

Discontent is the great lever of progress. Discontent made all our inventions, all our improvements. And the people here to-day, coming from all shores, coming from all nations and all races of men, are the best types of the greatest progress that has ever appeared in the world. Not the people who were simply born here, not the people whose ancestors fled from oppression a hundred or more years ago, but the people whose fathers in late years fled from oppression to seek liberty here. (Applause) Aye, and the people who have come here away from oppression abroad, counting for liberty here (applause)—these are our best people.

This country, we have been told, is the refuge of the oppressed of all nations. I say to us keep that fact shining before the people. It is not a secret. It is a fact. Here in this land, unoccupied, "barren as the sands of the sea," George has told us (applause), where in one state, the state of Texas, put the whole 1,400 million people of the earth, give

each family a half an acre, and have 300,000 acres left in that one little state—shall we close our doors to our suffering and fleeing brothers? I say no! Open them up, break down this infernal Chinese wall which enables a few to protect themselves and rob the many. (Tumultuous applause.)

Mr. Gurnack took his seat amid great and continued applause, and the usual collection was taken up. Mr. George making a few remarks meanwhile. Speaking of the advance which the democratic party is making, he said: "With every day as it passes the democratic masses are becoming more radical. In one place, in the Twenty-first district of Ohio (applause), they have nominated for congress a man who avows himself a free trader absolutely (great applause), a man who avows himself for the single tax (great applause), a man who from the first has been one of our best and staunchest friends—Tom L. Johnson of Ohio." (Applause and cheers.) Mr. George continued: "And now I have the pleasure to introduce for the first time to a single tax audience one of the best and ablest friends of the single tax, a man who by pen and speech and with his means has aided our cause most efficiently; a man who, beginning as a free trader, came to the single tax position as the logical result of his examination of facts. I said the other night when I stood up here to answer questions that I would only answer questions as to principles, because in the first place I was not an encyclopaedia. (Laughter.) Now the man whom I am about to introduce to you comes as near as any one can get to being an encyclopaedia. (Laughter and applause.) I want to assure each and every of our protectionist friends in this audience want to get up and ask hard questions he is ready to answer them."

"Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure to introduce Thomas G. Shearman." (Great applause.)

MR. SHEARMAN'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The very flattering introduction which has been given me, and especially the statement that I will answer all questions, reminds me of a capital story related by my friend Mr. Evans, who is a very much better story teller than he is an economist. (Laughter)—what he does not know about story telling is hardly worth knowing, and unfortunately what he knows about economics is exactly the same thing. (Laughter.)

His story was that a boy was sent away from a high school with a very black mark as incorrigibly stupid. When he came home, his father was very indignant and said: "What is the matter, that after all the pains bestowed on your education you cannot pass? Well," said the boy, "I went through an examination, and when I got through with the examination they said I had failed, and would not pass me." "How is that?" "I really don't know. They put a lot of questions to me and I answered them all correctly the first time." "What was the first question they put to you?" "They asked me how far the earth was from the sun." "What did you say to that?" "Why, I said I didn't know." (Laughter and applause.) I want to assure each and every of our protectionist friends in this audience want to get up and ask hard questions he is ready to answer them."

NO APOLOGY FOR FREE TRADE.

It is an immense pleasure to me to speak upon this platform, to this audience and surrounded by these friends, and with this banner behind me, inscribed, "Free Trade! Free Land! Free Men!" (Great applause.) We make no excuses. We make no pretenses. We are not apologizing for our principles nor running away from them. (Applause and laughter.) We don't tell anybody that free trade is a local question, that it is a question that the thing is impracticable. We come out plainly and tell every one just what we think, just what we mean, just what we intend to do. (Applause.)

I am a revenue reformer; but I have a larger idea as to what revenue reform means. It means a great deal more than free trade. Revenue reform means the reform of every evil that ever was, or is, or will be found in the collection of the public revenue. (Applause.) All the same, I am very proud of being called a free trader. (Applause.) I am proud of the name and the cause of free trade. Among those objects which can at present be attained, among those truths of the future which are practicable, which come within our immediate range, which are duties of to-day, for which men can fight now and fight with the confidence that they have effective weapons in their hands with which to make the foe before them—among such practical causes of the day and hour in which we live, there is absolutely none that is higher and nobler and broader and more far-reaching than free trade. (Applause.)

HOW TO REACH THE SINGLE TAX.

Some of my friends will say: "Are you not underrating the single tax?" You will see, when I get there. Some of our friends say: "We believe that the single tax is the one remedy and the only practicable remedy for those evils in society which can be remedied by any kind of legislation; what is the use of this mere tariff tinkering? Why disturb us with this little tariff bill, the fiercest pest here and its ten per cent. there? When we have this great, noble object in view we do not care for these minor issues and cannot talk of anything else."

Suppose there was one brick in a pile which you wanted to get out, and there were something over forty-one hundred bricks on the top of that one (applause and laughter); and you are going right and main for that one brick, the friend who sticks by you says: "Yes, my whole heart is set on getting at that brick, but I cannot spend any time in pulling away at those other four thousand. I will never waste my time or weary my hands by meddling with other bricks in which I am not interested." (Laughter.) Another man says: "I do not agree to that; I see there are forty-one hundred bricks on the top of that one brick which we want to get at; I see we must lift forty-one hundred bricks before we can get at number forty-one hundred and one; but I will only touch the one hundred lying closest to it." (Applause.) Another man comes up, equally devoted to this one brick, and says: "What a parcel of fools you are, of course you must take the whole forty-one hundred off, but I will be hanged if I touch an I can lift them all off at once." (Laughter.)

I am talking just now only to those men who think that the single tax is the only remedy for the evils that afflict society is to establish the system of the single tax. How can they do it? You must remember that you do not have to invent the single tax; you do not have to bring it into existence. It is in existence now. (Applause.) There is not a state in this Union that does not have the single tax. The trouble is that there are forty-one hundred taxes on top of it. You have nothing to do except to kill those forty-one hundred taxes. (Applause.) Some say: "We won't kill any until we can kill them all at once." I say, Kill any that you can get hold of. (Applause.) Some say that the tariff is not the one to begin at. Where should you begin then? Of the forty-one hundred piled on top of your single tax, four thousand are in the tariff. (Applause.) What is more, if you kill one hundred which are not in the tariff, you immensely increase the strength of the four thousand in the tariff."

The secret of the strength of the rising free trade sentiment at the present time is that we

have divided the forces of taxation, have divided the enemy, have got the whisky-mongers and the protected manufacturers on the one side, and the threatened and the free traders on the other. (Applause.) If you kill off the other taxes before you kill the tariff, you will have to wait more than fifty years for the single tax. The best thing to do is to strike down the tariff; and we must begin by taking a piece off it wherever we can.

The first thing is the Mills bill. That goes to the tender spot of the whole system. The tariff on wool is the keystone of the whole tariff. Pull that out and the whole arch will tumble down. That is why the woolen manufacturers who pay that tax, who would thank the Lord if they could only get rid of it, don't dare to abolish it now.

We are in favor of the Mills bill because it cuts down the tariff a little. The more it cuts it down the better we are pleased. We are in favor of it because it is a beginning. We are in favor of it because it opens the tariff discussion. We are in favor of it because it pulls the keystone out of the protection arch. When the tariff is gone, there will not be enough strength in any other kind of taxation to stand for five minutes. Just think of it. When you get rid of the tariff, how can the internal revenue taxes be kept up? You will never get the American people to impose internal revenue taxes on home manufactures while foreign manufactures come in free (applause); and you never ought to. Therefore, within twenty-four hours, yes, within twenty-four minutes after the total repeal of the tariff, you will repeal the internal revenue side of the protection arch. You will have to resort to then for taxes? Why, to direct taxation. Where will direct taxation land? It would not take five years of exclusively direct taxation to bring the whole community to the conclusion at which we have arrived long ago, that there is but one just tax, and its name is the single tax. (Applause.)

TARIFFS AND WAGES.

But there are some people who say, "We must keep the tariff up because we must keep up American wages," or as the democratic platform of 1884 expressed it, "The American workingman needs to be heavily taxed in order to compensate him for getting rich." For he got wages much higher than in Europe, before there was any tariff at all. Then the protective feature was invented—for what? In those olden times they said candidly, "to compensate the capitalist for the high wages which he is forced to pay to the grasping workman." That was before all the workmen had votes. When they got votes the employers said: "We want protection only for the sake of the dear workmen!" (Laughter.)

