune* newspaper that it is because I am an advocate of certain doctrines about the ownership of land. This I can gather also from your letter to me just before you procured the telegram from Rome. You said in that letter that the result would have been more satisfactory if in my card to the *Tribune* I had retracted the latter portion of the *Tribune* report, in which I had been made to reaffirm the said doctrines about land. As I cannot go to Rome to give an account of my doctrine about land, I would say that I have made it clear in speeches, in reported interviews and in published articles, and I repeat it here: I have taught and I shall continue to teach in speeches and writings as long as I live, that land is rightfully the property of the people in common, and that private ownership of land is against natural justice, no matter by what civil or ecclesiastical laws it may be sanctioned; and I would bring about it instantly if I could, such change of laws all the world over as would confiscate private property in land, without one penny of compensation to the misused owners."

In the archbishop's published statement he gives only the latter portion of this letter, beginning with the words, "My doctrine about land," &c. The reader may well wonder that the archbishop, while stating that I said I could not go to Rome, suppressed all of the reasons which I gave for my inability to go, and also the reason which I gave for reaffirming my doctrinal position.

"Why congress retaliates—not for what Canada has done, but what she may do," is a headline in the New York *World*. "Retaliation" for what may be done in the future is funny.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
20 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE:

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the post office, New York, as second class matter.

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

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

THE STANDARD wants a agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

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

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1887.

THE STRIKE.

The Herald wants to know what I think of the strike.

I think it a fight in the dark, the blind push of men squeezed past endurance. I think it the first passive form of a civil war, which steel-clad forts and armored ships cannot guard us against—the kindling of passions and the arraying of forces that roused to full energy may give cities to the flames and destroy our very civilization itself.

What does the Herald think of the strike?

Can it not see in this passive war, in which forty thousand men lay down their tools and give up for the time their means of livelihood, something more than the spread of foreign ideas or the machinations of "walking delegates"? Can it not see in this paralysis of industry, this semi-blockade of a great city, this hostile federation of capital on one side and organized labor on the other, the evidences of a deep wrong in the foundations of society, the premonitions of social dangers that the policeman's club will be powerless to ward off?

If the Herald looks it may see all this. And if it looks, it may see the cause and the remedy.

The reason why men having nothing but their power to labor are forced to fight for employment, to form combinations to coerce employers and to push back the competition of laborers like themselves, is that labor is shut out of its natural opportunities for employing itself by the monopolization of land.

Nothing can prevent these labor troubles, and nothing can prevent them becoming wider and more violent, save the acknowledgment of the right of all men to the equal use of nature's bounties.

This can be done peaceably and easily through simple legislation, and this I have always urged upon workingmen. Those who are most responsible for what already is, and for the worse that will surely come, are those who tell workingmen that they have nothing to gain through politics, and that society as it is is society as it ought to be.

And even while they are fighting under spur of temporary necessity the feeling is deepening among these striking men, as it is among workingmen all over the United States, that striking can at best secure only temporary advantage, and that the root of all labor difficulties is to be found in the land question, and to be reached through political action. This was declared emphatically at Cooper Union last week by Victor Drury, T. B. Maguire and James E. Quinn, the three principal leaders of the great District 49, and is reiterated wherever workingmen meet. Amid the scurry of storm clouds light is breaking.

The proposition that the strikers should also strike against rent shows the tendency in the same direction. It is a pity that the landlord cannot be separated from the house lord. But such a strike might, perhaps, have some effect in impressing upon landlords the fact that they, too, are vitally interested in the settlement of the great social problem.

HENRY GEORGE.

THE TENEMENT CURSE.

A correspondent in Pittsburgh sends us a ballad called "The Tenement House," written by C. H. Webb and published some thirty years ago, in which it is told how Popham Pophammer, Esq., got rich, built a fine house on Fifth avenue for himself, then built a house for his God, where Sunday, and finally built a tenement house for the poor, which was very rickety and aqualid, and finally burned down, women and children perishing in the flames. The verse is good enough to reprint, but not so the moral. That this city is disgraced by overcrowded tenements is not the fault of the Popham Pophammers. It is the fault of an unjust system, for which the whole people are responsible—as well those who live in tenements as those who live in Fifth avenue mansions—and from which all classes suffer, though in different ways. Tenement houses do not exist because there are greedy rich men, but because there is a great class of our people so poor that they are glad to get even such miserable shelter. And until we get over the habit of attributing social evils to the wickedness of particular individuals we shall never see the way to social reform.

Charles F. Wingate, the sanitary engineer, is contributing to the *Morning Journal* a series of articles, illustrated with striking cuts, in which he is showing under what shocking conditions a great mass of the people of New York are forced to live; and his articles have been supplemented by a large number of communications to the *Journal*, in which tenement dwellers make bitter complaint of the absence of almost everything that goes to make a habitable building.

The fact that the center of the population of New York is not below Canal street, and

shows strikingly how closely the great masses of our people are crowded together. Seven hundred and fifty thousand human beings, almost one-half of the entire population of the city, occupy 18,000 houses, which Mr. Wingate classifies as "low tenements," having reference to their character and not to their height. Most of these tenements are what are called "double-deckers," four families living on each floor, and in a large part of them the lot is so fully built upon that the people in the rear of one house can almost shake hands with those in the rear of another, and the light is so dim that, as Mr. Wingate says, "the occupants are bleached out like plants grown in a cellar."

The death rate in the tenement districts is something fearful, having been 51.11 in the thousand in 1870 and 55.50 in 1884. In one quarter, known as the Mulberry street bend, sixty-five per cent of the children die before they are five years old; and a diagram is given embracing about two and a half blocks in this neighborhood in which there was a death every other day for three years and a half, the total number of deaths being equal to those that should ordinarily occur in a city of nine thousand people.

But the death rate is only an indication from which the curses which overcrowding brings upon humanity can be inferred. The physical and mental suffering, the moral and spiritual degradation, cannot well be indicated in figures.

Mr. Wingate says, and every one who knows anything of New York will bear him witness:

In walking through the tenement districts at night or even in the day young girls will be seen standing in the doorways and alleys or seated on stoops talking to groups of men and grown up boys. The instinct of sociability must find gratification, and the street is the only source of relief from the cramped living rooms and from the surveillance of the family. In hot weather hundreds of men, women and children are driven from their stifling rooms to sleep on roofs, yards, stoops, in hallways and even in the streets. Every empty cart, packing box or shed becomes a bedroom. A truthful representation of a July night among the east side tenements would require the pen of a Dickens and the pencil of a Dore.

There is constant noise in tenements, which is inevitable from their flimsy construction and the presence of so many persons. There are no carpets to deaden the sounds of heavy-footed or moving furniture. The laughter and wails of children resound through every apartment. A scolding woman or a drunken wife makes life wretched to his or her neighbors. The ceaseless whirl of the sewing machine is dreadful to an invalid or nervous person.

It is when it comes to remedies that Mr. Wingate is weak. Here is what he proposes:

1. Stop building any tenement upon an average city lot, 25x100, to contain more than two families on a floor.
2. Tear down and destroy all rear tenements which abut directly upon each other.
3. Clean out and abolish the stale beer dives and all other physical nuisances.
4. Stop the overcrowding of tenements by the process of sub-letting—taking lodgers—so common in the Hebrew and Italian sections.
5. Insist that every tenement shall have a dry cellar, good drainage and an ample water supply.
6. Require the board of health to inspect every tenement once in six months, whether a complaint is made or not.
7. Abolish cesspools, and substitute indoor plumbing.
8. Appoint a sufficient number of women inspectors to give personal instruction in hygiene, cooking for the sick and the care of young children.
9. Vacate, and if necessary destroy, any building whose high death rate and condition prove that it is unfit for occupancy.
10. Cut light shafts so as to supply every hall and interior bedroom with direct light and air.
11. Arrest, fine, and if need be, prosecute, delinquent landlords under the criminal law, and fifty tenants as well.
12. Limit the number of liquor saloons in the tenement district.
13. Provide small parks and breathing places in every crowded section.

Here is the program which, with the aid of the press and the moral support which every humane man will give it, can be carried through. Let us fight it out on this line if it takes all summer.

And when we did "fight it out on this line," the fight would have to be begun over again. Nobody probably knows this better than Mr. Wingate. He is proposing palliatives, not a remedy, doubtless because he thinks that the public are not yet educated enough to understand that there can be a remedy. But the only way to get any truth appreciated is to agitate it.

All such measures as those that Mr. Wingate proposes are attempts to repress the symptoms not to cure the disease. They are like devices to enable a drunken man to walk straight or to somewhat restrain his quarrelsomeness. A better way is to get the man sober. And so the best way of preventing the evil results of overcrowding is to remove the causes of overcrowding.

What are the causes of overcrowding? It may be remarked in passing that this overcrowding is not confined to the poorest classes who inhabit what are called "low tenements." What is generally known as the middle class—in fact all except the rich—are in New York crowded together closer than human beings ought to live.

The reason of this is, of course, that there are more people wanting house room than the existing house room can accommodate. Says Mr. Wingate:

Hardly an empty room is to be found either in tenement or French flat. Forty-five applicants were recently awaiting a vacancy in one apartment house near the Central park, and a hundred in another. New buildings of all kinds are rented in advance of their completion, and occupied before the paint is fairly dry, and while still reeking with damp from the plastering. The real estate agents are in clover, and the landlords contented and independent. Hundreds of new dwellings have been projected, and will be as eagerly leased and occupied.

With such a pressure to get houses why are not more houses built?

The answer to this is twofold. In the first place the building of a house is in New York a punishable offense. We fine people in New York for building houses just as we fine them for getting drunk or obstructing the sidewalk. No sooner does a man build a house than down comes a tax collector, and in the name of the city and state levies

a tax upon him for having ventured to do such a thing, and this fine is repeated every year.

This lessens the incentive to build houses. It is true that the man who builds a house for rent, and is fined for having done so, puts off this fine upon the tenant in increased house rent. He is able to do this, because the fine falling upon all people who build houses as a punishment for having built houses, capitalists will not build houses for other people to live in unless they can get the ordinary returns to the capital invested, plus the fine. Or, to put it in another way, the tax upon the building of houses checks competition in the building of houses until house rent rises high enough to compensate for the tax. This does not at all lessen the need for houses, but it does lessen what economists call "the effective demand" for houses. The tenant having to pay higher rent than he would without the tax, and having no more means to pay it with, seeks to bring his rent within his means by putting up with smaller accommodations.

But in the second place—and this is the great reason why more houses are not built in New York—houses cannot be built without land to build them on, and land is very costly.

There is plenty of land in New York on which to build houses. Half the area of the city is, in fact, yet unbuild upon. But when the man who wants to build a house goes to get a place to put it, he finds that for one of these vacant lots he must pay an enormous price.

The reason is that the people who own this vacant land in and around the city of New York know that the population of New York is constantly increasing, and so that the longer they hold it, the higher the price they can get for it. Vacant land does not eat anything. There is no danger of its running off, or being lost, or of anybody carrying it away. The only difficulty that the owner of vacant land has in holding it for higher prices is the taxes upon it; and under our system the taxes upon vacant land are comparatively light, the owner of vacant land not being required to pay the tax imposed upon the man who builds upon or improves his land, and being taxed upon his land itself much less even than he would be taxed for the land itself were it built upon or improved.

It thus becomes a very profitable thing to hold land vacant in or about a great city, and great fortunes are made in this way.

George Storm, of the great cigar making firm of Straits & Storm, is a man with higher ideas than those which relate to the mere making of money, and he has been for some time revolving in his mind a plan by which workingmen and their wives and children might in the summer time enjoy the fresh air and salt bathing of the seashore. Let us suppose that Mr. Storm, associating with himself other rich men of the same kind, were to put up a great hotel on some pleasant beach containing a thousand rooms, and were then to offer it to some association of workingmen on condition that they should run it. Suppose those who went down first were to say to themselves, "This is a beautiful place, and the people of New York will soon be crowding down here wanting rooms. Let us rent to ourselves all these vacant rooms at five cents a week, and when people begin to come down here in a rush we can charge them our own prices." An artificial scarcity could thus easily be produced, and, with half the hotel vacant, there would be the greatest possible overcrowding in the rooms that were occupied.

What in such a case should we think of a sanitary engineer who, coming to view the place, should propose as a remedy to cut air shafts in the overcrowded rooms, and to have a force of policemen going around to drive people out of the rooms in which there were too many, even if in consequence they had to sleep in the open air.

Yet this is about the way that the people of New York are managing their city, and the goody-goody remedies that are proposed to somewhat improve the shocking condition of our tenement districts are of just such an order. There would be no overcrowding in such an hotel if no one were allowed to hold a vacant room unless he paid as much for it as though he slept in it; and there would be no overcrowding in the city of New York if the man who held a vacant lot had to pay as much taxes as the man who on such a lot put up the finest kind of a building.

A simple and effective remedy for overcrowding is what the united labor party proposes in its platform—to abolish all taxes on buildings and improvements and to concentrate taxation upon the value of land irrespective of improvements. With this done it would cease to be profitable to hold land vacant in expectation of a rise in its value.

The people who are now holding one-half of the area of New York vacant would find their taxes so heavy that they would be compelled to build houses upon their land in order to get an income from it, or else to sell it, at whatever price they could get to those who did want to build. It would thus be much easier to get a lot on which to build a house than now, while there would be no fine imposed for building, as there is now. The consequence would be an enormous increase in the number of houses built, and tenants would do their own inspecting a good deal more thoroughly and more effectively than any corps of city inspectors could. No one goes into a poor and unhealthy house when he can get a good one.

But how thoroughly this simple measure of placing all taxes on the value of land would prevent the overcrowding of tenements can only be realized when it is seen that its general application would abolish that difficulty of finding employment which is the cause of the deep poverty that compels men and women to herd together in any shelter.

Just as the breaking up of land monopoly in New York would set all the building trades at work, so would the breaking up of land monopoly over the whole country set all trades at work, so would the breaking up of land monopoly over the whole country set all trades at work. Land is the source of all employment, and when no one could monopolize land, everyone who wanted employment would be able to find it, and that cut-throat competition which now tends to force wages down to starvation rates would cease. Open land to labor and poverty is abolished.

But it will be said that in a great, steadily growing city like New York there must always be over-crowding at the center, because so many people want to live there. Now, they will not want to live there over-crowded if proper facilities for getting to the outskirts are provided. Our rapid transit facilities are a disgrace to the city. A passenger ought to be able to go from the City Hall to the northern boundary of New York or to the outskirts of Brooklyn or Jersey City in ten or fifteen minutes, and there is no reason whatever why we should not, as the united labor party proposes, carry passengers in this way without any charge at all. A tax upon the value of land would enable us to build and run such railroads free and do many other things besides without imposing any fine on industry. It would simply be using for the public benefit a fund which the public growth creates. Every man who comes to New York, every child who is born here, adds something to the value of land. Instead of allowing this great fund to go into the pockets of a comparatively small number of our people, and thus make a small class rich, we ought to use it for the common benefit of the whole community.

IS IT WISE?

Pomp and power, kings, kaisers, presidents and governors, legislation without ceasing, vast standing armies, Pinkerton detectives, steam and electricity in harness, huge national debts, burdensome taxes, state prisons, palaces and villas, millionaires by scores, bribes and bribe takers, luxury beyond a dream, beautiful churches, saviors of society, hurry-scurry, hurly-burly, lying, cheating, scrambling after wealth, and devil take the hindmost—the Civilization of the nineteenth century.

Misery and destitution, squalid tenement houses, rum mills by the thousand, thieves, tramps and prostitutes, children perishing, despairing women, famine-haunted men, ignorant preachers of chaos, fierce competition, increasing immigration, a struggling, writhing mass of humanity, fighting desperately for standing room in the slough of poverty, and the poor privilege of work at starvation wages—the Barbarism of the nineteenth century.

Dynamite, the tool of civilization, the weapon of barbarism.

Boom! and a despot dies amidst his guards. Strangle a few nihilists, and play that nothing is the matter.

Boom! and a great capital is stricken with a panic. Hang up a few Irishmen, and play again that nothing is the matter.

Boom! and an awful shadow of dread falls on a fair western city. Sentence a few socialists to death, and once more play that nothing is the matter.

Boom! and a stately steamship lies half wrecked upon the sea.

Shall we keep on playing that nothing is the matter?

THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT BILL.

A bill has been introduced in the state senate by Mr. Daly and in the assembly by Mr. Crosby that proposes to revolutionize the health department of this city. It appears to be a good bill, calling, perhaps, for slight amendments. We hesitate to suggest an amendment lest it delay the bill, for the people are impatient for almost any measure that will put out of office the present members of the board of health. The whole department is demoralized because of the bad character and incompetence of the board, and the health and lives of over a million of people in the largest city of the continent are endangered. Epidemics of measles and diphtheria are with us, and now comes a threatened epidemic of smallpox. This city at all times needs the wisest, most vigilant, most energetic health supervision that can be had, because, notwithstanding its rivers have given it the best possible means of securing a healthful growth, its sanitary conditions are bad from the mean habitations and the overcrowding of its wretched quarters. Money enough is given to obtain the best professional oversight. But what have we? A department with four heads. One is the president of the police commission, who needs only to know what a wise health officer would require in the way of help from the police; another is the health officer of the port, who holds his office at quarantine because of political favoritism, and who can do no more to protect the city from sickness by remaining at his post than by visiting the health department here; another is the president of the board of health, indicted on a grave criminal charge; and the fourth is a physician, against whose honorable name nothing can be said, but who, if he were competent, could have pulled this board, bad as it is, up to a higher sense of its duty. So far as the observation of the public can form any judgment of the last-named gentleman, he is useless or powerless where he is. Every member of the board should be compelled to retire.

Their energy and heroism have been exhausted in harassing the poor; and their prudence and discretion shown only in saving the owners of tenement houses from penalties. Let their highly-paid attorneys go with them, to write useless letters and give discreet opinions for private persons who may think their services worth paying for.

The bill now before the legislature, if passed and approved, will put these persons out of office. That is so acceptable a promise that we hail the appearance of the bill with pleasure. Looking into its text, however, we find that it provides one commissioner of health, responsible to the mayor for the faithful and capable performance of his duty, and for a deputy

responsible to the commissioner. This will throw the burden of responsibility where it ought to be, upon the mayor of the city; and now that sanitary science has become the study of some of the best professional minds of our day, the commissioner will have no difficulty in finding a wise and efficient expert as a lieutenant.

The seventh section of the bill ought to provide for the publication in a newspaper of all new orders under the sanitary code in the homes of people affected by them, as well as in the *City Record*; but even without amendment the passage of the bill will give cause for public rejoicing.

LAWYERS AS LEGISLATORS.

The lawyers in congress are disturbed. A bill before the senate proposes to make it unlawful for any member of either house to accept employment as a lawyer, or payment for services of any kind, from railroads which have obtained charters or a land or money grant from the United States. Such a law would destroy a respectable mask for bribery. Hence the flutter.

The bill ought to be passed, and public opinion should demand the passage of a similar bill by every state legislature. It would be well to make the prohibition even more general. If a merchant cannot, while pursuing his business, be secretary of the treasury, a lawyer while pursuing his profession should not be allowed to sit in a lawmaking body. Much of a lawyer's business may not conflict with a legislator's duties, but his profession admits of employment wholly inconsistent with such duties, and the line cannot be safely drawn short of the prohibition of its exercise while he is a lawmaker.

There is a danger from the influence which private interests exert upon honest men unconsciously; but there is greater danger in the opportunities which legal employment affords for the corruption of legislators. A law-making lawyer is exceptionally valuable to large interests that may be affected by legislation, and most of the fees of such lawyers come to them because they are law-makers. Thus they are under obligation to two masters—their clients who have legislative interests and the people whom they are sworn to serve. Which master has been best served may be learned by an examination of the railroad, land, currency and kindred legislation and non-legislation of the past thirty years.

The proposition to increase the number of general sessions judges by four can very well lie over until the three judges we have are harder pressed with work than now. Of the three, one is always idle, and those that work begin late in the day and quit early. Civil judges often have more work to do after leaving the bench than on it. There is reason, therefore, for short court hours in the civil courts. But in the criminal courts it is very seldom that any judicial work is done off the bench. These courts open in two parts only, at 11 in the morning, and usually close before 5, frequently earlier, with an hour's intermission in the afternoon. It is little wonder their calendars are 6,000 cases behind. Let all the judges sit at once; let the court open at 10 and keep open until 5, and the apparent necessity for more judges will vanish. The expense of four more judges, if devoted to preventing crime, would be far more effective for law and order than if spent in punishing offenders.

CLAY TILDEN, president of the Jersey City police board, offered to pay the expenses of decently interring the body of the boy whom Pinkerton's troops killed recently because, as the employer of the boy's father for over twelve years, he knew his circumstances financially. "This offer is not made as a city official," said Mr. Tilden, "but as an individual and employer to a worthy employee." What a commentary on our industrial condition that a worthy employee for twelve years should be an object of his employer's charity in so small a matter financially as the decent burial of his child!

The *Independent* is as gentle as a purring cat over the murder of young Hogan by Pinkerton's thugs. The thugs are "blameable, but not punishable," is its verdict. "He who opposes the arm of the law in any manner does so at his peril," it proceeds, referring to the fact that a party of boys while skating threw snowballs and pieces of ice at the thugs. "The police were assaulted and they fired upon the crowd, killing one of the offenders," it adds, in spite of the notorious facts that it was not the police, but the thugs, that were "assaulted"; that it was not a crowd, but a party of boys that "assaulted" them, and that the murdered lad was not in the party or in a crowd, but had stopped on the street on his way home to look at Pinkerton's troops. But the thugs "should have considered that their assaults were boys, and that the missiles were only ice and snow," murmurs the *Independent* in the tone of a pretty schoolma'am to the big, bad scholar on the back bench; and upon reflection it intimates that the boy's life may have been taken needlessly. Still, it "doubts" if the officers—meaning the thugs—"will be convicted of any crime." The owner of the *Independent* does not appear to realize that society is "squat on" the safety valve just now, and that this kind of palliation of crime by society savers fans the fires under the boiler. Or is it true, as there is good reason to suspect, that men like the owner of the *Independent* and the word-juggler of the *Evening Post* have deliberately set about the task of irritating and inflaming the minds of men already well high desperate? If violence comes, on the heads of these newspaper anarchists will rest the responsibility. They are teaching a dangerous lesson—that murder is not murder; that it may be blameable but is not punishable when the rich are murderers and the poor their victims.

The *Herald* tells with pride that an advertisement in its columns for a bookkeeper brought 127 applications. But how many applications would a bookkeeper advertising for a situation have got?

The Philadelphia *Record* prints the record of sales of daily papers by a firm in Phoenixville, Pa., for the years 1885 and 1886. Of course Pennsylvania papers are chiefly sold there, but the record incidentally shows that while all of the other New York dailies have increased their circulation, the New York *Sun* dropped from 272 copies in 1885 to 60 in 1886. As the *Sun* was built up originally by the pennies of working men, and has since proved a traitor to their cause, as it has to every other that it ever espoused, such facts as this show that justice is overtaking that paper.

For seven years ago the population of the United States was 54,000,000. In his grand-father's time the rent was about £1,000 a year. According to the valuation roll of our day it is well on to £6,000.

Concentration of the land into large holdings has reduced a large part of the population to direct poverty, and last spring meal was sent by charity to persons from a distance to keep some of the people from starving. Such tyranny on the part of the Duke of Argyll has resulted repeatedly in rebellion, which could only be put down by armed law, and several men are now confined behind bars for what "this grace" is pleased to call "mobbing, rioting and defiance."

Col. Fraser, of Kilmuir, bought an estate for £20,000, and went to work up his rent roll, so that he could sell it at £200,000. In the course of a few years he made three additions to the rent. At last some of the population refused to pay, which refusal was followed by disturbances in the townships of Garulad, Bornekitoavag, Herbuta and other places. A royal commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the crofters has in some cases caused reductions in rent to the amount of thirty, fifty, and even seventy-five per cent., besides wiping out considerable amounts of arrears. But these were exceptional cases. Being for the most part in sympathy with the dominant class the commission did not wish to describe those real changes which alone could do justice to the unhappy crofters.

JOHN MURDOCH.

On the Monument Erected to Mazzini at Genoa.

Italy, mother of the souls of men,
Of all that served thee best with sword or pen,
All sons of thee,

Thou knowest that here the likeness of the best
Of Italy's heroes stands,
The head most high, the heart found faithful,
The purest hands.

Above the fume and foam of time that flies,
The soul we know,
Now sits on high, where Mazzini sits
With Angelo.

Not his own heavenly tongue hath heavenly speech
Enough to say
What this man was, whose praise no thought may
Reach,

No words can weigh.
City's people, that hadst Columbus first
For sovereign lord,
Be prouder that the breast hath later nursed
This mightier one.

Earth shows to heaven the names by thousands told
That crown her fame;
But highest of all that name and earth behold
Mazzini's name.

—*Alfred Charles Seaburne.*

Real Free Trade.

Mr. Benjamin Adams, in a two column communication to the *Charleston, S. C., News and Courier* on free trade, attempts to find out why it is that the protectionists are, many of them, willing to carry their doctrine to the extreme of prohibiting imports, while the so-called free traders are really mere patchers and tinkers who shrink from any proposal to sweep away the protective system. He reaches the same conclusions as those of Mr. George in "Protection or Free Trade," namely, that beyond tariff restrictions there are other restrictions to freedom both of trade and production. These are, he says, monopoly of the resources of nature by private individuals. Abolishing import duties is but offering a stone to the starving workman, he says, whereas real free trade in land and imports would "raise the workman, be he farmer, farm hand, mill operative, storekeeper or clerk, white or black, from the hand-to-mouth poverty of to-day to a condition of ease and plenty."

The Brand of Cain.

"Cain corrupted the simplicity of the manners of former times and substituted fraud and artifice in the place of honesty and plain dealing. He was the original inventor of weight and measures, the builder of the first city in the world, and also 'the first man who divided the common property in the earth by inclosures and landmarks.'" —Josephus, *Antiquities*, book I, chap. II. Translated by Charles S. Clark, D.D. London 1786.

THE SCOTTISH LAND WAR.

Progress of Exterminating Crofters from the Lands of Their Ancestors.

GLASGOW, Scotland, Jan. 22.—All hail to THE STANDARD! May it go onward and upward until the land system which now grinds the souls of the masses is abolished. We in Scotland look to that banner with extreme interest and with dependence arising from the bad habit of relying upon the rich and influential classes. But this dependence, this want of self-reliance, is beginning to give way in the light of the new ideas spreading over Scotland. Mr. Gladstone's home rule bill, by the discussion of great, broad principles which it has induced, has been one of the best possible correctives of this habit of subservience on the part of the masses toward the "better classes." In advance are the crofters, reduced to poverty and misery by exorbitant rents upon their little farms. They thoroughly understand and are acting upon the idea of "no more landlords to parliament." But they can have few direct representatives in parliament, for when the process of their extermination is not going on—the small farms being absorbed into the large ones—the dominant land owning class finds means to sap their influence.

The parochial school system has done much to disseminate knowledge among the people, though, strange as it may appear, the teachers, as a rule, are not in sympathy with the spirit of democracy, but are subservient to, because they are dependent upon, the aristocracy. This comes from the power of appointment being in the hands of the local laird, his factor, some of the larger land holders and the parish minister, who, of course, favor no one inimical to their interests. The result is that in all my travels over this country I have not found half a dozen teachers who in a dispute between a landlord and his tenants, have sided with the latter. One of these rare exceptions was Donald MacRae of Roskeen, in Ross-shire, who, notwithstanding long and tried service, was dismissed for aiding the poor people in their demands for justice. However, in spite of the fact that their teachers are against them, the masses of the people are gaining a great deal from being taught to read and think for themselves, and the movement is going on after a similar fashion in other districts. Lord Macdonald, Col. Fraser, the Duke of Argyll and others, in attempting to crush out the new spirit in their tenants, have not only goaded to further action those they intended to subdue, but awakened to opposition thousands who, but for such measures, would never have revolted.

Perhaps the most notorious land owning tyrants in Scotland are Lord Macdonald, the Duke of Argyll and Col. Fraser. Lord Macdonald owns the Isle of Skye, one of the Hebrides. About twenty years ago occurred what is known as the "Battle of the Braes," which was caused by the landlord's superintendent, the factor, refusing to restore extensive pasturage on one of the hills named Ben Lee. The pasture was let to a large sheep farmer, regardless of the fact that the Braes men were already paying rent for it; and when, after much struggling against adversity, they rose up in revolt against this injustice, a strong body of armed police was brought up from Glasgow to repress them.

The Duke of Argyll, who might well be styled the "Prophet of Consolidation," holds that the remedy for all Highland and island ills is the concentration of land owning, and claims that great increases in rent follow as a consequence of such a course. He owns the Island of Tiree. When he came into possession there was a population of 4,400 souls. He and the potato disease have, according to the last census, reduced the population to 2,730 souls, or about 546 families. In his grand-father's time the rent was about £1,000 a year. According to the valuation roll of our day it is well on to £6,000.

Concentration of the land into large holdings has reduced a large part of the population to direct poverty, and last spring meal was sent by charity to persons from a distance to keep some of the people from starving. Such tyranny on the part of the Duke of Argyll has resulted repeatedly in rebellion, which could only be put down by armed law, and several men are now confined behind bars for what "this grace" is pleased to call "mobbing, rioting and defiance."