TARIFF TAXES FALL UPON THE POOR. Who pays these tariff taxes? Nine-tenths of them are paid by people whose incomes are less than \$100 a year. That fact is not seriously disputed. I could quote you one protectionist after another to show its truth—Senator Sherman of Ohio; Mr. Milliken of Maine's own state, and at present a member of congress, and others. They admit unequivocally that nine-tenths of all indirect taxes fall upon the poorest classes of the community; and worse than that, they bear on those who earn less than \$300 a year with ten times the severity that they do on the rich. (Applause.) There is not a bad carrier in New York who does not pay one hundred times as much tax, in proportion to his ability, as Jay Gould or William H. Vanderbilt pays. There is not a poor sewing girl in the city of New York who does not pay two hundred times as much, in proportion to her means and ability to pay, as the wife of either of these men. So, if I may name a famous lady and do it with no disrespect to her—Mrs. Blaine, I want to ask you, from your knowledge of that lady's economic position, that she does not pay to the federal government one three-hundredth part, as much in proportion to her means, as the average sewing girl in the city of New York. (Applause.)

WAGES NOT INCREASED.

You create this inequality, for what purpose? To enable your employers to pay you wages? What wages do they pay? Do they pay any larger wages than they would if there were no tariff? Mr. Blaine says so; but where is the proof of it? You never heard any, and there never can be any. (Applause.) Now, I want to ask you, if the working people of the United States are in any way better off in industries which can be said to be protected by the tariff. Not 850,000 people, all told, out of the 17,000,000 who were engaged in industries in 1880, were engaged in protected industries. Those were the only persons whose wages could be raised by the tariff. But if their wages were raised above the average of others, those 17,000,000 would all pour into their occupations and thus cut their wages down again. (Applause.)

TARIFFS MURDER INDUSTRIES.

What does the tariff do toward raising wages? You are told that it diversifies industry and develops new industries. That never was a greater falsehood. (Applause.) All that a protective tariff does is to murder some industries. That is all that any protective tariff ever did or ever can do. Just see what it does. Take pig iron. Does a protective tariff say that anybody shall be rewarded for making pig iron? Does it place any bounty on pig iron? Not at all. What it does say is that if any man imports pig iron he shall be sent to prison. Do you know that more bringing in of a pound of iron is punishable, at the discretion of the judge, by several years imprisonment? (Dissees.) More than that, revenue cutters are lying around our coast ready to pour shot into any one who dares to bring in goods from abroad, and any vessel which dared to enter into any of our ports with the exception of less than 200, would be instantly blown into atoms.

What does the tariff do toward developing industry? It does not develop pig iron. Where does the development come in? (Laughter.) Only in this: If you shoot the man who brings pig iron from abroad, he is forced to turn to some other industry. He must make a living somehow; and, perhaps, since he is not allowed to buy pig iron, he may conclude to make it.

Now, I will tell you how you might develop Brooklyn before the manner of the tariff. Don't offer men land or hope for free trade. There is something simpler than that—the protective tariff method. Set fire to every house in New York city. Have an army of soldiers to shoot anybody who dares to look on the ruins; and you will impose a protective tariff in favor of Brooklyn. The citizens of New York will flee to Brooklyn, and the future development of Brooklyn pays my powers of description. (Applause and laughter.)

PROTECTION DRIVING WOMEN OUT OF WORK.

There is a little illustration of this which took place right here in New York last fall. Cotton manufacturers, who were able to gain the ear of the committee that framed the tariff in 1888, got a tariff imposed on fine cottons, which are used for making ruffles—ladies know what they are; I don't. (Laughter.) Within a few weeks after that tariff came into effect, three thousand women, engaged in making ruffles, were thrown out of employment, because the material had been made too costly for further use. That was all for the sake of protecting American industry. (Laughter.)

PROTECTION DRIVING MEN OUT OF WORK.

I have spoken of the duty on pig iron.

What has been the result of that? You have had, until very recently, a large manufacture of steel in New York, and about three years ago the largest manufacturer issued a private circular announcing that he could not carry on his business here any longer at a fair profit, but would transfer his works to Alabama. Why? Because he could get pig iron \$6 a ton cheaper there than here. But the tariff amounts to \$3.72; and if he could have got rid of that tariff, he could have continued his manufacture here in New York, and the iron would have been sold as cheap here as in Alabama. You don't make a pound of pig iron in New York city. The tariff is killing the iron manufacture on the whole Atlantic shore, but especially in New England; because what we want in the east is to make the superior kinds of iron, and the west is beating us because it has cheaper pig iron. The tariff only kills an industry and never creates one, except in the same sense in which you might create a larger city in Brooklyn by destroying the city of New York. (Laughter.)

WAGES LOWERED UNDER HIGH TARIFFS.

How on earth can this tariff raise wages? Did it ever raise wages? I have read a statement, made on Oct. 3, 1819, by the protectionists of Philadelphia, who met in council and demanded a higher tariff. One of the reasons which they assigned for wanting the tariff raised was that there was a tremendous depression in business, manifested by a great fall in wages. Mechanics' wages had fallen from \$3.19 a week to \$3, or one dollar a day; and they wanted a higher tariff to enable them to raise wages. (Laughter.) The tariff in 1824, and a "tremendous" one still in 1828, which they maintained for a long time. Then came the tariff of 1842—the ideal protective tariff. What became of wages? Did mechanics' wages rise in those years? The official figures, obtained from protectionist manufacturers themselves, show that in 1845 the average rate of mechanics' wages for full grown men in iron works was eighty-seven cents a day, and \$1 a day in machine shops. (Applause.) They had fallen off thirteen cents in 1824, and in twenty-five years, instead of having risen, as protectionists claim that they always do, under protection, wages did not rise in the least under the tariff of 1842.

WAGES INCREASED UNDER LOW TARIFFS.

I was a boy then, and I remember distinctly how we got rid of that protective tariff in 1846. I was somewhat of a protectionist then, and I expected to see wages to go down; but they didn't. I remember distinctly how boys in New York city, by the hundred, applied for work under that protective tariff at fifty cents a week. In 1847, when the high tariff was abolished, wages increased and steadily advanced, until in 1856, the men who used to get one dollar a day under a high tariff were getting a dollar and a half under the low tariff. The wages of carpenters went up from \$1.25 to \$2 and \$2.25. And though they have since grown higher, they have not risen as rapidly under twenty-five years of protection as they did in ten years under a low tariff. (Applause.)

Neither as a matter of fact, nor as a matter of theory, is it possible, does or can a protective tariff raise wages. On the contrary, it lowers wages; it cuts them down. That is why I am in favor of absolute free trade (applause); because under absolute free trade we should have the most rapid rise in wages which this country has ever known.

THE POOR CAPITALIST MUST BE PROTECTED.

It is said that the manufacturers must have protection or they cannot pay the high wages they pay to workmen. What is the truth as to that? The American workingman produces more than double the amount in value of the product of the English workingman. (Applause.) They seldom get fifty per cent more than Englishmen. Whenever they get fifty per cent more wages, they produce over one hundred per cent more by their work. Today the wages in the cotton and woolen factories of this country are so near to the wages in England that the difference can hardly be discerned. In Pennsylvania, in the woolen and worsted factories, the average rate of wages amounted in 1885 to \$6.40 per week. At the same time the statistics of Halifax, in England, in the same class of industry, showed that men were making \$7.18 per week.

I do not mean to say that, as a general thing, English workmen receive as high wages as you do. As a general rule wages in America are very much higher than they are in England; but the only exceptions to the rule are in the protected industries. (Applause.) You take the carpenters, the masons, the plumbers, men who are engaged in industries which are not protected by a protective tariff—in all those industries wages are much higher in America than they are in England. (Applause.) But when you go into the iron manufacture, the wool manufacture and the cotton manufacture—the three great manufactures which maintain this tariff—you can find hundreds, yes, thousands, of men receiving lower wages here than men engaged in precisely the same employments in England, not working so many hours or producing as much. (Applause.)

AMERICANS EARNING EIGHTY CENTS A DAY.

I was in Washington two years ago; and I heard a manufacturer of iron and an owner of iron mines, the most estimable gentleman appealing to the ways and means committee to increase the tariff, in order that he might be enabled to pay higher wages. And Mr. Breckinridge (applause) cornered him with the question how much wages he paid. He did not like to answer; he turned rather red, and then said he paid his men eighty to ninety cents a day. (Laughter.)