Col. Fraser, of Kilmuir, bought an estate for £20,000, and went to work up his rent roll, so that he could sell it at £200,000. In the course of a few years he made three additions to the rent. At last some of the population refused to pay, which refusal was followed by disturbances in the townships of Garulad, Bornekitoavag, Herbuta and other places. A royal commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the crofters has in some cases caused reductions in rent to the amount of thirty, fifty, and even seventy-five per cent., besides wiping out considerable amounts of arrears. But these were exceptional cases. Being for the most part in sympathy with the dominant class the commission did not wish to describe those real changes which alone could do justice to the unhappy crofters.

JOHN MURDOCH.

On the Monument Erected to Mazzini at Genoa.

Italy, mother of the souls of men,
Of all that served

THE WEEK.

At a dinner of the representatives of New York's old Dutch families last week Mr. Willem Waldoor Astor responded to the toast, "William the Silent." Mr. Astor said: "It is a fortunate thing for a country when its great men spring from the people and not from a privileged class." Perhaps then it would be wise for the American people to abolish the privileged class of earth owners which Mr. Astor is so conspicuous a representative, and give the people constituting it a chance to spring into greatness.

Of the 175 present at the dinner 65 had the proof of their ancestry in the prefix "Van" to their names. These descendants of the Dutch emigrants who pre-empted Manhattan island two hundred years ago, drank champagne and ate through nine courses in truly aristocratic style; it is very doubtful, however, if either the eatables or the style would have suited old one-legged Peter Stuyvesant or the various market gardeners who no doubt formed a large percentage of the ancestry of these redoubtable rent-drawers.

The board of estimate and apportionment having somewhat reduced the appropriation at the disposal of the board of education, that body, presided over by a Wall street broker, proposes to economize by cutting down the salaries of the teachers instead of those of professors in the city colleges and of high priced officials who have a political pull. Teachers are wage earners, and the men who constitute a majority of the board of education believe in cutting down wages whenever an opportunity is offered. By the way, it is a not worthy fact that Isaac Bell, one of the leading directors of that plutocratic enemy of labor, the Old Dominion steamship company, and a former crony of Tweed's, is a member of the board of education.

The vigorous resistance of the *Herald* may prove effective, and there is some ground to hope that the present agitation may result in the passage of a bill shortly to be introduced in the interest of the teachers, and which provides: 1. Line promotions of teachers in the order of seniority of appointment as fast as vacancies occur. 2. Salaries of each grade of teacher and principals shall be fixed by law, as in the case of firemen and policemen. 3. When the average attendance of a school diminishes during the year, the board of education shall not turn the teachers into the streets, but shall transfer them to fill vacancies in other parts of the city, with rank and salary as before. 4. Teachers who remain in schools whose attendance has diminished shall not have their salaries reduced.

A choice collection of saviors of society, members of aristocratic clubs, arranged a cock fight of seven battles, which took place last Saturday in a Fifth avenue mansion. Cock fights are prohibited by law, and the promoters of this one showed the regular society-saving respect for law by keeping their amusement and the games of the "gentlemen" engaged in it a secret.

The liability of the elevated railroad for damages for depreciation in the value of real estate, occasioned by the erection of its structure, has been determined by the court of appeals in two cases decided by that court last week. The damages in one case are ten thousand dollars and in the other three thousand eight hundred and forty-one. The fight over the law having been decided against the company, the fight will now probably be renewed over the effort of the plaintiffs to collect their money. If the railroad cannot beat its adversaries on the judgment they will try to on the execution.

Assemblyman Finn has introduced in the legislature of this state a bill prohibiting individuals and corporations from combining to produce artificial scarcity in natural or staple products. The punishment for individuals is to be already prescribed for conspiracy, and for a corporation it is to be the forfeiture of its franchise. Similar laws already exist, and no addition to their number can do any good so long as any political party remains in power that looks to the money of the wealthy men and corporations for its hope of success.

Congress has continued to indulge in buncombe concerning what is called the fisheries dispute. On Friday last week Mr. Frye of Maine read with a great deal of dramatic effect a telegram from Eastport, in that state, announcing that Canadians were fishing in American waters, while American fishermen were vigorously excluded from British waters. "That is all!" exclaimed Frye. On Monday Mr. Hoar of Massachusetts, another politician-fisherman, presented to the senate resolutions relative to the Massachusetts legislature, demanding the retaliatory exclusion of all Canadian products by land or sea. In the house on the same day Mr. Lawler of Illinois introduced resolutions alluding to the belligerent tone of the Canadian press and the report that the British will back up the Dominion government with a fleet, rectifying the defenseless condition of our ports and calling on the president to inform congress what steps, if any, are necessary to meet this emergency. This piece of gasconade was referred.

All of this bluster is simply the outcome of a desire to scare the country into costly and needless war preparations with the threefold object of maintaining the present high tariff, promoting jobbery and giving us what the plutocratic class is fond of calling a strong government. In none of these objects have the workmen, who would be drafted into the army in case of war, any favorable interest. The actual number of American citizens engaged in the fishery business is very small. The chief men concerned are vessel-owners, whose crews are largely made up of Canadians. These vessel owners demand that their boats and those of the Canadians shall fish side by side, enjoying equal opportunities in Canadian waters, but that when the fish come to market, those in Canadian vessels shall pay a high duty, while those in American vessels shall come in free. Canada is eager for a treaty that will give Americans and Canadians absolutely equal rights in British waters and equal rights to sell the fish thus caught in American ports free of duty. The Yankee vessel owners demand the right to raise the price of fish to every consumer in the United States for their own benefit. It is to preserve this privilege to a few vessel owners that men like Frye, Hoar and Lawler would subject our people to all of the horrors of war, and ask the mass of our workmen to sacrifice their lives in defense of the great principle of high priced fish.

The purpose of some of this war talk is plainly disclosed by an associated press dispatch, which, after describing in a model of a gumbat displayed by Cramp, in Philadelphia in the room of the house committee on naval affairs, goes on to say that "some of the members will take advantage of the favorable opportunity afforded by the pendency of the fisheries retaliatory measures to bring before the house one of the bills now in the hands of the naval committee providing for a substantial addition to the navy."

The senate gave some time last week to the consideration of a postal telegraph bill. Mr. Wilson of Iowa submitted a substitute for the Edmunds bill. It will be remarkable indeed if either Wilson or Edmunds shall frame, and the senate pass any bill that does not guard against the interests of the existing telegraph companies.

It is well, however, that the subject should be kept before the public mind.

The senate has again rejected the nomination of Mr. Matthews for receiver of deeds in the District of Columbia. The rejection was due to the votes of democrats who do not think that negroes ought to have any political rights, and to republicans who think his possession of such rights ought to be made dependent on his continued support of the republican party. Mr. Hoar, the fat and fussy little senator from Massachusetts, has proposed an official inquiry into the right of the president to reappoint a man who has been rejected by the senate. On the other hand, the pastors of twenty-one colored churches, with Bishop John V. Brown at their head, have protested against the discrimination by republican senators against a man solely on account of color.

Senator Beck's Scotch blood is up on account of the treatment accorded to his bill to forbid congressmen from acting as attorneys for land grant railroads. The conduct forbidden is so reprehensible that no right thinking man would think of permitting it; but so many senators are thus engaged that thus far the bill has had no chance. On Friday of last week it was made the unfinished business for the following day. On Saturday it was discussed and then by a motion of Mr. Best of Missouri it lost its place on the calendar. Senator Beck was angry, and declared that he would move every day to take it up until he got a vote on it, and he was so persistent about it that he got it back to its place on the calendar. On Monday Mr. McKee of Arkansas submitted a similar bill in the house, and asked for its immediate consideration, but Mr. Parker from New York objected and it went over.

The river and harbor bill, bristling with jobs and extravagance, has passed the house of representatives. Several of the appropriation bills are well advanced, and the disposition seems to be to spend money freely in everything, and to do anything rather than leave the people to apply their money to their own uses instead of taking it from them by taxation to spend it in jobs.

The house judiciary committee has reported adversely a proposed amendment to the constitution providing for the election of United States senators by the people of each state, instead of by the legislature. Despite the adverse report Mr. Weaver of Iowa got the joint resolution placed on the calendar, where it will, however, remain indefinitely.

Slow as congress moves in matters that concern the whole people, both houses managed to pass, with indifferent haste, a bill giving away the streets of Washington to a cable railway company that is backed by a pool of real estate speculators, in which many congressmen are pecuniarily interested.

The senate passed on Monday a resolution introduced by Mr. Van Wyck of Nebraska, instructing the secretary of the treasury to report whether or not any national banks are loaning money on condition that it shall be repaid in gold.

On the same day a joint resolution was introduced in the house by Mr. Crain of Texas, proposing constitutional amendments changing inauguration day from the 4th of March to the first Monday in April, and providing that the fifty-first congress (that elected last fall) shall terminate on Dec. 31, 1888, and that the fifty-first congress shall begin its session on the 1st of January, 1889. The last named amendment ought to be adopted. The house of representatives now in session was elected in 1884. That chosen in 1886 will not meet until next December. Such an arrangement is preposterous. The same reasons that demand this change are equally potent, however, against the other amendment. The processes of electing a president need to be shortened, so that the new president shall come in with the new congress as soon as practicable after their choice by the voters.

The conference committee on the bill repealing the pre-emption and timber culture law and amending the homestead law have been unable to agree, because the house members declare, the senate conferees are acting in bad faith and do not wish to compromise the differences. The measure is essentially a prohibition of the acquisition of public land by any but actual settlers, and by them not in excess of 160 acres per family. Another meeting of the conferees is provided for in a few days. The senate, a stronghold of monopoly, will kill every such bill whenever it dares to do so. If it could only deal with them in its favorite secret session there would be no more of such measures passed.

Secretary Manning will soon retire from the treasury to take the presidency of the new Western national bank just organized in this city. It is astonishing how rapidly the treasury educates men into bankers. Mr. Manning might have lived in Albany a century without being called to New York city to become the head of a great bank institution. Mr. Manning differs from John Sherman in leaving the treasury before beginning his career as New York banker. It is said that the new institution will pay Mr. Manning \$30,000 a year for serving it alone, whereas the United States only paid him \$8,000 a year for serving all of the national banks as secretary of the treasury.

The prolonged senatorial struggle in Texas ended on Tuesday in the nomination of J. Reagan in the thirty-second ballot, in the democratic caucus, and this assured his election. The railway influence did all in its power to defeat Mr. Reagan, and his election is an evidence that the people are still more than a match for monopoly in Texas.

The long wrangle over the United States senatorship in New Jersey continues, and both parties are resorting to reckless and even revolutionary tactics in order to win success. When a big office is in view the respect of the political saviors of society for law and order loses all restraining power.

The bitter fight in Indiana ended on Wednesday in the election of David Turpie, the democratic caucus candidate. Mr. Robinson, the cratie caucus backer, voted for Turpie and republican greenbackers voted for Harrison. The vote stood 76 to 74. Speaker Sayre of the house declared that there had been no election, and President Smith of the senate announced the election of Turpie. It is understood that the republicans will hold a joint convention of their own, vote for Harrison, and try to get the United States senate to admit him.

The senatorial contest in West Virginia promises to be a stubborn one. Thirty-eight democratic members have pledged themselves to stand by Senator Camden, the Standard oil and railroad candidate, to the end. Nine other democrats have pledged themselves never to vote for Camden. The republicans stick to Wilkey; but Goff, another monopolist adherent, is their real choice. The greenbackers, who have several members, stick to Burdette. It is said that the railroads are prepared, in case of need, to deliver several republican votes for them to Camden, rather than permit the election of any anti-monopoly candidate.

A bill has been introduced in the Pennsylvania legislature providing for a state railway commission, modeled on that provided for by the interstate commerce bill. Unless the bill is satisfactory to the railroad it will have a poor chance of passing the Pennsylvania legislature.

week a member read a dispatch, dated Washington, Jan. 26, giving the text of a letter addressed to the president, signed by Ralph Beaumont, John J. McCartney and James Campbell, claiming to be the "national legislative committee Knights of Labor," opposing the interstate commerce bill, and requesting President Cleveland to veto it. Mr. Dixon of Cook county, leader of the labor party in the house, "branded the letter as a farce," and said "it had been promulgated in the interest of monopolies." Another labor representative thought that Mr. Dixon was mistaken. Whether he was or not, it is very unwise for any committee to declare in the name of the working people opposition to the first serious attempt, however imperfect it may be in detail, to subject the railways to legislative control.

Justice Bradley has ordered the discharge of Oscar T. Baldwin, who robbed the Mechanics' bank of Newark, N. J., of \$250,000. One of the grounds of the decision that the sentence of Judge Nixon was illegal is that it imposed hard labor, whereas imprisonment was alone provided for. This is the galling grievance of Baldwin, and his threatened suit for damages because he was compelled to work is now in order. The brutality of compelling a gentleman who stole a quarter of a million to work like a common laborer who never stole anything, infuriates Baldwin and his numerous lie friends.

The tendency of the police to interfere with free speech was again illustrated by Detective Grissell, at Buffalo, who informed Mrs. Parsons that "The police had concluded not to allow her to speak." The woman was not intimidated, however, and as the detective thought better of his threat the speech went on.

At a meeting of the barbed-wire pool in Chicago last week, a general advance in prices of from five to ten per cent. was agreed upon to take effect immediately. The pool has been gradually strengthening itself for four years and now controls the market. A combination with the Smooth Wire association is about being made, and "overproduction" in either sort will be avoided.

The queen's speech at the opening of parliament last week fell flat, and gave no information that the public had not received long before.

Lord Randolph Churchill relieved the monotony of the opening proceedings, however, by a declaration that he had resigned from the cabinet because of the extravagance of the war and navy estimates, and also because of the government's needless interference in the affairs of other nations. This statement was loudly cheered by the liberals.

Opinions naturally differ as to the effect of Churchill's performance, but there are indications of a disposition on the part of the younger Tories to flock about him, and that the old fogies begin to fear him is shown by the fact that the *St. James Gazette* denounces him as an unprincipled politician, who is playing his own game without regard to the interests of his party.

About the only definite programme announced by the government is a plan for cutting of debate and preventing anticipated obstruction by Irish members through the invention of a more effective gag law.

The negotiations for a reunion of the liberal party do not appear to have accomplished much thus far, and the defeat of Goschen has so encouraged some of the more radical Gladstonites that they oppose any further efforts at reconciliation.

How reconciliation is possible between true liberals and those led by Chamberlain is difficult to see at this distance. Chamberlain made a speech at Birmingham last Saturday night, in the course of which he justified the secession of the unionists, declared that they were increasing in numbers, and that there were limits to their concessions. He said he would not submit to terms dictated by a portion of the Irish representatives in parliament, nor to a minority party representing an anti-English conspiracy. The whole tone of the speech indicates that Chamberlain's idea of conciliation is that Gladstone shall surrender to him on the Irish question. Mr. Chamberlain bitterly denounces "the plan of campaign."