ENGLISHMEN NINETY-SEVEN CENTS A DAY.

I have in my possession a republican card (holding it up) issued to persuade democratic workmen to vote the republican ticket, in which they compare English and American wages. What do you suppose this hand bill says? That the average of English workmen engaged in precisely the same industries—Ninety-seven cents a day. That is a republican testimony, and it is true. (Applause.) A coal mine owner from Maryland came before the committee; and he begged them to have compassion on his poor workmen; for if the committee took off any part of the duty of seventy-five cents on coal, the wages of these men would be reduced. They asked him what their wages were. He didn't like to answer. Finally he said they were forty cents a ton. He needed seventy-five cents protection in order to enable him to pay forty cents in wages. (Applause and laughter.) That is like Mr. Carnegie, who, in order that he may generously pay his workmen \$4.25 a ton for labor, needs and cannot live without an adequate protection of \$17 a ton; and the hard-hearted republican senators are actually going to cut him down to \$15.68. (Laughter.) He will take every cent of that \$13.20 out of the wages of his workmen—if he can.

They asked the coal miner how much the average wages came to. He said, about 80 cents a day. In this very same industry, this card in my possession, issued by the republicans and distributed by the hundred thousand in Brooklyn and New York, shows that the wages in England were over 90 cents a day. (Applause.) So you see that there are some industries in this country where the rate of wages is much below the standard of England.

AMERICAN MINERS AT SIXTY CENTS A DAY.

Look at this (showing the card): There is

the British flag, and it is headed with "60 cents a day." This is issued by the league of republicans clubs, which is engaged in trying the fat out of the protected manufacturers; of which the president is Mr. Foster, to whom we are indebted for some of the best things in this campaign. (Laughter.) When you look at the text, you find that the 60 cents were paid in Belgium and not in Great Britain; and Belgium has a tariff on iron, while Great Britain, where wages are much higher, has none. (Great laughter.) Then we turn around the card and there (showing it) is the American flag. Everything is blooming in America. You wouldn't believe that in America such a thing existed as workmen living on 60 cents a day. Yet it was stated in the presence of the ways and means committee that in Berks county, Pennsylvania, the iron miners were only receiving 60 cents a day. Some doubted the statement, whereupon Mr. Hewitt spoke up (applause) and said: "Yes, the condition of the miners in that region is miserable in the extreme. They often work for less than 60 cents a day. That is no wonder the British flag. (Applause.) Mr. Foster cannot find any place in England where the miners work for 60 cents; but in Pennsylvania he can find them by shoals."

AMERICAN LABOR TWICE AS PRODUCTIVE.

I have talked longer than I meant to (cries of "Go on"), but I will stay to answer questions as long as they don't turn the gas out. (Laughter and cries of "That's right.") The press is the best paper for free trade that I know of in the hands of any man who thinks for himself. I saw the issue last week of the "Tariff Talk" with Colonel A. L. Conger of Ohio, who is eager for protection. And what does he say in regard to wages? I quote his words: "We pay twice as much for labor in this country as abroad, and therefore we get twice as good results from that labor." (Laughter and applause.) Labor which receives poor pay brings poor results. (Applause.) True as gospel! But then, how can pauper labor interfere with intelligent labor? Just look at the figures a little in this country. No matter where you go in any part of the world you find this thing true. If you go to India, where men work for ten cents a day, you find that it takes twenty household servants to accomplish what two good Irish girls will do here, and sing over it. (Laughter.) One man is brought up to make the beds and sweep the rooms, and another to cook the vegetables, and another to cook the meat, and another to wave the punka to keep the flies and mosquitoes and the baby (laughter); and no one of them will ever touch the work of another. So, you see, labor is not very productive there. In Crefeld, Germany, where poor men work very hard, fourteen and sixteen hours a day, and where they earn only sixty cents a day as the result of that labor, the statistics furnished annually by their employers show that more than sixty per cent of the cost of production is spent in wages. In Paterson, New Jersey, where wages are not so good as in England, the wages which used to be so much despised by our American workmen, but which they are forced to accept under our high tariff—less than thirty per cent of the cost of production consists in the cost of labor. (Applause.) The higher up you go in the scale of wages the cheaper is the cost of labor.

HIGH WAGES MEAN CHEAP LABOR AND LOW WAGES MEAN DEAR LABOR.

This fact is proved conclusively by the census of 1880, which our protectionist administration took themselves. Those returns show conclusively that where wages are high profits are large. Do you know that the cities of New York and Brooklyn pay the highest wages of any part of the country? Brooklyn stands at the head. The average wages paid in all the manufacturing industries in Brooklyn are \$470 a year. The average wages in Philadelphia, that fountain head of protection, are only \$436 a year. Why did not Philadelphia drive Brooklyn out of existence? Why is it that manufacturers have increased so much more rapidly in Brooklyn than anywhere else in the United States? Because Brooklyn, paying higher wages, gets a higher production for those wages; and Philadelphia gets only a smaller production, in consequence her lower rate of wages. In Brooklyn the wages are \$124 higher than in Philadelphia, while the net production was \$337 higher. The difference between Brooklyn and Baltimore in wages was \$220 a year; the difference in production was \$436. That principle, that the varying wages of the thousands of towns and counties in the United States.

I am not going to weary you with tables of statistics. I have compared these figures in all branches of industry. It is so with carpenters, weavers, spinners, iron makers, but makers, wool workers and cotton workers, and so with all industries added together. From beginning to end, from north to south, from east to west, wherever high wages are paid the net production is larger. The south, where low wages prevail. That proves that the manufacturers who pay high wages do not need protection, and the workmen suffer by it, because protection, by limiting the market of the manufacturer, limits the production of the workman, and in every way tends to cut wages down instead of raising them up.

THE MERE QUESTION.

I am only taking this subject, but I wish to say one thing, and that will be birds with one stone—the Irish question and imports and exports. Two assertions are made by protectionists—first that Ireland is ruined by free trade, and secondly, that our exports must exceed our imports, or we will be ruined; or, as Mr. Evans puts it, the state into which we want to come is one in which we will sell to all the world, and all the world will sell nothing to us. (Great laughter.)

There is one country when you attain to that; and that is, wherever you wish to export almost nothing—Egypt. And another country has been for a century past doing much the same thing. Ireland ought to be a paradise by this time, on Mr. Evans's theory, for she has been exporting all the time more than she has imported. During the terrible famine of 1849 she exported more provisions than she imported. While England was subsidizing most liberally, it must be said in justice to her, pouring in millions of pounds worth of money to keep them from starving, and all the world was helping Ireland, though benevolent landlords were all the time taking over more provisions from Ireland than England and all the world could pour in. What a prosperous country Ireland ought to be! (Laughter and applause.)

THAT SORT OF THING HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR ALL THESE YEARS.

You have heard of the absentee landlord. What a blessing he must be to any community. He causes his tenants to export everything to him; and he never insists that they shall import anything in return. So the country is blessed by a perpetual favorable balance of trade. Every Irishman knows that what Ireland needs is not a protective tariff, but a tariff that would just cut off the landlords. (Great applause.) It is not free trade; it is the landlords that are the curse of Ireland. (Applause.)

IRISH MANUFACTURERS INCREASING UNDER FREE TRADE.

And next you hear stories about the immense number of workmen who have been thrown out of employment in Ireland by the introduction of free trade. Do you know that the number of persons engaged in manu-

facturing industries in Ireland has increased more than 100 per cent since the introduction of free trade? (Applause.) Governor Beaver, a very good man from Pennsylvania, was preaching on this subject in Brooklyn; and he told a large audience that the linen industries of Ireland had been destroyed under free trade and transferred to England. I do not suppose he meant to misrepresent the truth; but it is the fact that these industries are being destroyed in England, and transferred to Ireland. (Applause.) When Mr. Porter got up his clever statistics about the linen industry, in which he states that the linen manufacture has fallen off in England and increased in Germany, he is always careful to say nothing about Ireland. Why? Because, under the influence of free trade, the linen manufacture of Ireland has increased more than one hundred per cent and amounts to more than that of all the rest of Europe. More than 60,000 people are now engaged in the manufacture of linen in Ireland; whereas, before free trade, there were for less than 25,000. (Applause.) More persons are now engaged in the Irish linen factories than were ever before engaged in all other factories in Ireland.

THE COBDEN CLUB.

You hear a good deal of the Cobden club. (Applause.) Where are the friends of Ireland in England to-day? They are all in the Cobden club. (Applause.) What is the Cobden club? It is mainly Mr. Thomas Bayley Potter, one of the five members of parliament who organized the movement in favor of this country in 1863, a consistent home ruler, who has voted for Gladstone every time. (Applause.) Who is the leading philosophical free trader in England at the present day? John Morley. (Applause.) Who is John Morley? The English statesman who, long before Mr. Gladstone made up his mind, had declared himself in favor of home rule in Ireland. (Applause.)

Richard Cobden himself (applause), after whom the club is named, was always a friend of Ireland. He was kept out of public office, largely by his friendship to Ireland. He would not enter a government which would not do justice to Ireland. He was the man who destroyed the protective system in England, although he did not go as far as we would desire.

FRIENDS OF IRELAND ALL FREE TRADERS.

What is William E. Gladstone? (Great applause.) Are Irishmen going back on him, on that noble old man, who, in the eightieth year of his age, is devoting himself with marvelous activity and energy to furthering the cause of Ireland, and only taking care of his health and saving his strength so as to disappoint the Salisbury and Balfours, who are eagerly hoping for his death? Irishmen do not have one single friend among the protectionists of England (applause); while nineteen out of twenty free traders of England are your friends, and always have been; and they are the men who are bent upon and determined to secure your freedom and your proper independence. (Applause.)

Free traders, and they only, are the allies of Farnell. (Applause.) Who subscribed the \$30,000 to support Farnell in the infamous prosecution brought on by the Times? They are free traders to a man. (Applause.) Irishmen! what you want is freedom. (Applause.) You don't want any tory "protection." You want to protect yourselves. Freedom is what Ireland wants: freedom is what America wants—free trade, free land, free men! (Great and long continued applause.)

MR. SHEARMAN ANSWERS QUESTIONS.

When the applause had somewhat subsided Chairman George arose and announced that Mr. Shearman was prepared to answer questions. More than a dozen men jumped up in various parts of the hall, and Mr. George, having recognized the first one that caught his eye, repeated the following question:

Q.—If tariffs destroy manufacturing industries, why is it that manufacturers in this country to a man are in favor of a protective tariff?

A.—In the first place, I cannot accept the statement. They are not by any means. Our good friend, Mr. Tom L. Johnson (applause), to whom Mr. George referred early this evening, is a manufacturer and an absolute, thoroughgoing free trader. J. B. Sargent of New Haven (applause) is the largest manufacturer in his line, and is a free trader. William Marshall of Brooklyn, the largest cordage maker in America, is a free trader. (Applause.)

Nevertheless, it is probably true that a majority of the manufacturers in the United States are protectionists. That is nothing at all new in the history of this world. When any class of men once give way to their selfish instincts and endeavor to frame a national policy for their own benefit and not for the benefit for the nation at large, they invariably overshoot the mark, and in their greediness do themselves injury as well as other people. This is just as true about lawyers as about manufacturers; just as true about clergymen as about lawyers; just as true about doctors as about clergymen; just as true about anyone who seeks to frame laws for his own interest instead of for the interest of the whole people.

The same question: Then you mean to say that the mechanic, the doctor, the lawyer, the manufacturer, are simply aiming to cut their own heads off?

A.—What I do say is that when any one of those classes undertakes to act for its own selfish interests, it practically does cut its own head off. That is true of every class in the world.

A gentleman with a decided foreign accent attempted to frame a question in which the only intelligible word was "police"; but after a vain endeavor to understand, Mr. Shearman said: "I shall have to follow the example of Mr. Evans's boy and say, 'I don't know.'" (Laughter.)

Q.—On the platform I see the sign "Free trade! free land and free men!" We have free trade between the sister states; and we have neither free land nor free men. I wish the gentleman to tell me why? (Laughter.)

A.—Because we have only gone half way. If you start out for Albany and stop at Poughkeepsie, you will never get to Albany. We have free trade between all the states; but that is the secret of the wonderful prosperity that we have. (Applause.) That is why wages are so high; it is because we have so much free trade. But so long as we do not have absolute free trade, taxes to the extent of seven hundred millions a year are piled upon the shoulders of the poorest men of the community; and the poorer you are the more taxes you pay in proportion to your means. In addition, about five hundred millions are piled on the shoulders of the poor under the shape of bounties to protected manufacturers and mine owners. When you take that vast amount year after year out of the wages of the workmen, and more especially out of the wages of the poorest classes, how can you have free land or free men? (Applause.)

Q.—I would like to ask whether, if this country adopted free trade in wool, admits wool free of duty, England will not at once place a duty on export duty on wool, in order to protect her manufacturers?

A.—If my friend will only get the republican

majority to consent to pass a bill repealing the duty on wool, to take effect, on condition that that state of things never occurs, on my part I will agree to find among my friends any amount of money to put in bank to guarantee this country against any possibility of that thing happening. Nobody dreams of its happening. It is impossible. Moreover, England has no surplus wool to export.

Q.—How much do the 60,000 people, engaged in the linen industry in Ireland earn a year? (Applause.)

A.—In the first place, the 60,000 Irishmen engaged in linen manufacture undoubtedly receive very much less wages than work people of a similar class in the United States; although Mr. Barbour, the president of the Barbour flax spinning works, a most ardent protectionist, testified before the tariff commission, in 1883 that he was compelled to steadily raise the wages of his Irish employees, but was steadily cutting down the wages of his American employees. (Laughter and applause.) At that rate the Irish would after a while get rich. (Laughter.) It is very true that since the adoption of partial free trade in England in 1816 the population in Ireland has largely fallen off. Why is it? LANDLORDS. (Applause.)

Q.—I would ask Mr. Shearman, who had the kindness to answer the gentleman on this side of the house, giving him such cheering and encouraging news (applause), to make a statement; ask your question?—how is it that Brazil lowered an export duty on coffee?

A.—If I answered literally, I would say, "Because Brazil wanted to," but I understand that long and full questions cannot be asked here, and I seek, therefore, to answer the spirit of every question. (Applause.) What the gentleman means is this: That when we repealed the duty on coffee in 1873 Brazil put an export duty on coffee, with a view to make us pay as much for coffee as we did before. Did she succeed in doing that? For a year or two she did. That is sixteen years ago; and ever since the first two years she didn't. (Applause.) If we had been in such a condition that we must have coffee or die, and there had been no place other than Brazil from which coffee could be got, we should have had to pay that export duty. But there was a great deal of coffee in other parts of the world; and Brazil could not get any more for her coffee than Porto Rico got for hers. The consequence is that for the last fourteen years Brazilians have paid that duty themselves. (Applause.)

Q.—Why is it that Germany and Italy, with high tariff duties, send us ten immigrants to one from England?

A.—I have been there. If you had been there, you wouldn't wonder. Italy enjoys all the blessings of an enormously high protective tariff. It almost beats ours. In some respects our tariff is worse; but, taken as a whole, the Italian tariff is the worst. I have seen workmen in Rome working all day long for thirty and forty cents a day, eating their black bread and softening it with water at the pump. I have seen poor creatures in the Neapolitan districts living on twenty or thirty cents a day, and not always earning that. No wonder, then, that they want to emigrate. What is the cause? Free trade! They never had it; never began to have it. In Germany, since 1879, when they adopted the protective tariff, they have sent more and more emigrants to us. The high tariff has driven people out.

Q.—Is there any law in England against trusts?

A. There is what is called the common law, which is substantially the same as ours; but England, having free trade, has never had occasion to resort to that. (Applause.)

Q.—What is there to prevent them from organizing a trust on the other side?

each family a half an acre, and have \$20,000 worth left in that one little state—and we have our own down to our suffering and doing nothing! I say no! Open them up, break down this infernal Chinese wall which enables a few to protect themselves and rob the many. (Thunderous applause.)