Evictions continue in Ireland and the usual brutality characterizes the conduct of the bailiffs and the police. In several instances serious riots have been threatened. A surprising incident is the writing of a letter by the mother of Clifford Lloyd, expressing her sympathy for the tenants evicted at Glenbeigh. When Mr. Lloyd was special magistrate under Lord Spencer he was noted for the savage severity with which he enforced the laws against the tenantry.

Belfast indulged in another of its customary disgraceful riots on last Saturday night. The soldiers of the West Surrey regiment insulted a number of Catholics, and the latter retaliated with stones, disabling many of the soldiers. Numerous arrests were made.

On the arrival of the steamship Alaska at Queenstown on Tuesday, Michael Davitt was met by the mayor of Cork and a deputation from the Irish national league. He was escorted to Cork, where he was received with enthusiasm by the people and given a banquet by the municipal council. The Cork council, by the way, has in response to a request by the Prince of Wales for subscriptions to the queen's jubilee, replied that it would be more appropriate for his royal highness to send relief to the Irish people in distress.

Germany and France are still watching each other and steadily preparing for the fight that each of them professes a desire to avoid. France is gathering military supplies and German drilling the reserves. On Tuesday Emperor William said to the president of the Prussian landtag: "Once before we had to dissolve the reichstag owing to its refusal to vote an army bill, and then the differences between the government and the parliamentary majority were only brought to an end by a foreign war."

The Frankfurt *Gazette* publishes a special dispatch from Rome, saying that the Vatican is surprised at the assertions of the organs of the Prussian government relative to the attitude of the pope. Prince Bismarck, the dispatch says, promised the pope the complete abrogation of the May laws in return for the Vatican's influencing the center party to vote for the septennate. To this proposition the pope responded that he was unable to interfere, but that he had caused the leaders of the Catholics to know that he would be pleased if the members of the center found voting for the septennate consistent with their political duty. The Germans appear to accept this astounding interference in their domestic affairs as quietly as do the daily newspapers of this city.

The Italian troops have met with a severe disaster in the Sudan, and instead of recalling them the chamber of deputies has voted the government \$1,000,000 to send them reinforcements. The radicals proposed returning from the ill-fated enterprise, but they were howled down by the majority.

Among THE STANDARD'S exchanges is the Walla Walla *Weekly Watchman* of Walla Walla, Walla Walla county, Washington territory. Well, we won't weary well wishers wilfully with w's, as an ample alphabet allows another alternative.

ANSWERS TO QUERIES.

An Inquiring Vermonter.

WESTMINSTER, VT., Jan. 25.—I am reading "Progress and Poverty" for the third time and want an explanation of one or two points. In Chapter I. of Book X. it is stated that the device of "placing all taxes on the value of land would be in effect putting up the land at auction to whoever would pay the highest rent to the state." Suppose I pay ten dollars rent for the land on which my "hovel" stands and you do the same, but next year you build a house at a cost of three thousand dollars. The following year I offer one hundred and ninety dollars rent for your land, and I can afford to, for you cannot remove the house, and you must bid over me or lose the use of your land and incidentally the improvements on it. Could all improvements be taken up and removed to another place without cost it would be different. Here is a farm worth about three thousand dollars. The improvements have cost probably eight thousand dollars. What rent should be paid on it? Suppose some "board" appraises the rental values; then a man must pay any rent they say or abandon his property, for the next man can afford to pay rent equal to the amount of the land and improvement rental. This, in effect, is taxing all property its full rental value, save such as can be put on wheels or aloft. Why not tax bodies of water as well as land? All the water power of the Connecticut river is in private hands.

W. H. BLANCHARD.

You are misled by confusing land with real estate. It is not both the house and the land that would go to the highest bidder, but the land alone. After buying land, if it were put up at auction for the benefit of the state, you would still be obliged to pay the owner of improvements for them. It is, therefore, not necessary to the plan that improvements should be capable of immediate removal. A farm worth \$3,000, the improvements of which alone are worth \$8,000, is not supposable. It is probable enough that the improvements cost that much and have deteriorated in value since. It is also possible that it would now cost that much to replace them, and when replaced that they would be worth far less than the cost, on account of poor situation. A grand hotel, erected in a swamp for example, would not be worth more than the value of old materials. The ground rent of such a farm, however, or indeed of any farm, could be easily ascertained by determining the value of the adjoining highway, on the assumption that there was enough of it for a farm. Your fear about unfair appraisements is not well grounded. Anything of that kind would soon correct itself. If too high, they would be subject to review; if too low, the community would interfere.

Why not tax bodies of water as well as land? Why, that is involved in the proposition, which is simply this, that the value of all natural advantages privately appropriated shall be taxed for public benefit. If you read again the passage you quote, you will see that it is introduced as an illustration of the way a land value tax would bring vacant land into use. "Progress and Poverty" does not advocate the sale of land at auction for the benefit of the state; it advocates a tax laid solely on land values, so as to take for public use that value of natural opportunities which demand for them creates, and to throw open those natural opportunities which are not in demand for present use, but are kept idle on speculation.

Land Reform the Key to Independence.

NEWARK, N. J., Jan. 31.—The *Leader*, the workingmen's organ of New York, says that "The ownership of their own homes by many of the striking coal handlers at Bergen Point is the mainstay of their ability to continue their strike. Is not this inconsistent with the idea that land should not be privately owned?"

L. E. T.

No. It is in perfect harmony with that idea. Those strikers who own their own homes are independent, because there is a part of the earth on which they can rest the soles of their feet without somebody else's permission. If every workingman was similarly situated, a strike would be irresistible if once begun. But none would be begun. It would be a case of Captain Scott and the coon.

Under the existing system of land tenures very few workingmen can have homes. As population increases at any point, land values there rise above the ability of workingmen to buy. But if private property in land were done away with, every one could have a home. As the independence of the land-owning strikers in New Jersey is, so, many times multiplied, would be the strength of all workingmen, if land values were taxed so high as to open up all unused land to any one who wanted to use it.

The car-drivers' strike last summer could have been won if the idle land of this city had been open to occupancy. The strikers then would have had no fear of being turned upon the street for lack of rent money, for a few hundred tents would have sheltered them till cold weather. As it was, although one third of Manhattan island is vacant, there was no place upon which the car-drivers could have pitched a tent without trespassing.

It is not the greed of employers that makes all strikes difficult, and so many of them failures, but the greed of employers pressing in one direction and that of landlords pressing in the other. The employers flat, "Work for twenty cents an hour or get no wages at all," meets that of the landlord, "Pay rent or quit!" and, between the two, workmen are crushed like grains of corn between the upper and nether millstones. Employers would be impotent if workmen could locate upon the nearest idle land.

It is not ownership of land that makes land animals independent of each other, but right of occupancy. He to whom that right is denied is not free, and private ownership operates to deny it to an increasing multitude. Put an end to private ownership by taxing land values to death and the right of occupancy in all, and with it personal independence, will revive.

Land and Cattle.

NEW YORK.—Will not the arguments against private property in land, which I admit are very forcible, apply in the case of private property in cattle?—A READER OF THE STANDARD.

[Certainly not. It is evident that you have not read those arguments with sufficient attention to know whether they are forcible; else you would not ask so foolish a question.]

Land is limited; cattle may be multiplied indefinitely. Land is essential to human life; cattle are not. Cattle would disappear from civilization but for human labor; while the surface of the earth and all it contains would be the same if human labor ceased.

Cattle are as much products of labor as linen cloth. The natural forces necessary to labor reside in the soil; if that be devoted by labor to the cultivation of flax, the product may be linen; if to grass it may be cattle. If to flax it tends to diminish the supply of cattle; if to grass the supply of linen.

Literally, human labor makes nothing. It directs and shapes, but does not create. It

produces cattle by the thousand herds when it devotes land to raising cattle; wheat beyond measure when it devotes land to raising wheat; lumber, iron, coal, clothing, when it resorts to land for those things. It can exterminate cattle by neglecting to breed and nurture them, as it can exterminate plows by neglecting to make them. And it is no more true of food and clothing than it is of cows and horses, that the continuing supply is due to human industry.

But not so of land. That is the source of everything we enjoy. It cannot be diminished by neglect or increased by industry. Its private appropriation limits opportunities to produce; but the private appropriation of products, whether cattle or something else, does not, so long as land is available. If one man owned all land nobody could keep cattle without his permission, but if one man owned all cattle, land being free, the cattle monopoly would soon end.]

PRESS OPINIONS.

What a blessing our tariff is—not alone to those who are "protected" by it—but also to customhouse officials and all the dead beats and hangers on of that government almshouse, as shown by the mere cost of collecting all that boodle. The secretary of the treasury estimates that little expense bill for the next fiscal year to be a trifle over six and a half million of dollars. There was considerably more sense in the famed Chinese wall than there is in our tariff.—[Burlington, Ia., Justice.]

The coal handlers think they should have more money for unloading boats and cars, so they form a pool and say, "No more boats and cars shall be unloaded until we receive what we demand." They are simply fighting their employers with their own weapons. They will probably not be so successful, because they lack the power, which the latter possess, for enforcing their decrees as to prices. But there will be little sympathy wasted on the coal poolers who refuse to share with those who mine and handle the coal the tax which they levy upon consumers.—[Reading, Penn., Herald.]

No private individual or company should be suffered to take the law into his own hands and organize an independent army of his own by employing a number of Pinkerton's private detectives to shoot down strikers. For any man or any company to undertake to go to war on his own responsibility is an insult to the spirit of our government and an outrage upon democratic principles. The peace must be preserved by lawful authority, not by bands of armed men directed by private individuals.—[Richmond, Va., State.]

It is true, we believe, that the Pinkerton men are usually sworn in as special peace officers. But experience shows that they do not act under that same feeling of responsibility and accountability to the law that is felt by regularly elected peace officers. They are hired men with the hired man's feeling of accountability to the party that pays their wages. They have less anxiety to preserve the peace than to serve the interests of their employers.—[Toledo Commercial.]

The tariff is what is called a "blind tax," by which the people are taxed for the benefit of monopolists without realizing that they are taxed. When a poor man buys a dollar's worth of woolen goods at current prices he gets really, as an average, about 40 cents in goods and pays 60 cents tax. The bulk of this money does not go to support the government, but three-fourths to four-fifths of it goes to foster corporate and individual enterprises thus favored by a false and corrupt system of legislation. Do you wonder that your wives and children are poorly clad and scantily fed when the bulk of your earnings are demanded for "blind taxes" to be appropriated to building up colossal manufacturing and other favored industries fostered by partial and unjust legislation.—[Alvarado, Tex., Signal.]

That public opinion has become aroused over the dangerous innovation by which hired mercenaries are brought into this and other states for the alleged protection of private interests, is amply proved by the introduction on Monday last of three separate bills, in the state assembly, each designed to put a check on this growing abuse.—[Newark, N. J., Evening News.]

It makes considerable difference where warlike demonstrations are made. A speech like that of Ingalls in any European parliament would have lighted the beacon fires on every hill in five empires. Here in America it causes a passing wonder what the gentleman ate for supper the night before.—[Chicago Herald.]

There are lobbies enough in Washington, and there is no need that the Knights of Labor should swell their number. Evil communications corrupt good manners, according to the old proverbs, and habitual intercourse with the lobby in Washington might corrupt the most virtuous of knights. John Barrett went to Washington as a representative of labor, and he became the lobbyist of the Tin Plate association.—[Philadelphia Record.]

The employment of children at confining or arduous labor should be permanently forbidden, and the most stringent legislation should be enacted to prevent parents from evading the law.—[St. Paul Globe.]

The adoption of the Georgian system of taxing lands on their unimproved or ground rent value, and of exempting improvements from taxation, would break up forever the land monopoly system which has brought Ireland and Scotland to the very verge of revolution, and which is making such rapid progress in this country as to frighten all thinking men.—[Grand Rapids, Mich., Workman.]

Protection begets monopoly and monopoly destroys competition, and so the consumer must suffer. Will any protectionists deny this proposition?—[Dayton (Ohio) Democrat.]

Ideas do not die in their beds. They are shot down in the streets, tortured at the rack, burnt at the stake and crucified on the cross, and the more they are slaughtered the more they live. Like human souls, their immortal work begins with death.—[Chicago Express.]

A New Election Law.

In the Michigan legislature there has been presented a bill to "preserve the purity of elections." Under it the state, county or city will provide all ballots, and the names of all candidates for state offices will be printed on a white slip, those for county office on a blue slip, and those for city offices on a pink slip. On election day the inspectors of each election district will have a requisite number of slips. The voter asks for one, takes it into a private apartment, and proceeds to punch a hole with a punch provided for the purpose opposite the name of each person for whom he desires to vote.

The inspectors are sworn to secrecy, and this system of balloting is expected to guarantee as near as may be purity of elections and the abolition of bribery. The proposal that correspondingly colored tickets and boxes shall be provided appears to be the chief difference between this plan and that originating in Australia and since adopted in England.

It Points to Poverty.

The American *Israelite* thinks it an ominous sign that a large number of young Israelites who were born in France, but who have been residents of the United States for some time, are going back to the country of their birth to enter the army, in many cases at the request of their parents. The *Israelite* thinks that this points to war. It is much more unerringly points to the fact that it is constantly becoming more difficult for willing men to earn a living in America.

Dr. Edward McGlynn.
Soggarth most noble,
Soother of trouble,
Brave as the bravest of martyrs of old!
Eloquent preacher,
Truth's fervent teacher,
Shepherd most faithful of Christ's holy fold!
Loved as none other,
To true men a brother,
Haer of tyranny the wide world o'er!
Search this planet all round,
Thy peer can't be found,
Humanity's advocate, Soggarth Ashore!

Friend of the lowly,
Priest, monk and holy,
Type of apostles of ages ago,
Dauntless and fearless,
In charity peerless,
No stain on thy vesture, 'tis white as the snow,
O! fond thou'rt enshrined
In the heart and the mind
Of the thousands who know and cherish thy worth;

And thy name and thy fame
Shall be hailed with acclaim
While liberty lives and illumines the earth!
—J. Ryan.

The McGlynn Testimonial.