Mr. George took his seat amid great and continued applause, and the usual collection was taken up. Mr. George making a few remarks. Speaking of the advance which the democratic party is making, he said: "With every day as it passes the democratic masses are becoming more radical. In one place, in the Twenty-first district of Ohio (applause), they have nominated for congress a man who avows himself a free trader absolutely (great applause), a man who knows himself for the single tax (great applause). I saw a man from the first time he had one of our best and staunchest friends—Tom L. Johnson of Ohio." (Applause and cheers.) Mr. George continued: "And now I have the pleasure to introduce for the first time to a single tax audience one of the best and ablest friends of the single tax, a man who by pen and speech and with his means has aided our cause most efficiently; a man who, beginning as a free trader, came to the single tax position as the logical result of his examination of facts. I said the other night when I stood up here to answer questions that I would only answer questions as to principles, because in the first place I was not an encyclopedia. (Laughter.) Now the man whom I am about to introduce to you comes as near as any one can get to being an encyclopedia. (Laughter and applause.) And after his speech if any of our present friends in this audience want to get up and ask hard questions he is ready to answer them."

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure to introduce Thomas G. Shearman. (Great applause.)

MR. SHEARMAN'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The very flattering introduction which has been given me, and especially the statement that I will answer all questions, reminds me of a capital story related by my friend Mr. Evans, who is a very much better story teller than he is an economist (laughter); what he does not know about story telling is hardly worth knowing, and unfortunately what he knows about economics is exactly the same thing. (Laughter.)

His story was that a boy was sent away from a high school with a very black mark as being incorrigibly stupid. When he came home, his father was very indignant and said: "What is the matter, after all the pains bestowed on you by your education you cannot do better than the boy." I went through an examination, and when I got through with the examination they said I had failed, and would not pass me. "How is that?" "I really don't know." They put a lot of questions to me and I answered them all correctly the first time. "What was the first question they put to you?" "They asked me how far the earth was from the sun." "What did you say to that?" "Why, I said I didn't know." (Laughter and applause.) I won't answer every question in that way; but you see that I am safe in promising to answer every question correctly.

NO APOLOGY FOR FREE TRADE.

It is an immense pleasure to me to speak upon this platform, to this audience and surrounded by these friends, and with this banner behind me, inscribed, "Free Trade! Free Land! Free Men!" (Great applause.) We need no excuses. We make no pretences. We are not apologizing for our principles nor coming away from them. (Applause and laughter.) We don't tell anybody that free trade is a local issue. We don't tell anybody that this is impracticable. We come out plainly and tell every one just what we think, just what we mean, just what we intend to do. (Applause.)

I am a revenue reformer; but I have a large idea as to what revenue reform means. It means a great deal more than free trade. Revenue reform means the reform of every evil that ever was, or will be found in the collection of the public revenue. (Applause.) All the same, I am very proud of being called a freetrader. (Applause.) I am proud of the name and the cause of free trade. Among those objects which can at present be attained, among those truths of the future which are practicable, which come within our grasp, which we can fight now and fight with the confidence that they have effective weapons in their hands with which to make the free face before them—among such practical causes of the day and hour in which we live, there is absolutely none that is higher and nobler and braver and more far-reaching than free trade. (Applause.)

HOW TO REACH THE SINGLE TAX.

Some of my friends will say: "Are you not underrating the single tax?" You will see, when I get there. Some of our friends say: "We believe that the single tax is the one remedy and the only practicable remedy for those evils in society which can be remedied by any kind of legislation; what is the use of this mere tariff tinkering? Why disturb us with this little Mills bill, its five per cent here and its ten per cent there? When we have this great, noble object in view we do not care for these minor issues and cannot talk of anything else."

Suppose there was one brick in a pile which you wanted to get out, and there were something over forty-one hundred bricks on the top of that one (applause and laughter); and you are going right and main for that brick. Suppose a friend who stands by you says: "Yes, my whole heart is set on getting at that brick, but I cannot spend any time in pulling away at those other four thousand. I will never waste my time or weary my hands by meddling with other bricks in which I am not interested." (Laughter.) Another man says: "I do not agree to that; I see there are forty-one hundred bricks on the top of that one brick which we want to get at; see we must lift forty-one hundred before we can get at one of those four thousand and one; but I will only touch one of those hundred lying close to it." (Applause.) Another man comes up, equally devoted to this one brick, and says: "What a parcel of fools you are; of course you must take the whole forty-one hundred off; but I will be hanged if I touch any; I can lift them all off at once." (Laughter.)

I am talking just now only to those men who think that the best remedy that can be found for the evils that afflict society is to establish the system of the single tax. How can they do it? You must remember that you do not have to invent the single tax; you do not have to bring it into existence. It is in existence now. (Applause.) There is not a state in this Union that does not have the single tax. The trouble is that there are forty-one hundred taxes on top of it. You have nothing to do except to kill those forty-one hundred taxes. (Applause.) Some say: "We won't kill any until we can kill them all at once." I say, Kill any that you can get hold of. (Applause.) Some say that the tariff is not the one to begin at. Where should you begin, then? Of the forty-one hundred piled on top of your single tax, four thousand are in the tariff. (Applause.) What is more, if you kill one hundred which are not in the tariff, you immensely increase the strength of the four thousand in the tariff.

The secret of the strength of the rising free trade sentiment at the present time is that we

have divided the forces of taxation, have divided the enemy, have got the whisky men on one side and the protected manufacturers on the other. (Applause.) If you kill off the other taxes before you kill the tariff, you will have to wait more than fifty years for the single tax. The best thing to do is to strike down the tariff; and we must begin by taking a piece off it wherever we can.

The first thing is the Mills bill. That goes to the tender spot of the whole system. The tariff on wool is the keystone of the whole tariff. Pull that out and the whole arch will tumble down. That is why the woolen manufacturers who pay that tax, who would thank the Lord if they could only get rid of it, don't dare to abolish it now.

We are in favor of the Mills bill because it cuts down the tariff a little. The more it cuts it down the better we are pleased. We are in favor of it because it is a beginning. We are in favor of it because it opens the tariff discussion. We are in favor of it because it pulls the keystone out of the protection arch. When the tariff is gone, there will not be enough strength in any other kind of taxation to stand for five minutes. Just think of it. When you get rid of the tariff, how can the internal revenue taxes be kept up? You will never get the American people to impose internal revenue taxes on home manufactures while foreign manufactures come in free (applause); and you never ought to. Therefore, within twenty-four hours, you will, within twenty-four minutes after the total repeal of the tariff, you will have the internal revenue taxes. What will the government have to resort to then for taxes? Why, to direct taxation. Where will direct taxation land? It would not take five years of exclusively direct taxation to bring the whole community to the conclusion at which we have arrived long ago, that there is but one just tax, and its name is the single tax. (Applause.)

TARIFFS AND WAGES.

But there are some people who say, "We must keep the tariff up because we must keep up American wages," or as the democratic platform of 1884 expressed it, "The American workingman needs to be heavily taxed in order to compensate him for getting high wages. For he got wages much higher than in Europe, before there was any tariff at all. Then the protective feature was invented—for what? In those olden times they said candidly, 'to compensate the capitalist for the high wages which he is forced to pay to the grasping workman.'" That was before all the workmen had votes. When they got votes the employers said: "We want protection only for the sake of the dear workmen." (Laughter.)

TARIFF TAKEN FALL UPON THE POOR.

Who pays these tariff taxes? Nineteen-tenths of them are paid by people whose incomes average less than \$400 a year. That fact is so seriously disputed, I will quote one protectionist after another to show its truth. Senator Sherman, of Ohio; Mr. Milliken, from Maine's own state, and at present a member of congress, and others. They admit unequivocally that nine-tenths of all indirect taxes fall upon the poorest classes of the community; and worse than that, they bear on the taxes who earn less than \$500 a year with ten times the severity that they do on the rich. (Applause.) There is not a hod carrier in New York who does not pay one hundred times as much tax, in proportion to his ability, as Jay Gould or William H. Vanderbilt pays. There is not a poor sewing girl in the city of New York who does not pay two hundred times as much, in proportion to her means and ability to pay, as the wife of either of these men. So, if I may name a famous lady—and I do it with no disrespect to her—Mrs. Henry Green, I entertain no doubt, from my knowledge of that lady's economical habits, that she does not pay to the federal government one three-hundredth part, as much in proportion to her means, as the average sewing girl in the city of New York. (Applause.)

WAGES NOT INCREASED.

You create this inequality, for what purpose? To enable your employers to pay you wages! What wages do they pay? Do they pay any larger wages than they would if there were no tariff? Mr. Blaine says so; but where is the proof of it? You never heard any, and there never can be any. (Applause.) Not one-twentieth of the working people of the United States are in any way concerned in industries which can be said to be protected by the tariff. Not 850,000 people, all told, out of the 17,000,000 who were engaged in industries in 1880, were engaged in protected industries. Those were the only persons whose wages could be raised by the tariff. But if their wages were raised above the average of others, those 17,000,000 would all pour into their occupations and thus cut their wages down again. (Applause.)

TARIFFS MURDER INDUSTRIES.

What does the tariff do toward raising wages? You are told that it diversifies industry and develops new industries. There never was a single instance of that. (Applause.) All that a protective tariff does is to murder some industries. That is all that any protective tariff ever did or ever can do. Just see what it does. Take pig iron. Does a protective tariff say that anybody shall be rewarded for making pig iron? Does it place any bounty on pig iron? Not at all. What it does say is, that if any man imports pig iron without paying \$6.75 a ton tax he shall be sent to prison. Do you know that the mere bringing in of a pound of iron is punishable, at the discretion of the judge, by several years' imprisonment? (Hisses.) More than that, revenue cutters are lying around our coast ready to pour shot into any one who dares to bring in goods from abroad, and any vessel which dared to enter into any of our ports with a cargo of less than 200, would be instantly blown into atoms.

That is the way in which you develop pig iron. Where does the development come in? (Laughter.) Only in this: If you shoot the man who brings pig iron from abroad, he is forced to turn to some other industry. He must make a living somehow; and, perhaps, since he is not allowed to buy pig iron, he may conclude to make it.

Now, I will tell you how you might develop Brooklyn after the manner of the tariff. Don't offer men land or houses free. No, there is something simpler than that—take the protective tariff method. Set fire to every house in New York city. Have an army of soldiers to shoot anybody who dares to leave the city and you will impose a protective tariff in favor of Brooklyn. The citizens of New York will beg to Brooklyn, and the future development of Brooklyn passes your powers of description. (Applause and laughter.)

PROTECTION DRIVING WORKMEN OUT OF WORK.

There is a little illustration of this which took place right here in New York. Some cotton manufacturers, who were able to gain the ear of the committee that framed the tariff in 1882, got a tariff imposed on fine cottons, which are used for making ruffles—ladies know what they are; I don't. (Laughter.) Within a few weeks after that tariff came into effect, three thousand women, engaged in making ruffles, were thrown out of employment because the material had been made too costly for further use. That was all for the sake of protecting American industry. (Laughter.)

PROTECTION SERVING MEN OUT OF WORK.

I have spoken of the duty on pig iron.

What has been the result of that? You have had, until very recently, a large manufacture of stoves in this state. About three years ago the largest manufacturer moved a private circular announcing that he could not carry on his business here any longer at a fair profit, but would transfer his works to Alabama. Why? Because he could get pig iron 95¢ a ton cheaper there than here. But the tariff amounts to \$6.75; and if he could have got rid of that tariff, he could have continued his manufacture here in New York, since iron would have been fully as cheap here as in Alabama. You don't make a pound of pig iron in New York city. The tariff is killing the iron manufacture on the whole Atlantic shore, but especially in New England; because what we want in the east is to make the superior kinds of iron, and the west is beating us because it has cheaper pig iron. The tariff only kills an industry and never creates one, except in the same sense in which you might create a larger city in Brooklyn by destroying the city of New York.

WAGES LOWERED UNDER HIGH TARIFFS.

How on earth can this tariff raise wages? Did it ever raise wages? I have read a statement, made on Oct. 2, 1819, by the protectionists of Philadelphia, who met in council and demanded a higher tariff. One of the reasons which they assigned for wanting the tariff raised was that there was a tremendous depression in business, manifested by a great fall in wages. Mechanics' wages had fallen from \$9.19 a week to \$8, or one dollar a day; and they wanted a high tariff to enable them to raise wages. They got a tremendous tariff in 1824, and a "tremendous" one still in 1888, which they maintained for a long time. Then came the tariff of 1842—the ideal protective tariff. What became of wages? Did mechanics' wages rise in those years? The official figures, obtained from protectionist manufacturers themselves, show that in 1845 the average rate of mechanics' wages for full grown men in iron works was eighty-seven cents a day, and \$1 was a high price. (Applause.) They had fallen off thirteen cents a day in twenty-five years, instead of having risen, as protectionists claim that they always do, under protection. Wages did not rise in the least under the tariff of 1842.

WAGES INCREASED UNDER LOW TARIFFS.

I was a boy then, and I remember distinctly how we got rid of that protective tariff in 1866. I was somewhat of a protectionist then, and I expected to see wages to go down; but they didn't. I remember distinctly how boys in New York city, by the hundred, applied for work under the tariff of one dollar a day, fifty cents a week. In 1847, when the high tariff was abolished, wages increased and steadily advanced, until in 1854, the men who used to get one dollar a day under a high tariff were getting a dollar and a half under the low tariff. The wages of carpenters went up from \$1.25 to \$2 and \$2.25. And though they have since grown higher, they have not risen as rapidly under twenty-five years of protection as they did in ten years under a low tariff. (Applause.)

Neither as a matter of fact, nor as a matter of theory or possibility, does or can a protective tariff raise wages. On the contrary, it lowers wages; it cuts them down. That is why I am in favor of absolute free trade (applause); because under absolute free trade we should have the most rapid rise in wages which this country has ever known.

THE POOR CAPITALIST MUST BE PROTECTED.

It is said that the manufacturers must have protection or they cannot pay the high wages they pay to workmen. What is the truth as to that? The American workingman produces more than double the amount in value of the products of the English workingman. (Applause.) They do not doubt it. They say they seldom get fifty per cent more than Englishmen. Whenever they get fifty per cent more wages, they produce over one hundred per cent more by their work. Today the wages in the cotton and woolen factories of this country are so near to the wages in England that the difference can hardly be discerned. In Pennsylvania, in the woolen and worsted factories, the average rate of wages amounted in 1885 to \$6.40 per week. At the same time the statistics of Halifax, in England, in the same class of industries, showed that men were making \$7.18 per week.

I do not mean to say that, as a general thing, English workmen receive as high wages as you do. As a general rule wages in America are very much higher than they are in England; but the only reason for the rule are in the protected industries. (Applause.) You take the carpenters, the masons, the plumbers, men who are engaged in industries which cannot be benefited by a protective tariff—in all those industries wages are very much higher in America than they are in England. (Applause.) But when you go into the iron manufacture, the wool manufacture and the cotton manufacture—the three great manufactures which maintain this tariff—you can find hundreds, yes, thousands, of men receiving lower wages here than men engaged in precisely the same employments in England, not working so many hours or producing as much. (Applause.)

AMERICANS EARNING EIGHTY CENTS A DAY.

I was in Washington two years ago; and I heard a manufacturer of iron and an owner of iron mines—a most estimable gentleman—appealing to the ways and means committee to increase the tariff, in order that he might be enabled to pay higher wages. And Mr. Breckinridge (applause) cornered him with the question how much wages he paid. He did not like to answer; he turned rather red, and then said he paid his men eighty to ninety cents a day. (Laughter.)

ENGLISHMEN NINETY-SEVEN CENTS A DAY.

I have in my possession a republican card (holding it up) issued to persuade democratic workmen to vote the republican ticket, in which they compare English and American wages. What do you suppose this card bill says are the wages of English workmen? Ninety-seven cents a day. That is the republican testimony, and it is true. (Applause.)

A coal mine owner from Maryland came before the committee; and he begged them to have compassion on his poor workmen; for if the committee took off any part of the duty of seventy-five cents on coal, the wages of these men would be reduced. They asked him what their wages were. He didn't like to answer. Finally he said they were forty cents a ton. He needed seventy-five cents protection in order to enable him to pay forty cents in wages. (Applause and laughter.) That is like Mr. Carnegie, who, in order that he may generously pay his workmen \$4.25 a ton for labor, needs and cannot live without an adequate protection of \$17 a ton; and the hard-hearted republican senators are actually going to cut him down to \$15.68. (Laughter.) He will take every cent of that \$1.33 out of the wages of his workmen—if he can!

They asked the coal miner how much the average wages came to. He said, about 80 cents a day. In this very same industry, this card in my possession, issued by the republicans and distributed by the hundred thousand in Brooklyn and New York, shows that the wages in England were over 90 cents a day. (Applause.) So you see that there are some industries in this country where the rate of wages is much below the standard of England.

AMERICAN MEN AT SIXTY CENTS A DAY.