The publisher of THE STANDARD acknowledges the receipt of the following sums for the fund for Dr. McGlynn:

J. P. Roche, Post office, Boston.....	\$1.00
A. M. McGlynn, Birmingham, Conn.....	1.00
Martin T. Kelly, New York City.....	1.00
W. M. Rapsher, March, Conn.....	1.00
"A Park Policeman," New York.....	2.00
Mark W. Cross, Boston.....	5.00
Wm. Hackett, Boston.....	5.00
"A Priest of the Amovable Class".....	10.00
M. F. McQueney, Nashua, N. H.....	10.00
"An Italian Catholic".....	1.00
A. M. Molina, New York.....	3.00
E. C. Leubuscher, New York.....	1.00
J. B. Carroll, Springfield, Ohio.....	5.00
By Robert Fyne, Hartford, Conn.....	5.00
Robert Fyne.....	\$1.00
Herbert C. Fisher.....	1.00
Henry Meyer.....	1.00
Dr. Thomas Smith.....	1.00
Frank E. Cleveland.....	1.00
Miles Mohrman.....	50
Fred. H. Smith.....	50
James A. McGlynn.....	50
George C. McLean.....	50
George Schaubles.....	50
Joseph A. Green.....	50
"A Poor Agnostic".....	1.00
Leonidas.....	1.00
Thomas Murdoch.....	1.00
T. O.....	2.00
P. T.....	1.00
Previously acknowledged.....	\$36.00
Total.....	\$87.00

From a Catholic Working Woman.

Birmingham, Conn., Jan. 26.
Henry George—Dear Sir: As a subscriber to your fearless and truthful paper, permit me to add a trifle to the McGlynn fund. I am only a working woman, but while I can use my hands to earn a dollar a day, I can also have thirty-three cents. It is a great pity Catholics are such moral cowards, inside the church as well as outside. If they were all as brave as the rank and file would make Rome sick. God speed The Standard and bless the standard-bearer, that earnest of America. A MCGLYNN CATHOLIC.

From a District Attorney.

District Attorney's Office,
March 26, Penn., Jan. 26.
Henry George—Dear Sir: Please find enclosed \$1, my note toward the McGlynn Testimonial fund. Every citizen of the republic who believes in free thought and free speech in American politics, will contribute such a mite, then Dr. McGlynn, "the first martyr of the new era," will be an earnest and worthy ally. Let this be done. It will emphasize the cause of labor all over the world and mark with indelible grandeur a new epoch in history. Furthermore, such a manifestation of gratitude toward the man who has so bravely caused in this country will give renewed encouragement to Michael Davitt and his supporters in the land league movement in the old world. W. M. RAPHER.

From a Catholic Priest.

Please find enclosed \$10 for the Dr. McGlynn fund. Your distinction between the church and the men in the church is solid and theological. In every age of the church the same distinction has been made. Pope Gregory VII stirred up the people in his day against the priests and bishops. It is a natural feeling of the people that he took a prominent part in politics and to the discussion of a purely ecclesiastical question such as taxing the land. Dr. McGlynn's affair will have one good effect. The great majority of the Catholic priests have been stigmatized with the term "amovable" by the late timid council of Baltimore, can console themselves with the fact that the authorities in the American church are of the same timid and conservative leaning church of the metropolis, who have proved themselves to be very "small potatoes" indeed. Honors coming from such men may be treated with indifference. A PRIEST OF THE "AMOVABLE CLASS."

BOSTON AWAKENING.

Land and Labor Discussed Before a Large Audience by Mr. W. W. W. W.

T. B. Wakeman, a member of the New York bar, addressed a meeting on Sunday evening in Boston, and was greeted with an enthusiasm that shows that Boston workmen are beginning to wake from the apathy that characterized them during the recent mayoralty contest there.

The Boston Globe says that the meeting was one of the most remarkable in the history of the labor movement in Boston. The hall was densely packed, and the audience, which included many women, was so well dressed that the Globe reporter concluded that they must belong to the "middle class." This shows that it was just such an audience as were those assembled in Cooper Institute and Chickering hall in this city during the mayoralty campaign here.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. E. M. Chamberlain, who made a successful appeal for contributions to continue the course of free lectures on the labor question. He introduced Mr. Wakeman as coming from New York, the center of the present conflict between employer and employee, and also as one who had taken a prominent part in the recent uprising of labor in this city, "that was the wonder of the civilized world."

Mr. Wakeman was received with long-continued applause, which in his opening remarks he attributed to the fact that he was just from the seat of war.

"Labor today holds the great city of New York in a state of siege. Whether that movement will be successful or not, we know that there is sufficient strength behind it to give it at any rate a certainty of temporary success which will be a lesson to those who control the country to-day. There have been two great struggles in this country hitherto—the war of the revolution and that of the rebellion. The first was successful in breaking the monopoly of political power enjoyed by George Washington, and the second was successful in breaking the monopoly of political power enjoyed by the whole people. The result was the means of extending that political equality to all the people, black as well as white. Just as political power has passed into the hands of the people, so will the industrial power pass into the hands of the people, and out of the hands of the monopolists we hope. Our present contest is between the wage-worker and the monopolist. As Henry George has well said, it is the opening of the campaign against poverty. The Knights of Labor is the great organization, greater than either of the two old political organizations which has so far been mainly instrumental in bringing the contest up to its present status. On them will devolve in a measure its future work. The present strike in New York is something unknown heretofore in its immensity as affecting the commerce of that city. It shows clearer than anything else what can be done by united labor. I have heard, as the previous speaker has stated, that the coal miners have decided to strike to aid their fellow laborers in New York. If this is done, the coal famine will be completed to make terms with their slaves."

"Strikes and boycotts are all well enough, but there is one inherent weakness to them; they do not go far enough. There is another side of the question not enough considered. Supposing that some of the strikes are successful, the effect is to reduce still further the number of capitalists engaged in production; and if wages are increased they naturally go into the savings banks, which lean the money thus accumulated out to these capitalists. The workmen receive about three per cent on their deposit, while the capitalist makes in conceivably higher. There is over \$800,000,000 deposited in the savings banks of this country, which is more than is put into all the state and national banks of the land. The workman is the real capitalist; but he foolishly puts this enormous power, this butt end of the whip, into the hands of the monopolists. In production the wage worker receives only one-half the value of his product, while the capitalist, perhaps operating on the workingman's capital, receives the other half. This must not be. Wage workers must become the law makers of this country in order to wipe this out. [Great applause.] We must agree to come together or we must be slaves. [Applause.] In New York this feeling caused a number of men to rally around Henry George and ask him to lead them."

"Every class interested in the working people came to these meetings. The free thinker sat alongside the priest, and the rich merchant by the side of the poor laborer. The laborer there displayed sprang forward into light. The 68,000 votes they cast have formed the basis of a permanent organization, with every prospect of success in every assembly district of New York. It is as well organized now as the democratic or republican party, and has a thorough going boss. Who is John McLaughlin? [Applause.] I call him the boss because he is the central figure of the central committee, and does as he is directed, which is what I call a boss. Mr. Wakeman explained the principles of the new party. He was listened to with close attention and frequently interrupted by applause. An incidental allusion to Dr. McGlynn elicited cheers. At the conclusion of Mr. Wakeman's address, resolutions were adopted calling on the government to take possession of the coal mines and administer them in the interest of producers and consumers, declaring that the strike of the freight and coal handlers in this city is just, and promising sympathy and whatever material support those comprising the meeting could afford. Protests were also made against the employment of Pinkerton detectives."

The Philadelphia Campaign.

The political situation at Philadelphia at the time of the entrance of the workmen into politics is peculiar. Owing to a large increase in the powers of the office of mayor under the new city charter, the election is regarded as one of vast importance. The dominant party, the republicans, have accepted a "highly respectable" savior of society at the hands of the bosses and many other republicans of the same class are disappointed. These disgruntled ones and the federal officeholders, all of whom appear to have been appointed by a civil service reform administration to meet Sam Randall's, hunger for the spoils, have engaged in a futile dalliance with a view to nominating candidates for the democratic party. Finally, the democratic conventions met and nominated candidates, who promptly declined. Others have since been chosen, but the party enters the field without the ghost of a hope of success. This condition of affairs would help the united labor ticket if it were not for the fact that so large a number of the Philadelphia workmen are still under the strange delusion that they are doing something for themselves in voting for the high tariff policy of their bosses.

The devoted leaders of the labor party are, however, doing excellent work and forming at least the nucleus of Pennsylvania's contingent in that party of the future, which will soon come to the front. At a mass meeting on Monday evening Thomas Phillips, the candidate of the party for mayor, said that the men who control wealth have got things fixed so that the profits of labor are running into their hands, and to stop this tendency radical thought is necessary; this conservative, surface-dimming nonsense will not do. The people must go back to those principles of Thomas Jefferson. They must do their own thinking and read the writings of men who are considering these great questions. There must be solid thought. The dangerous man

is he who does not think, but is content to follow band leaders and party leaders, and let somebody else do his thinking for him. Such people, he thought, are to be considered as a dangerous class. The labor party desires to stir up the brains of the American people, and he insisted on this educational feature of their purposes. He saw danger coming in the enormous power of aggregated wealth and in the ease with which it is securing legislation, and he wanted to arouse the people. He did not want to take from the rich to give to the poor, but he desired equality of rights, every citizen to have an equal say and be protected in the possession of the fruits of his toil. Speeches followed by Charles S. Keyser, the party's candidate for city solicitor, and by Capt. E. M. Lester. Resolutions were adopted declaring that both the republican and democratic parties have lost their usefulness, and pledging the support of the meeting to the candidates of the united labor party.

Thomas Phillips, the candidate for mayor, was born in England in 1837. He learned the trade of a shoemaker and began work when he was thirteen years of age, and was a union man, possessed of a traveling card when but fifteen years old. He is a son of temperance, and was a republican from the organization of that party until, as he says, he "found it deserting its original labor stand." He was one of the first shoemakers to join the Knights of Labor. When that order arranged to have a column of labor news printed in the *Public Record*, Mr. Phillips was selected as editor of the column. He has also written articles on co-operation for numerous publications.

J. George Frank, the candidate for receiver of taxes, is master workman of Cigar makers' local assembly No. 53, Knights of Labor, and has been recording and financial secretary of his assembly. He was born in Baltimore in 1861.

Charles S. Keyser, candidate for city solicitor, was born in Philadelphia in 1828, and his ancestors came to this city with William Penn. He has always been an independent in politics, and has been a candidate of the greenback party, and has for years been greatly interested in the labor question.

Louis A. Ross, the candidate for magistrate, was born in Lancaster, Penn., in 1843, and has lived in Philadelphia since he was eighteen years old. He served in the Union army during the war, and is now a street car driver on the Thirteenth and Fifteenth street line. He is a Knight of Labor, and was chief marshal of the great parade of that order last October, to receive the delegates returning from Richmond.

New York.

During last Friday night's session of the New York county committee of the united labor party eight members (one-half) of the delegation from the Sixteenth assembly district withdrew. They had been offended, they thought, and went out to cool off. Next morning three of the partisan newspapers stated that "the entire delegation" from the Sixteenth had bolted the committee. The *Sun* made the point against the labor party in its smart way by displaying headlines and by saying significantly that the Sixteenth had polled 3,300 votes for the labor candidate last fall. The promptness with which the incident was noted and exaggerated may be taken by the members of the labor party county general committee as a notification that the old party press has its forge hammers ready to break up the committee itself on the occurrence of any serious untoward event.

Chicago.

The managers of the united labor party in Chicago are busy with the preliminary work of a campaign. For the mayoralty Judge Barnum, Judge Prendergast and Capt. Daniel Gleason each have a large following. Interviews with labor leaders printed in the *Chicago Herald* of last Saturday make it evident that Carter Harrison has not the ghost of a chance as a candidate with the new party. Newspaper gossip about his aspirations to be a standard bearer for the labor party simply created amusement among the crowds at labor headquarters.

The Labor Party in Canada.

Will the labor voters stand by the labor candidates? asks the *Toronto Evening Telegram*, the question implying a doubt as to the success of the labor candidates for the Dominion parliament. The Toronto candidate for the provincial legislature polled a large vote, but the confidence that there is a fighting chance for success comes to the worker only after he has surprised himself by doing something apparently impossible. The *Telegram* believes that the workmen of Canada must fight for themselves and not for the regular parties.

How Congress Makes Communists of Us All.

New York Herald, Jan. 28.

The house of representatives finds it impossible to agree upon a measure to reduce the people's taxes, though the surplus revenue forced from the people's pockets amounts to a hundred millions or more per annum.

But when a private corporation asks the house to give it the free use of thirty-two miles of Washington streets for cable roads this measure is put through under whip and spur; no "rules" seem to stand in its way, and a great majority agrees even to meet an hour earlier than usual to get to a vote, and then passes the bill.

THE PUBLIC BE D—D.

In the senate Mr. Beck last session introduced a bill prohibiting members of either house from acting as attorneys for corporations which had an interest against the government. The judiciary committee had the indecency to change this perfectly proper and necessary bill so as to make it ridiculous. Debate on it was put off on various pretexts, last session. Mr. Beck, with honest obstinacy, has asked its consideration several times this session; but the senate has always been very eager to get first to some other business. Yesterday, at last, all senatorial excuses and expedients were exhausted and the senate was forced to take up Mr. Beck's measure.

THE PUBLIC BE D—D.

As to the action of the house, we suppose the explanation to be this: There has been going on for some years a tremendous real estate speculation in Washington. A great number of members of congress have become interested in Washington lots. Thirty-two miles of cable road, it is thought, will add to the value of outlying real estate; hence the haste and eagerness to give this scheme the free use of Washington's streets, for one-half of which the whole country has paid.

THE PUBLIC BE D—D.

As to the senate, the corporation attorney power in the senate judiciary committee was great enough to get a Pacific railroad funding bill reported which would have enabled these corporations to take twenty-five millions out of the treasury by merely borrowing enough to pay their legitimate debt to the government.

THE PUBLIC BE D—D.

The shifts and devices to which senators have resorted for many months to put off, and if possible, to kill Senator Beck's honest proposition speak for themselves, and are the strongest argument for the bill. We shall watch curiously the treatment of the cable road scheme by the senate. That body has a good many bills of great public importance in

its hands, which it pushed over on different pretexts last session and has not peeped about at this session. Will it, also, like the house, push everything else aside and put through this cable scheme?

There is a great howl about communism and anarchy in these days. Mr. Hewitt and some other foolish New Yorkers last November tried to scare people about Henry George as an anarchist. The attitude of congress toward public questions, we take leave to tell senators and representatives, does more toward anarchy in the world to spread that feeling of hopelessness and contempt for constituted authorities among the people which gives agitators their lever. The labor organizations of the country are not always wise, but if both houses of congress continue to neglect and oppose public interests and further protect corporation and their own personal fortunes they will greatly hasten the day when the Knights of Labor, the labor unions and the grangers will pull together.

When they do there will be a change.

WOMAN'S WRONGS.

The Attitude of United Labor on Woman Suffrage Commended.

There is no one who more admires the brave fight *THE STANDARD* is making for the uplifting of the people than myself. The stand, Mr. Editor, that you have taken in the McGlynn matter is just and true; the papers that try so hard to have it appear that you are fighting the Catholic religion do so in the hope to incite Catholics against you. Protestant papers do this not because they fear and distrust Catholics less, but because they hate and fear you more. I am rejoiced to see that Catholics all over the country stand by you and Father McGlynn.

The condition of women—of one-half of the people—is of the highest public interest. If the working men suffer from oppressions, how much more do working women suffer! If men's wages are inadequate, how much more women's? If men's wages are cut down to the starvation point, women's are cut down to the starvation point. That working women are infinitely worse off than working men none will deny. A disfranchised class is always ground into the very mire of degradation. Always, excepting the favored numbers whose relationship to the ruling sex gives them comforts and luxuries that their sisters can never possess. The widows of distinguished men are pensioned by the government, not for any service performed by those women, but because of the connection of their husbands with popular men. The people are taxed to pay pensions to rich women like Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Garfield, while thousands of women equally as worthy are starving in garrets. It is the cruellest mockery to call this a land of equal rights. We have an aristocracy of politicians and army officers, and the toiling masses are taxed to keep them in princely luxury.

I ask *THE STANDARD* to come to the front, and, without fear or favor, light the monstrous injustice done to women. I ask it to show to the Knights of Labor that it is their daughters who most suffer from the injustice of subjection. The wives and daughters of the rich may be protected and pampered and maintained in comfort, but the daughters of the poor are driven to the wall by hard poverty. Every thinking man and woman knows that the trade of prostitution, which is the crime of crimes, is the direct outgrowth of the enslaved position of woman. Such a life is directly contrary to the laws of nature. No woman born of a free and equal woman could ever sink to such a position. The Rev. Charles H. Eaton, of your city, says hard poverty and want drive 20,000 women of New York every year into evil ways.

Does it not seem monstrously selfish that strong men should wish to hedge themselves about with a rampart of laws which favor their own sex and oppress the other, which give men better chances in the race of life than women? Herbert Spencer says that the sentiment of justice is the latest and highest development of human nature; this development has made slow progress in the brains of democrats and republicans; the signs of the times indicate that the brains of the labor party are broadening into justice.

May the sunlight of prosperity foster its growth.

ELIZABETH A. MERIWETHER

ALL DEAD MEN HAVE GRAVES.

But How Many Living Men Have That Much Land?

NEW YORK, Jan. 31.—After carefully reading "Progress and Poverty" I have come to the conclusion that the only man who can justly lay claim to the right of property in land is a dead man. He needs only six feet of this precious gift of Heaven. It is doubtful in my mind whether the most bitter opponent of private property in land, or the most grasping land grabber, will dispute this title. Strange that the rich, who do not deny the land to the dead, refuse it to the living. The favorite song of my childhood, and one which until recently could rouse my patriotism to the pitch of enthusiasm, begins with "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing." Since it became known to me that the country which I was taught to believe was mine is owned and controlled by the Vanderbilts, the Astors and the Goulds, I have ceased warbling this tune. Even the "Hallelujah chorus" has no charm for me when I reflect that I do not own one inch of the ground upon which my home is built.

Young America Strikes.

A novel and successful strike has taken place at Port Richmond, Philadelphia. On Tuesday last the pupils of the George B. McClellan public school there refused to attend the sessions on account of the dismissal of Mrs. Spallen, supervising principal of the school. The boys called themselves Knights of McClellan, and wore little bows of red ribbon. The parents of the children, as well as their older brothers and sisters who had been educated under Mrs. Spallen abetted them in their action. The directors had dismissed the principal at a special meeting for alleged insubordination. It seems she preferred to conduct the examination of the children in the new building which they occupy instead of in the old room where many of them sat three at a desk. Because she refused to obey the order of a director to stop this she was dismissed. A few nights after the pupils had struck the board met, the room being filled with angry parents. The charge was rehearsed, but the opinions of the members present seemed to coincide with those of the director who said: "If the superintendent said that construction on the law then the superintendent is an ass." Mrs. Spallen was reinstated by the board amidst much applause.

Mule Poetry.

A few lines composed on seeing a mule-driver give his mule an unkind thrashing in No. 2 street (the pit) as it was coming from the race to the pit below.

Why whip thy friend? No, I don't pass—
Why, don't you know, you fool,
Your father is a stupider ass,
Your brother is that man's
O, cruel driver, stay thy hand,
Your brother's head and weak;
He tries to make you understand,
Altho' he cannot speak.

Go take him gently by the rein,
And lead him to the stable;
For what he says is true to Cain,
For saying Brother Abel.

And yet, poor mule, I envy thee,
Though by a tyrant led;
You'll never have to wait, nor see
Your wee things cry for bread!

—JAMES T. HARRIS.

MUNICIPAL FRESHNESS.

A Pinstripe for Cleaning Sidewalks and Fifty Dollars for Hoisting Whirligigs.

The edition of New York ordinances now in use is a revision of the original. It can be found in any police station or district court. The preface tells that in 1881 two eminent and high priced lawyers of this city revised and expunged the work, and after many conferences with the mayor and alderman were enabled to "eliminate such ordinances as had become obsolete." Consequently there is nothing there that is not in the plain and practical line of a policeman's duty; and when, after the next snow storm, he finds Smith's or Jones' sidewalk unkept, he should do as he is bidden, turn in with broom and shovel and clean it off himself. His fee is fixed—one pinstripe for each twenty-five foot of sidewalk. What if he never heard of a pinstripe; the ordinance states its value at 18¢ cents, and commands him to earn and afterward collect it. It was so decided a hundred years ago; the aldermen and the revisers have decided "after many conferences" that it is the law still, and no man who objects to cleaning sidewalks at the rate of a pinstripe per lot has any business to wear a uniform and swear loyalty to the law. If he is so that not one of our three thousand policemen ever earned a pinstripe in the whole course of his life, the three thousand are virtually in contempt, or, if they persist, in open rebellion.

When the March winds have scattered the snow he failed to clear away, this book of city laws makes it the business of the policeman to arrest every boy who flies a kite below Fourteenth street and to keep a sharp eye on the corner grocer lest he engage in the heinous crime of harboring a whirligig in his back yard. For that offense a penalty of fifty dollars is fixed. Why grocers should be anatomized as specially addicted to whirligigs, and what a whirligig is anyway, has always been a mystery in the present generation. There is no record of any arrest of a grocer for whirling. However, as it is the tendency of the stock, so these stung up holders of protection to American labor must reduce cost by cutting down the wages of the handlers at the Jersey docks, and when the wage earners protest, they fill their places with some of the same pauper laborers whose product has been kept out of the country by a tariff. It is the old story! We shut out the pauper goods, but we admit the men who make them. Either way suits the purposes of the protectionists.

The higher price caused by the tariff is paid to the land owner, and although he collects it in the sacred name of protection to American labor, he seizes every opportunity to cut down wages and fights every advance, if need be, with the pauper laborers whom he wages free of duty.

Another illustration of the beauties of the protective tariff was given recently in Higgins' carpet factory on the west side of New York. The proprietors are strong supporters of this fine protective system which Ralph Beaumont says "has in twenty-five years saved more paupers and more outcasts than any other nation in the world." With their heartfelt devotion to the interests of labor, it must have been a sore trial to reduce wages; but nevertheless the other day they announced a cut of 10 per cent; and when the weavers rebelled Messrs. Higgins conceded all the other points, but swore that wages must come down.

Come down they did, although only to the extent of five per cent. The reduction of cost in making a piece of carpet amounts to about 20 cents, or say a quarter cent a yard. Now, as readers of *THE STANDARD* may know, we have a tariff on the wool of which carpets are principally made—all for the protection of American labor. True, the man who reaps a benefit from this tariff—if anybody does—is, as with other tariff duties, a land holder, the great ranchman who herds flocks of sheep on free government land. But the wool that is used in carpets must be imported. So much as goes into a yard of carpet pays 7 cents duty, and the price is enhanced just to that extent. Messrs. Higgins & Co. wanted to reduce the cost of their carpets to sell them more freely. If they could have bought wool free of duty it would have saved seven cents, but this was impossible, because we are "raising wages" by means of protective tariffs; so as the best way open, these protectionist manufacturers of carpets try to take a half cent out of their employees' wages, and finally succeed in robbing them of half this. The total wages paid for making a yard of carpet only amounts to ten and a half cents, so that Higgins can't take out the whole of what the tariff is supposed to add to the wages of American workmen, but if they are at all like those typical protectionists, the coal companies, we would only do them justice to credit them with the wish, if not the power. Truly, as Mr. George said in the free trade meeting at Cooper Union, "What workmen need is not protection, but justice." EDWARD J. SHIVER.

both ends and yield, bewildered and helpless, to their fate. The barber who is dragged into court and fined three dollars for setting up a pole at his door pleads vainly that he bought a permit of the city for one dollar. That permit was illegally given. Should he chance to have none, he is likely to find for maintaining a nuisance without permission. One offense is only more heinous in degree than the other; as when a man is fined ten dollars in a police court for carrying a pistol without a permit, there is nothing for it but to pay and take it out in growling. No one doubts that a citizen has the right to bear arms, and that to rob him of it is unconstitutional and an outrage. But to kick would cost more than ten dollars, and the wise New Yorker pays his fine and charges the loss to the next customer whose ill luck sends him along.

JACOB A. RUS.

HOW AMERICAN LABOR IS PROTECTED.

A Lesson of the Present Strike That Workmen Should Heed.

The production of coal is a great protected industry. What do workmen, who have been the mainstay of tariff duties, think of recent developments in that industry? The land owners, who operate both the mines and the railroads that supply New York with coal, are all great advocates of protection to American labor. It would cost from one to two dollars in freight to bring a ton of coal here from abroad; but it is the solemn belief of these men that even this would not save our coal miners and handlers from competition with the pauper labor of Europe or Nova Scotia; so congress grants them—all for the benefit of labor—a protective tariff of seventy-five cents a ton, and no voice is louder in the halls (and lobbies) of congress against any reduction of the tariff than that of the coal barons. With this aid they are enabled to sell for from \$2 to \$4 a ton of coal that has cost, in wages, under 80 cents to mine, 35 cents to transport and about 15 cents to handle at New York, or less than \$1.50 in all. But this profit of from 30 to 300 per cent is not enough to pay dividends on watered stock, so these stung up holders of protection to American labor must reduce cost by cutting down the wages of the handlers at the Jersey docks, and when the wage earners protest, they fill their places with some of the same pauper laborers whose product has been kept out of the country by a tariff. It is the old story! We shut out the pauper goods, but we admit the men who make them. Either way suits the purposes of the protectionists.

The higher price caused by the tariff is paid to the land owner, and although he collects it in the sacred name of protection to American labor, he seizes every opportunity to cut down wages and fights every advance, if need be, with the pauper laborers whom he wages free of duty.

Another illustration of the beauties of the protective tariff was given recently in Higgins' carpet factory on the west side of New York. The proprietors are strong supporters of this fine protective system which Ralph Beaumont says "has in twenty-five years saved more paupers and more outcasts than any other nation in the world." With their heartfelt devotion to the interests of labor, it must have been a sore trial to reduce wages; but nevertheless the other day they announced a cut of 10 per cent; and when the weavers rebelled Messrs. Higgins conceded all the other points, but swore that wages must come down.

Come down they did, although only to the extent of five per cent. The reduction of cost in making a piece of carpet amounts to about 20 cents, or say a quarter cent a yard. Now, as readers of *THE STANDARD* may know, we have a tariff on the wool of which carpets are principally made—all for the protection of American labor. True, the man who reaps a benefit from this tariff—if anybody does—is, as with other tariff duties, a land holder, the great ranchman who herds flocks of sheep on free government land. But the wool that is used in carpets must be imported. So much as goes into a yard of carpet pays 7 cents duty, and the price is enhanced just to that extent. Messrs. Higgins & Co. wanted to reduce the cost of their carpets to sell them more freely. If they could have bought wool free of duty it would have saved seven cents, but this was impossible, because we are "raising wages" by means of protective tariffs; so as the best way open, these protectionist manufacturers of carpets try to take a half cent out of their employees' wages, and finally succeed in robbing them of half this. The total wages paid for making a yard of carpet only amounts to ten and a half cents, so that Higgins can't take out the whole of what the tariff is supposed to add to the wages of American workmen, but if they are at all like those typical protectionists, the coal companies, we would only do them justice to credit them with the wish, if not the power. Truly, as Mr. George said in the free trade meeting at Cooper Union, "What workmen need is not protection, but justice." EDWARD J. SHIVER.

A Real Free Trader.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Workman.

We should like to inquire in this connection if the editor of the *Workman* approves of Mr. George's free trade notions and his ideas of land reform? If not, what Mr. George would do to workmen?—Grand Rapids, Mich., Workman.

Why, bless your soul, the editor of the *Workman* has been an absolute free trader for years, and the *Workman*, almost from the day of its birth, has championed this doctrine. And the logic of free trade means more than mere commercial freedom—freedom to labor as well as freedom to exchange the products of labor—freedom of access to the resources of nature for the purpose of earning a living by honest work. Industrial freedom means that the land of the country belongs to the whole people of the country, and that it cannot of right be monopolized by the few to the robbery of the many of their inalienable birthright in the soil, which is in the ultimate the sole source of life and of all that supports life and makes it worth living.

"Demagogue" Van Wyck.

Charlton, Ia., Herald.

The *Register* says "Demagogue Van Wyck dies hard, but he dies." Mr. Van Wyck is very liable to develop into a very lively corpse in the future, to the consternation of all those who imagine that he is dead simply because the railroad lobbyists succeeded in inducing the legislature of Nebraska to override the will of the people. Men of brains and conscience, as well as courage to espouse the cause of the common people against the unjust impositions of corporate monopolies, always die hard, and the blood of such martyrs becomes the seed of more abundant fruit in after years. If Van Wyck is politically dead, his cause and that of the people which he espoused still lives, and a half dozen Van Wycks will arise in his stead to carry forward the good work. The practice of cutting all beneficiaries of the human race down to size only increases the number of demagogues, falsely so called.

They Are Scared.

St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

President Amundson, of the American protective tariff league, says that the organization is working with "unusual earnestness and energy," and that the league "will be in a position two years hence to take an influential part in the presidential campaign." This is a plain announcement that the protectionists are sorely frightened, and recognize the fact that the movement for a modification of the high bounties paid by taxpayers to manufacturers is gathering strength as the people begin to comprehend what tariff taxation really is.

THE HUNTING OF THE BOODLER.

With Some Remarks on the Maintenance of Boodler Preserves.

Did you ever see a fox hunt, stranger? If you haven't, you've missed a grand and an exhilarating and an instructive spectacle. Come with me, and let us take our stand on this little eminence and enjoy the pleasures of the chase.

A glorious hunting morning, isn't it? with a southerly wind and a cloudy sky, and the ground not frozen nor yet thoroughly thawed, but just in good condition for a gallop. See the spectators, how they gather—the whole country side is here, impatient for the show. For a noble boodler fox is to be run to death to-day, and the hunt is out, brave in uniform and gallantly mounted. No fear but what they'll find; the aldermanic goose is to be drawn, and that covert was never known to be empty yet.