Look at this (showing the card). There is

the British flag, and it is headed with "60 cents a day." This is issued by the league of republican clubs, which is engaged in frying the fat out of the protected manufacturers; of which the president is Mr. Foster, to whom we are indebted for some of the best things in this campaign. (Laughter.) When you look at the text, you find that the 60 cents were paid in Belgium and not in Great Britain; and Belgium has a tariff on iron, while Great Britain has no tariff on iron, and the wages are much higher here than there. (Great laughter.) Then we turn around the card and there (showing it) is the American flag. Everything is blooming in America. You wouldn't believe that in America such a thing existed as workmen living on 60 cents a day. Yet it was stated in the presence of the ways and means committee that in Berks county, Pennsylvania, the iron miners were only receiving 60 cents a day. Some doubted the statement, whereupon Mr. Hewitt spoke up (applause) and said: "Yes, the condition of the miners in that region is miserable in the extreme. They often work for less than 60 cents a day." That is not under the British flag. (Applause.) Mr. Foster cannot find any place in England where the miners work for 60 cents; but in Pennsylvania he can find them by shoals.

AMERICAN LABOR TWICE AS PRODUCTIVE.

I have talked longer than I meant to (cries of "go on"), but I will stay to answer questions as long as they don't turn the gas out. (Laughter and cries of "that's right.") The President of the league for free trade that I know of in the hands of any man who thinks for himself. In its issue last Wednesday it had a "Tariff Talk" with Colonel A. L. Conger of Ohio, who is eager for protection. And what does he say in regard to wages? I quote his words: "We pay twice as much for labor in this country as abroad, and therefore we get twice as good results from that labor." (Laughter and applause.) Labor which receives poor pay brings poor results." (Applause.) True as gospel! But then, how can pauper labor interfere with intelligent labor? Just look at the figures a little in this country. No matter where you go in any part of the world you find this thing true. If you go to India, where men work for ten cents a day, you find that it takes twenty household servants to accomplish what two good Irish girls will do here, and sing over it. (Laughter.) One man is brought up to make the beds and sweep the rooms, and another to cook the vegetables, and another to cook the meat, and another to wave the punkah to keep off the flies, and another to mind the baby (laughter); and no one of them will ever touch the work of another. So, you see, labor is not very productive there. In Crefeld, Germany, where poor men work very hard, fourteen and sixteen hours a day, and where they earn only sixty cents a day as the result of that labor, the statistics furnished annually by their employers show that more than sixty per cent of the cost of production is spent in wages. In Paterson, New Jersey, where wages are quite up to one dollar a day—the rate which used to be so much despised by our American workmen, but which they are forced to accept under our high tariff—less than thirty per cent of the cost of production consists in the cost of labor. (Applause.) The higher up you go in the scale of wages the cheaper is the cost of labor.

HIGH WAGES MEAN CHEAP LABOR AND LOW WAGES MEAN DEAR LABOR.

This fact is proved conclusively by the census of 1880, which our protectionist administration took themselves. Those returns show conclusively that where wages are high profits are large. Do you know that the cities of New York and Brooklyn pay the highest wages of any part of the country? Brooklyn stands at the head. The average wages paid in all the manufacturing industries in Brooklyn are \$470 a year. The average wages in Philadelphia, that fountain head of protection, are only \$346 a year. Why did not Philadelphia drive Brooklyn out of existence? Why is it that manufacturers have increased so much more rapidly in Brooklyn than anywhere else in the United States? Because Brooklyn, paying higher wages, gets a better production for those wages; and Philadelphia gets only a smaller production, in consequence of her lower rate of wages. In Brooklyn the wages are \$134 higher than in Philadelphia, while the net production was \$337 higher. The difference between Brooklyn and Baltimore in wages was \$230 a year; the difference in production was \$436. That principle runs all through the varying wages of the thousands of towns and counties in the United States.

I am not going to weary you with tables of statistics. I have compared these figures in all branches of industry. It is so with carpenters, weavers, spinners, iron makers, nail makers, wool workers and cotton workers, and so with all industries added together. From beginning to end, from north to south, from east to west, wherever high wages are paid, the manufacturer makes a larger profit than where low wages prevail. That proves that the manufacturers who pay high wages do not need protection, and the workmen suffer by it, because protection, by limiting the production of the workman, and in every way tends to cut wages down instead of raising them up.

THE IRISH QUESTION.

I am only skimming this subject; but I wish to add one thing, and thus kill two birds with one stone—the Irish question and imports and exports. Two assertions are made by protectionists—first that Ireland is ruined by free trade, and secondly, that our exports must exceed our imports, or we will be ruined; or, as Mr. Evans puts it, the state into which we want to come is one in which we will sell to all the world, and buy of the world with nothing left over. (Great laughter.) There is one country which attains to that; she exports almost everything and imports almost nothing—Egypt. And another country has been for a century past doing much the same thing. Ireland ought to be a paradise by this time, on Mr. Evans's theory, for she has been exporting all the time more than she has imported. During the terrible famine of 1846 she exported more provisions than she imported. While England was subscribing most liberally, it must be said in justice to her, pouring in millions of pounds' worth of provisions to keep them from starving, and all the world was helping Ireland, those benevolent landlords were all the time taking out more provisions from Ireland than England and all the world could pour in. What a prosperous country Ireland ought to be! (Laughter and applause.)

THEIR OWN HEADS OFF.

The same questioner: Then you mean to say that the mechanic, the doctor, the lawyer, the manufacturer, are simply aiming to cut their own heads off? A gentleman with a decided foreign accent attempted to frame a question in which the only intelligible word was "policemen," but after a vain endeavor to understand, Mr. Shearman said: "I shall have to follow the example of Mr. Evans's boy and say, 'I don't know.'" (Laughter.)

Q.—On the platform I see the sign "Free trade, free land and free men;" we have free trade between the sister states; and we have neither free land nor free men. I wish the gentleman to tell me why! (Laughter.)

A.—Because we have only one half way. If you start out for Albany and stop at Poughkeepsie, you will never get to Albany. We have free trade between all the states; and that is the secret of the wonderful prosperity that we have. (Applause.) That is why wages are so high; it is because we have so much free trade. But so long as we do not have absolute free trade, taxes to the extent of seven hundred millions a year are piled upon the shoulders of the poorest men of the community; and the poorer you are the more taxes you pay in proportion to your means. In addition, about five hundred millions more are piled on the shoulders of the poor under the shape of bounties to protected manufacturers and mine owners. When you take that vast amount year after year out of the wages of the workmen, and more especially out of the wages of the poorest classes, how can you have free land or free men? (Applause.)

IRISH MANUFACTURERS INCREASING UNDER FREE TRADE.

And next you hear stories about the immense number of workmen that were thrown out of employment in Ireland by the introduction of free trade. Do you know that the number of persons engaged in manu-

facturing industries in Ireland has increased more than 100 per cent since the introduction of free trade? (Applause.) Governor Beaver, a very good man from Pennsylvania, was preaching on this subject in Brooklyn; and he told a large audience that the linen industries of Ireland had been destroyed under free trade and transferred to England. I do not suppose he meant to misrepresent the truth; but it is the fact that those industries are being destroyed in England and transferred to Ireland. (Applause.) When Mr. Porter gets up his clever statistics about the linen industry, in which he states that the linen manufacture has fallen off in England and increased in Germany, he is always careful to say nothing about Ireland. Why? Because, under the influence of free trade, the linen manufacture of Ireland has increased more than one hundred per cent and amounts to more than that of all the rest of Europe. More than 60,000 people are now engaged in the manufacture of linen in Ireland; whereas, before the introduction of free trade, no more than 25,000 were so engaged. (Applause.) More persons are now engaged in the Irish linen factories than were ever before engaged in all other factories in Ireland.

THE COBDEN CLUB.

You hear a good deal of the Cobden club. (Applause.) Where are the friends of Ireland in England to-day? They are all in the Cobden club. (Applause.) What is the Cobden club? It is mainly Mr. Thomas Bayley Potter, one of the five members of parliament who organized the movement in favor of this country in 1868, a consistent home ruler, who has voted with Gladstone every time. (Applause.) Who is the leading philosophical free trader in England at the present day? John Morley. (Applause.) Who is John Morley? The English statesman who, long before Mr. Gladstone made up his mind, had declared himself in favor of home rule in Ireland. (Applause.)

Richard Cobden himself (applause), after whom the club is named, was always a friend of Ireland. He was kept out of public office, largely by his friendship to Ireland. He would not enter a government which would not do justice to Ireland. He was the man who destroyed the protective system in England, although he did not go as far as we would desire.