Ala! the fox has broken cover, the huntman twangs his horn, the attendant riders settle down to their work, and here they come across the open, just where we can have a good view of them. How bravely the alderman—I mean the fox—is running, full of hope to reach the distant hills, where he vainly thinks to find an untrodden earth. Hear the mellow music of the dogs! Hark to Joseph! brave hound of Hungary, yelping his tune! Hark to Herald! Hark to Tribune! Hark to Telegram! Hark to Mail and Express! These four hounds are in their voices. See Martino, Mr. F. H., how fearlessly he rides; observe the scarlet-coated hunters flying over fences, leaping ditches, jostling, crowding, recking little of risk to life or limb, so only they may be in at the death and carry off poor Reynard's bush. How the people cheer, and run on foot a little way, and seek short cuts across the fields, and shout and yell as though their very lives depended on the capture of one poor giver or taker of bribes. Even the philosopher of the *Post*, the monk of Mount Athos, who by lifelong contemplation of his own inwardness has attained the knowledge of all things in heaven and earth, even he, the all-knowing, is moved to speech, and expounds to an unheeding audience the umbrilical theory of vulpicide. Now for a moment the hounds are at fault; but see, the gallant Martino makes a skillful cast; the cry of "Hark, forward!" rises far on the left, and away they go again, hounds and hunters, tag, rag and bobtail, *Post* philosopher and all, through bush and briar, over hill and dale, until they fairly run poor boodler down and make a finish of him.

Glorious fun, isn't it? Your flushed cheek and sparkling eyes tell plainly how you have enjoyed it; and yet, to a human mind, it seems a little rough upon the alderman—I should say upon the fox. It's a cruel sport after all, and smacks rather of the hard-hearted days of ancient Rome than of the softer civilization of this nineteenth century. "But foxes must be killed," you say, "because they're vermin, destructive to the peace of innocent chicken roosts and generally incompatible with successful agriculture." Oh, foolish stranger! Is it not the new year's tale of it? Do you suppose, that the eagle hounds, and the gallant huntmen, and the tag-rag and bobtail who cheer them on would like to see the breed of boodlers exterminated and finished once for all? You foolish man! They want to kill the fox they're after because they are after him; but for the fun and sport of chasing him; but as for exterminating the race—well, you just propose cutting down the coverts wherein these boodler foxes live and breed, or try to catch one of the vermin in the new year's tale of it. Do you suppose, that a hue and cry will be raised against you? Why, the very hounds will rend you for interfering with their lawful prey.

Not my friend! this chasing of the boodler betokens no special hatred of bribe-givers and bribe-takers. The breed of them is as flourishing as ever, and none take more pains to foster and preserve them than those who most enjoy running one or two of them to death at intervals. Nor is there existence so at variance with our nineteenth century civilization as you might suppose. For the bribe-taker—the man who goes into politics for the money he can make out of it—is an inevitable necessity of our social and political system; and as for the bribe-giver—why just incline your ear to your own lips and whisper softly to yourself, in strictest confidence, whether, if you'd had Jake Sharp's chance to buy the Broadway franchise, you wouldn't have taken it just as Jake Sharp did?

Never there! you needn't blush so furiously. I'll never forget the words of the great boodler hunter, and the next time the great boodler hunt meets you and I will be there, and ride as bravely and hallo as lustily as though we really thought the whole affair was serious, and not a mere bit of playful political fun.

T. L. MCCREADY.

MEN AND WOMEN.

Charles A. Dana is fertile in petty invention. Along with "cyanophagous," a verbal curiosity which he turns off for the amusement of his regular readers, he suggests a "red list" for the benefit of Knights of Labor. Cyanophagous, the reader is left to infer, has some connection with a windbag; but the "red list" is elaborately explained. It is for the names of authors of Labor ruffianly of bloody names. Such a "red list" might be more appropriately suggested to the striking corporations that have laid an embargo on the commerce of the city; but Mr. Dana has no advice for them except to make all they can out of the sweat and misery of men. "Put money in thy purse!" is Mr. Dana's golden rule.

Rev. Campbell Fair has recently become rector of St. Mark's Episcopal church at Grand Rapids, Mich., and in a recent lecture there on the Irish question he took the side of the Irish landlord. Mr. Fair is an Englishman, whose fondness for strong drink, high prices of an orange here always kept him in hot water in Baltimore. He is chiefly known to fame as the minister who insists on preaching a sermon on each recurring 17th of March to prove that St. Patrick was a Protestant. Philanthropist Jay Gould is a roaring democrat in Texas, where he is trying to beat Reagan's senatorial aspirations by backing John Ireland. It looks something like presumption on Judge Reagan's part to insist on going to the senate when he knows that Jay Gould would prefer somebody else. [Chicago Herald.]

Frederic Harrison, the English positivist, says "clothing," as well as houses, furniture and food, "are products of society." This puts an end to the nebular hypothesis. It also proves that the other planets are inhabited, since if there had been no society to produce them they would not exist. But why does not society produce more lands! The supply is running short. Is it a lost art?

Another Consolidation.

Philadelphia Record.

Another step toward the coalition of the Reading and Pennsylvania railroad interests was taken yesterday by the transfer of the express business of the Reading railroad system to the Adams Express company. A bridge across William's alley could facilitate the frequent conferences between Presidents Roberts and Corbin.

No Right to Monopolize.

Grand Rapids Workman.

No man has a right to monopolize more land than he cultivates or uses productively. And yet millions on millions of acres of God's earth is thus monopolized all over the whole country to the robbery of the great mass of the people of their right to an equal opportunity to make a living by honest work.

One
Ha! ha! I
my hon
Really, m
Quixotti
How am
Lazarus
What alth
bitter f
Can I help
him? I
Though m
his deej
Pun success
the won
Might have
and me
He in robes
and he
All his chil
for w
Homeless
dying i
All the voi
ever fa
Had the lu
less an
He'd have
could:
There's th
would
Beggars d
life's b
Shall I no
Food m
Just becau
dogs cr
Though his
and bl

Can Type of the Modern Dives.

Can't he! ha! well, that's a good one—pon
your honor—ho! ho! ho!
Can't you, good sir, excuse me; you're
quoting, don't you know.
Can I help it? Who begot him? Did I make
him? Need I care?
Can't you "rotund abundance" aggravate
his deep despair?
Can't he be a failure; that's the way
the world goes.
Can't he have been the other way with Lazarus
and me—who knows?

Can't he be in robes and in tatters; half starved I
and he full fed?
Can't he be a plump and rosy; mine in tears
for want of bread.

Can't he be a helpless, hopeless, living,
dying in despair?
Can't he be the world to him an Eden, ever changing,
ever fair.

Can't he be the luck best so against me—fate so pit-
iless and grim—
Can't he have let me grin and bear it best I
could; so let him.

Can't he be the porchouse; let him enter. No, I
won't let him do so.
Can't he be the sidewalk would destroy
his harmony.

Can't he not wear gorgeous clothing, eat the
food my souladores,
Can't he because he's so against him that the
dogs can lick his sores?

Can't he starve children shiver, pinched
and blue with bitter cold,
Can't he mine in furs close mantled, costing
all their weight in gold?

Can't he herd in filthy hovels, penitentially
vile,
Can't he my palatial dwelling o'er their squalor
proudly smile?

Can't I pay him daily wages when I've work
for him to do?
Can't he down to bottom figures? Why, of
course, that's business, too.

Can't it be his affair, not mine; his at least as
much as mine?
Can't he as will I get him, though he fast
the while I dine.

Can't he for himself the word is; climb and
push your neighbor down.
Can't you be a hammer, as the world
will smile or frown.

Can't he live and live, once a motto, will not do
these modern days.
Can't he "Choke your rivals off, and on their
ruins fortunes raise."

Can't he Competition? That's the law that
governs trade.
Can't he you can buy your labor more the
money to be made.

Can't he the only thing worth doing; money 'tis
what marks the man.
Can't he good enough for me that; give me bet-
ter one who can.

Can't he money? Nothin' like it; I'll have all
that I can get.
Can't he any how I can and hunger for more
money yet.

Can't he not any how I can—not exactly; there's
the law.
Can't he jackal who, when hunting with the
trapper, leaves a paw.

Can't he you philanthropic fanatics! how you
starve your zeal!
Can't he a law of nature forces him and such like
to the wall.

Can't he the "struggle for existence," "might makes
right" is the proper view,
Can't he the law of evolution; I'm Darwinian
through and through. —G. INGLES.

Can't he Toronto, Canada.

ONLY A FAKIE'S DAUGHTER

Sitting here by my fireside thinking, on this
morning Sunday, I remember that it is just one
week since I first saw Cassy. We were so
busy at the factory that the wheels were going
round a m. until 10 p. m., and every resource
had been brought into play to keep us well up
to the labor to be done. I went down into the
office on Monday morning, as was my custom,
to get my orders, and to report to Goldstein
Brothers, whose forewoman I was, how the
business of the work-room progressed. It
was progressing so well for them, and so ill
for us, that they had a double share upon
every hand in the place, from the black porter
up, and if they could have split me into two
women, or indeed into four, there would have
been enough for us all to do, and something
over. Having examined all the quality,
strength, skill and time we possessed, no more
was to be said on that score—we were work-
ing "top speed," and far behind at that. When
Max Goldstein handed me the order book it
had "eight hundred dozen shirts" marked here,
"five hundred dozen" there, and so on for
twenty pages, with more new orders than
could be filled in six weeks.

"Here are some letters from customers for
special orders," said he hurriedly, "and
here's one—I only read the first few lines—
from a girl who wants work. I don't suppose
she's of much account, or she wouldn't be idle
on this season; but if you think she can help
anybody, and for her. Run, now, quick as
lightning, and show her your room."

All that encouragement and a 25-horse
power engine could do to stimulate the speed
of "my team" had been done long ago, and it
was maddly flying along time the highway at a
rate which blurred the days of the week until
there seemed but two left out of the seven,
and they were Monday morning and Saturday
night. I went back to the work-room, ar-
ranged the business of the day in accordance
with my instructions, and then sat down at
the desk to look over the letters. At last I
came to her's—Cassy's—and it was such a
strange composition that I reproduce it. It ran
thus:

"Mister Goldstein and Brother, would you
be so kind and give me work? I have been
out of work six weeks, but I can iron good.
I don't have work to pay my board, and I can
iron very good, and bear on hard. Wages is
of no account, only I must pay my way.
Mister Herman, the baker, can tell you I am
honest." Then came her name and address,
and afterward, like a true woman, she had
added her P. S., and what a burst it was!

"I wrote to the mayor, and I wrote to the
president, and I wrote to you, and I pray for
an answer. Oh, for God's sake, give me some-
thing to do, but ironing preferred."

I have spelled the words correctly, and
I have spelled the sentences, otherwise it is just
as I received it. There were times when the
mail brought letters by the score with similar
petitions, but their writers were nearly always
of so little account as to capabilities, and of
such extravagant expectations as to wages,
that very few of them received attention,
another drawback being, that to answer
even in the briefest manner, was to become
involved in a correspondence that grew like
the gourd of Jonah. Two things in Cassy's
specie decided me not to fling it aside—she
talked "on hard," and she had taken the
extraordinary step of addressing the mayor
and the president. I thought I should like
to hear on Goldstein Brothers on Tuesday morn-
ing, between twelve and half-past, and ask
her the forewoman. That half hour, it is to be
observed, was my dinner-time, and belonged

to me to do with as I chose. I was always so
driven in my oversight of the work-room; I
lived so constantly with a sense of an intoler-
able and crushing load upon me, under which
I could by no means stand erect, my haste was
so extant, the hours so long, and the weeks so
short, that, to give away my restless, the
precious interval in which I had the right to
sit down and draw my breath, was like giving
away a morsel of my life—nevertheless I was
impelled to bestow it on a girl whom I had
never seen—there was something unique in
her idea of telling the head of the corporation,
and the head of the nation that she was out of
work.

Tuesday came, and the weather was feroc-
ious. It hailed and snowed, rained and sleeted
by turns, and there was a northeast wind
strong enough to wrench the buttons off one's
coat, and a cold of that fine, penetrating
quality which creeps even into one's pockets;
but as we were not to have any more of the
engine. The machinery roared within like a
sulphur sea, the blast roared without like an
angry giant, but no one looked up to say,
"How it blows?" or "How it freezes?" Even
if it had not been forbidden to speak, no human
creature's voice could be heard. In that tur-
moil a hundred women sat silent as death, im-
passive as stone, outstriking and outdoing by
storm and steam. At noon I ate my lunch
quickly, for I was on the watch for the new
applicant, and was not of course surprised
when a message came to me through the
speaking-tube that a person wished to see me
down stairs. I had formed an idea of what she
would be like—I saw too many in the course
of three years not to know only to the type of
her class, and I saw too many of her kind, and
much more originality than they generally
exhibited. She would be tall, thin, tragic and
anxious-eyed, ready to take the world by the
throat, voluble enough to drown a listener in
the stream of her griefs. There was but one
doubt about her in my mind, and that related
to her dress.

Many came so overdressed as to make it
patent by their poor finery that they were
wearing what is popularly known as "the
bottom of the trunk?" others were arrayed in
such garments as are seen only upon those
who are too far gone in wretchedness to care
for decent appearance. It was seldom any
medium between these styles presented
themselves. As the paper upon which she had
written was gilt-edged, I concluded that what-
ever her needs and whatever the weather she
would be overdressed, and with this preposi-
tion I went out to meet her on the landing of
the stairs below. Tempest tossed, dripping,
panting, enveloped in a waterproof cloak and
hood—there she was, and in the very first
glance I knew that in all my forecastings I
had been mistaken. She drew back from me
to shake the sleet from her shoulders and her
head, quickly unbuttoned and slipped out of
her stout wrapping and stood before me as
trim a little figure in a gingham dress and
apron as I ever saw. There was a cat-like
neatness about her and a cleanliness good to
see, and yet she had been out in a gale that
was violent enough to raise her from the
ground. She was a mere child in years, not
beautiful either, but with such a stock of
rugged, brilliant-checked, sparkling health,
such brown-skinned, brown-haired and bright-
eyed youth and strength that it was a
pleasure just to gaze on her. She looked at
me with the shy yet happy confidence with
which children lift their faces, and with that
expression she might have passed for faith's
own daughter. It was very evident indeed
that she came ready to work and with no
notion of being repulsed. "Could I see the
forelady?" she asked presently, handing me
the card which I had sent to her.

"You might search through the factory
room for me," said Cassy, and you would
find no such thing in it as a forelady, and you
might hunt the dictionary from A to Z and
find no such word as that, but the forewoman
is here, at your service."

She opened her brown eyes very wide when
I first addressed her, but her surprise and
disappointment quickly turned to a smile
when she gathered from the tones that I was
more in jest than in earnest, and with an air
of modest self-defense that had nothing of
self assurance in it she answered:

"I noticed that the other word is on the
card, but I thought it would be more polite to
say forelady, and that you would like it
better; but if there is no such word how could
you like it?"

"Sure enough," said I. "Let us start right,
and we'll get on faster. You say you can
iron good, Cassy?"

"Yes, I can," she nodded, "and I'm not
afraid to bear on hard."

"Just so," you said in your letter. Will
you tell me how it comes, then, that you are
out of work?"

"Didn't I tell you?" she cried, eagerly.
"No—that was in the letter I wrote to the
president. The baker's wife gave me a basket
and filled it with apples and oranges; so first
I sold them to the factory hands; but you
see, the gentlemen are so much stricter now
that you don't get in only at twelve o'clock,
and you couldn't sell enough in half an
hour, and you couldn't sell enough in one
place to keep going. So I went this fall to
the ironing up at Mr. Reubens'. Zelle, an old, old
presser, taught me how."

As she paused for breath I inquired, "And
why did you leave Mr. Reubens'?"

"I didn't leave him," she returned as if
greatly astonished at the question. "He took
his factory to New York."

"Oh, I see," Mr. Reubens left you. Perhaps
he was thoughtful enough to have given you
a word of recommendation?"

"He never told me he was going away," she
said, shaking her head, "and when I remem-
bered it it was too late. Besides, he would
only have said what I have said, that I can
iron very good and am not afraid to bear on
hard." Tears were gathering in her eyes, but
she bravely held them back. She had been so
sure a moment ago that it was something of a
blow to be questioned and doubted.

"Well, never mind, we can soon try your
hand, Cassy; but how old are you?"

"I'll be seventeen next October," she an-
swered. This was January, and her year had
almost ten months to run; but, like a child,
who always speaks of the coming birthday,
Cassy was rich in futurity. She had no mother
she told me on further interrogation, and her
father, it was plain, had abandoned her to the
mercy of strangers. She found no fault with
him, but rather extenuated his heartlessness.

"He goes on trips, you know, wherever
there's a fair or a crowd, and sometimes he
doesn't make out very well; so, of course, he
can't do anything for me."

"But when he does make out?" I persisted.

"Then he must buy more stock and pay his
own way, you see," she explained. "It is very
hard, indeed, to sell on the curbstones and
doorsteps on account of the police, but the
baker's wife is very good to me; she says I am
as near as her own children"—this with proud
satisfaction.

"How many has she, Cassy? More than
seven, I'll be bound."

"Yes, ma'am—nine, besides me."

"I wish I was as certain of going to heaven
as the baker's wife! A true, good woman she
must be. Well, Cassy, I can give you work;
but first, are you very, very sure that there is
nothing more suitable to you age and strength
than this?"

"Oh, I've tramped and I've tried," she cried,
nervously, "and I've cried and I've prayed,
and I've done all I know how, but I couldn't
get anything to do. Last of all, when I
thought I was at the end of everything, Mrs.
Herman—that's the baker's wife, you know—
she said: 'You go upstairs, Katinka, and be-
gin again; begin with God—you didn't ask
him right?' So I went upstairs and began
again. First I prayed, and then that put it
into my head that the president couldn't be
any busier than God, and not so far away;
and the mayor was still nearer, and then I've

membered Mr. Goldstein, so I wrote three let-
ters. "If you send me away now," she pleaded,
tears falling fast, "what shall I do next?"
"Cheer up!" said I. "I'll not send you away!
Are you ready to go with me?" She never
knew how loth I was to take her.

"This very minute!" she asserted quickly,
and followed me up the narrow, black stair-
case. On we went to the fifth story, and
even in the darkness I saw her face was
radiant. "Will it be steady?" she whispered
anxiously before we reached the top.

"It will be so steady, Cassy," I answered
gravely, "that if you and I were made of
cast iron, instead of flesh and blood, it would
be better for us!" She laughed aloud—fortu-
nately we were still upon the stairs—"I don't
care how steady the iron is, nor how hard it is,
nor how long they keep me at it! I can pay
my way as last! I'll do my best to please you,
and I'll bear down as heavy on the cloth
as—"

"As Fate will bear on you, poor child," I
thought to myself, and, opening the door, we
went into the press room together.

She was true to her word, faithful, prompt,
efficient and apparently untiring. What she
knew she did well, and what it was necessary
to teach her she learned thoroughly. She
was paid by the piece for her work, and by
midsummer she was earning five dollars and
sometimes a little more per week. She had
almost cleared off her long indebtedness to
her friend, the baker's wife, and was as brave
and affectionate and grateful a soul as
heaven's light ever shone upon and found
penitent but independent. She clung to me
with an astonishing loyalty, and told me
what she had the chance, all the incidents of
her humble and monotonous life. She was, as
I have said, faith's own daughter, and not one
of the nine little bakers and bakeresses who
sat nightly at their mother's feet, to hear the
chapter read from the old Dutch Bible
listened with more reverence than Cassy.

Still I pitied her, trudging heavenward over
the long, cruel road that stretched before
her. There was not a soft leaf or bud that
belonged to youth's bright morning, not a joy
nor a hope that would ever bloom for her on
the stony groundwork of her life. She
never saw the sunshine, and at night she was
too tired to raise her eyes to the stars over-
head; but how did this business of "getting
on," as Cassy calls it, look from Cassy's
point of view? Let Cassy speak for herself.

"I was going home last night, and a man
stopped me just there at the corner. Was I
frightened? Oh, no, I wasn't frightened, for
he didn't look like other men do when they in-
sult you and chase you through the dark
streets. I have nearly dropped dead some-
times with my heart beating so, but not this
time. He spoke very civilly, and he had a
book and a pencil. 'You are one of Gold-
stein's girls, I believe,' he said, and then ex-
cused himself for stopping me; and what do
you think he wanted? Why, he said that he
was a reporter for some paper—I forget its
name—and that he had called on Goldstein to
talk to the hands about their long hours and
the poor pay, and all that, but the firms of
different factories wouldn't let him in, so he
had to stop their hands on the street. 'You
can make my complaint to me, if you have
any,' he said, 'and you can tell me your name
and address, and some day the newspapers
will make it all right for you.' What did I
say?" she cried, with the first flash of anger I
ever saw in her brown eyes. "I thought of
how mad Mr. Goldstein would be, and how
he'd take our work from us and lock the
doors, and how we'd all starve to death be-
cause of that meddling man. I remembered how
I had cried and prayed and wrote to get him
to do even if I had to bear on pretty
hard, and I said, 'I'll never tell you one word
what I get nor what I do, nor anything. Your
paper could never make it all right for us, but
we'd all get locked out and starved to death.'
He laid his hand on my arm then and said,
'But listen to me an instant.' Did I? No, I
didn't. I told him he was a rascal, and tore
away home as fast as I could go. Wasn't I
right? Poor, poor little Cassy!"

The summer waned, the autumn came and
went, and gradually I saw a change in the little
presser. The splendid stock of health, the
boundless vitality she had brought to her daily
work had been heavily drained during the hot
months, and her cheerfulness and hopefulness
seemed to forsake her. She had looked like
her to a Juno; but what rose and fell to the
color in her cheeks faded, or burned there
only in brilliant, circumscribed spots, the light
of her eyes grew dull, her step listless, but
she never flagged, nor lost a day. She stood
at her post wet to the waist with perspiration;
hot vapor from the dampened goods upon her
table and upon twenty others around her,
rose in clouds before her; the red-hot stove
made the air tremble and wave; the red-hot
sun beat in the windows and down on the roof
tilt the room was like a boiling caldron. I
saw the evil days I had feared for her, but I
had no more power to help her than she had
to live in the winter. On the twelfth of October
"day off" for a week or two, but she steadily
refused. "Why, you don't," want to die, do
you, Cassy?" I asked.

"Die?" she echoed with a frightened
glance; "I have not lived yet, you may say!
I will go and see the doctor." Shortly after
this she said to me one evening, "Did you
ever notice that if you come in here of a morn-
ing with a thought in your mind, especially an
ugly thought, or with a tune in your head, es-
pecially a tiresome tune, how the engine takes
it and all the machines beat time to it and sing
it over and over, or say it millions of times
until you're very heart sick of it?"

"Yes, Cassy, but mightn't it be the other
way, too, with a happy thought or a merry
tune?" I suggested, knowing only too well the
nervous horror that was in her mind.
"Perhaps it might; but I often think they
are scared at the hideous noises, and that's the
reason they come so seldom."

"And what does the machinery sing or say
now, Cassy? Let me hear what it beats with
its iron music." We were just outside the
press room door; there were shafts, pulleys
and belts there, too, and vibrations that made
the floors shiver.

"Listen!" she whispered, with her mouth
close to my ear and her fevered hand upon
my wrist—"listen! 'If you get sick, who will
take care of you; and if you die, where is
your grave?' That's what it says, millions and
millions of times." She kept time to the
strains of the machinery. I see a striking
change in her, and notwithstanding her brave
spirit, her patience and her hopefulness, that
change is not for the better. Not for the bet-
ter did I say? I am wrong, wrong; it is
infinitely better that she should go early hold-
ing fast to her faith in God than that she
should linger a few more years, until she had
lost even that gracious hope which on the
verge of the black and horrible grave, seems
to comfort and uphold her. And yet I never
felt a keener pity for any living, suffering
creature than I did for her when I looked
down at her lying upon the bed from which I
am certain she will never rise. Even while I
talked to her a curious thing happened, which
could not have been my fancy—a cold, white
light fell suddenly upon her face, deepening
and transfiguring her expression, but her old

spirit was so strong within her, her mind so
free from the delirium in which she has
moaned for days and days, that I was almost
persuaded she might get well again. It is
now high noon of a stormy Sabbath in January,
but the day is as dark as a winter's twilight.
The sleet rages and beats without, the wind is
from the north-east, with a howling, sob-
bing and wailing in it as might drive a hypo-
chondriac prematurely to a halberd. I am
not, I believe, subject to atmos-
pheric influences, but under these heavy
clouds, with the dismal whining of that blast in
my ears, I cannot rid myself of the impression
that the angel of death is abroad like a
monstrous waster and destroyer—not only
abroad, but sweeping near me—and that the
bitter chill in the air is the overshadowing of
his outstretched wings. Scientists tell us
that there is no waste in nature; that destruc-
tion is really a transmutation; that death is
but life in another shape. They should stand
with me at my work, see what I have seen,
know what I have known, come with me and
gaze on this ruined frame that once was
Cassy, and they would find there is in nature
a waste which is so awful and so tragic
when it deals with humanity that it wrings
the soul and makes the heart ache to think of
it. I was reminded of this by the box of
orange blossoms sent to me yesterday by a
friend in the south. I took them to-day just
as they were to Cassy, and as if their
fragrance exhaled the thought she exclaimed:
"So the sun has been shining on somebody's
garden, though it would not on mine!"

I turned to look at her "garden"—a single
pet upon the window-sill, which held a
dwindled, leafless rose bush.

"I never grew a bit, for all my care, since
the day I brought it home in my arms from
the street corner where it stood among so
many other flowers. It always wanted some-
thing or missed something that belonged to
it, and its leaves dropped one by one," she
said sorrowfully. "It didn't live, here in the
garret, the life God meant a rose should live,
and it is dying by inches."

So like, so very like her own poor rose was
she as she lay there with the orange blossoms
in her hand. "Every one of these," she con-
tinued, "would have turned to fruit, wouldn't
it?" she pointed to the white sprays.

I shook my head. "Not one blossom in
every ten comes to perfection, Cassy."

It was a startled glance she raised to mine,
and there was a sharper tone in her usually so
gentle voice as she questioned, almost petu-
lantly, as the sick often do:

"What were the other nine made for, then—
only to wither and die?"

"What, indeed, were they made for?" I an-
swered. "Why, if I could riddle you that,
Cassy, I could also reveal to you the secret of
all the pain and suffering in God's universe.
Spring after spring, ever since the world began,
for every blossom that ever came to full fru-
ition thousands heaped the ground like snow.
You can see this waste under any apple tree
in May."

It was just then that I noticed the curious
shadow sharpen her face, and as I said be-
fore, deepened its expression; she looked up
slowly, musingly.

"A waste, you say, do you think there could
be a waste when the hairs of our heads are all
counted?"

I would not distress her by saying "yes,"
and how could I say "no"? "I don't," she
added, vehemently. "If I did I could not
bear to—"

but her words were cut short by the
cough that racks and strangles her of
late, and I concluded the sentence for her but
in a different way.

"You could not bear to live, you were going
to say. That is because you are, as I have
often told you, faith's own child, Cassy."

She caught my hand and held it; she searched
my eyes with a look so piercing, clear, so won-
derful, so strangely bright, and yet so pitiful that
it moved me to grief and wonder.

"What is it, Cassy?"

She turned on her pillow and drew from be-
neath it a book—the baker's Dutch Bible in
miniature—hunted something within its leaves,
and then handed it to me, saying only, "There,"
and this is what I read upon the page, "The
grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the
word of our God shall stand forever."

I stooped and kissed her—"It's all right
with you then, Cassy, isn't it?"

"It's all right," she murmured, smiling
faintly. "There is no waste."

But sitting here, cold and solitary by my fire,
which has burned to ashes, I would give much
to believe that she was not a part of the
wicked and reckless ruin that is wrought by
man's hand every day unchecked and unre-
buked. Hark! there is a knock at my door—
they have come to tell me that Cassy is dead."

C. L. ECKEL.

SONGS OF ENGLISH RADICALS.

Marching Song.

Air—"O'Donnell Abou."

Workers of England, why crouch ye like

slaves?

Why chain an existence of insult and want?

Why stand to be plucked by an army of raven?

Or hounded for ever by twaddle and cant?

Think on the wrongs ye bear

Think on the rags ye wear,

Think on the insult endured from your birth;

Toiling in snow and rain,

Rearing up heaps of gain,

All for the tyrants who grind ye to earth.

Oh heed not the talk of those fat agitators,

Who prattle of Gladstone or Churchill or worse,

Expect not your rights from professional

praters,

But manfully trust in your courage and force.

Waste not your ready blows,

Strike not at foreign foes,

Your bitterest enemies tread your own soil.

The preachers who blind ye,

The landlords who grind ye,

The gluttons who revel whilst ye are at toil.

—J. Connell in Justice.

Call a Spade a Spade.

When I see the poor and helpless

Turned out of doors to die,

When I see poor little children

With no cover but the sky,

Then I cry with all my might—

"These laws are not God-made!"

Smite down such "rights of property,"

And call a spade a spade.

When I see rack-rented crofters

By glistering bayonets driven

From humble homes built on the soil

Their Father-God has given,

Then I cry with all my might—

"These laws are not God-made!"

Crush these dual "rights of property,"