FRIENDS OF IRELAND ALL FREE TRADERS.

What is William E. Gladstone? (Great applause.) Are Irishmen going back on him, on that noble old man, who, in the eightieth year of his age, is devoting himself with marvelous activity and energy to furthering the cause of Ireland, and only taking care of his health and saving his strength so as to disappoint the Salisbury and Balfours, who are ever hoping for his death? Irishmen you don't have a single friend among the protectionists of England (applause); while nineteen out of twenty free traders of England are your friends, and always have been; and they are the men who are bent upon and determined to secure your freedom and your proper independence. (Applause.)

Free traders, and they only, are the allies of Parnell. (Applause.) Who subscribed the \$30,000 to support Parnell in the infamous prosecution brought on by the Times? They are free traders to a man. (Applause.)

Irishmen! what you want is freedom. (Applause.) You don't want any tory "protection." You want to protect yourselves. Freedom is what Ireland wants; freedom is what America wants—free trade, free land, free men! (Great and long continued applause.)

MR. SHEARMAN ANSWERS QUESTIONS.

When the applause had somewhat subsided Chairman George arose and announced that Mr. Shearman was prepared to answer questions. More than a dozen men jumped up in various parts of the hall, and Mr. George, having recognized the first one that caught his eye, repeated the following question:

Q.—If tariffs destroy manufacturing industries, why is it that manufacturers in this country are so much in favor of a protective tariff?

A.—In the first place, I cannot accept the statement. They are not by any means. Our good friend, Mr. Tom L. Johnson (applause), to whom Mr. George referred early this evening, is a manufacturer and an absolute, thoroughgoing free trader. J. B. Sargent of New Haven (applause) is the largest manufacturer in his line, and he is a free trader. William Marshall of Brooklyn, the largest cordage maker in America, is a free trader. (Applause.)

Nevertheless, it is probably true that a majority of the manufacturers in the United States are protectionists. That is nothing at all new in the history of this world. When any class of men once give way to their selfish instincts and endeavor to frame a national policy for their own benefit and not for the benefit for the nation at large, they invariably overshoot the mark, and in their greediness do themselves injury as well as other people. This is just as true about lawyers as about manufacturers; just as true about clergymen as about lawyers; just as true about doctors as about clergymen; just as true about mechanics or farmers, or just as true about anyone who seeks to frame laws for his own interest instead of for the interest of the whole people.

The same questioner: Then you mean to say that the mechanic, the doctor, the lawyer, the manufacturer, are simply aiming to cut their own heads off?

A.—What I do say is that when any one of these classes undertakes to act for its own selfish interests, it practically does cut its own head off. That is true of every class in the world.

A gentleman with a decided foreign accent attempted to frame a question in which the only intelligible word was "policemen," but after a vain endeavor to understand, Mr. Shearman said: "I shall have to follow the example of Mr. Evans's boy and say, 'I don't know.'" (Laughter.)

Q.—On the platform I see the sign "Free trade, free land and free men;" we have free trade between the sister states; and we have neither free land nor free men. I wish the gentleman to tell me why! (Laughter.)

A.—Because we have only one half way. If you start out for Albany and stop at Poughkeepsie, you will never get to Albany. We have free trade between all the states; and that is the secret of the wonderful prosperity that we have. (Applause.) That is why wages are so high; it is because we have so much free trade. But so long as we do not have absolute free trade, taxes to the extent of seven hundred millions a year are piled upon the shoulders of the poorest men of the community; and the poorer you are the more taxes you pay in proportion to your means. In addition, about five hundred millions more are piled on the shoulders of the poor under the shape of bounties to protected manufacturers and mine owners. When you take that vast amount year after year out of the wages of the workmen, and more especially out of the wages of the poorest classes, how can you have free land or free men? (Applause.)

Q.—I would like to ask whether, if this country adopted free trade in wool, admits wool free of duty, England will not at the same time place an export duty on wool in order to protect her manufacturers?

A.—If my friend will only get the republican

majority to consent to pass a bill repealing the duty on wool, to take effect on condition that that state of things never occurs, on my part I will agree to find among my friends any amount of money to put in bank to guarantee this country against any possibility of that thing happening. Nobody dreams of its happening. It is impossible. Moreover, England has no surplus wool to export.

Q.—How much do the 60,000 people, engaged in the linen industry in Ireland, as compared with American workmen? And why, since free trade has been introduced have so many Irishmen emigrated to America?

A.—In the first place, the 60,000 Irishmen engaged in linen manufacture undoubtedly receive very much less wages than work people of a similar class in the United States; although Mr. Barbour, the president of the Barbour flax spinning works, a most ardent protectionist, testified before the tariff commission, in 1883 that he was compelled to steadily raise the wages of his Irish employees, but was steadily cutting down the wages of his American employees. (Laughter and applause.) At that rate the Irish would after a while get there. (Laughter.) It is very true that since the adoption of partial free trade in England in 1816 the population in Ireland has largely fallen off. Why is it? LANDLORDS. (Applause.)

Q.—I would ask Mr. Shearman, who had the kindness to answer the gentleman on this side of the house giving him such cheering and encouraging answers (cries of "Don't make a statement; ask your question")—how is it that Brazil levied an export duty on coffee?

A.—If I answered literally, I would say, "Because Brazil wanted to;" but I understand that long and full questions cannot be asked here, and I seek, therefore, to answer the spirit of every question. (Applause.) What the gentleman means is this: That when we repealed the duty on coffee in 1872 Brazil put an export duty on coffee, with a view to make us pay as much for coffee as we did before. Did we succeed in doing that? For a year or two she did. That is thirteen years ago; and ever since the first two years she didn't. (Applause.) If we had been in such a condition that we must have coffee or die, and there had been no place other than Brazil from which coffee could be got, we should have had to pay that export duty. But there was a great deal of coffee in other parts of the world, and Brazil could not get any more for her coffee than Porto Rico got for hers. The consequence is that for the last fourteen years Brazilians have paid that duty themselves. (Applause.)

Q.—Why is it that Germany and Italy, with high tariff duties, send us ten immigrants to one from England?

A.—I have been there

AN ENGLISH PAPER FOR CLEVELAND.

SOMETHING THAT THE PROTECTIONISTS MAY PRINT WITH A LITTLE BRITISH FLAG OVER IT.

The London "Weekly Dispatch" on the Real Issue of the American Campaign.

London Weekly Dispatch, Sept. 18.

It is thirty years since the politics of the United States presented a subject so worthy of an attentive eye as that which is raised by the forthcoming presidential election. Before the war the issue that was mainly raised was the question of state rights, and those who lived through that exciting period have a lively recollection of the abstract and even metaphysical arguments employed in that great controversy. But the nominal issue was not the true issue. What gave point to the discussion—whether the constitution of the United States was a federal form of government or a mere confederation of states—was slavery. Should slavery continue to exist and expand, or should it perish—such was the real question that led to the war. At the present time the subject in dispute is on the surface a more reformer of the tariff, and President Cleveland is quite justified in saying on behalf of the democratic party that they have entered upon a crusade in favor of free trade. His flag is not so broad nor so large; all he asks is to "free from duty the imported raw materials used in home manufactures." But, underlying this narrow topic, there lies a far mightier controversy, and in its real character and ultimate results, President Cleveland's platform will bring to the front the land question, which is a new distracting Ireland, and will speedily bring on a storm in England and Scotland. Just as the battle for the Union involved the existence of slavery, so the struggle for tariff reform will settle the question of the nationalization of land in the great republic of America. It is the intention of the democratic party to raise that issue, any more than it was the intention of the republican party to destroy slavery when it rose in arms to defend the integrity of the United States; but just as the incorable logic of facts made the republican party an abolition party, so will the democratic be driven to espouse the cause of labor, and be compelled to throw the burden of imperial taxation upon land.

The situation is profoundly interesting. The revenue of the United States, as distinguished from the separate states of which it is composed, is derived from customs and excise. The customs duties have been fixed with no regard to the requirements of the public expenditure, but for the purpose of protecting American manufactures from foreign competition. Of late years, the income derived from customs has brought in the money to the exchequer far beyond its wants, and the government are at their wits' end to know what to do with the taxes they have raised. The kings of Europe have no dread of surpluses; they have never suffered from the embarrassment of an overflowing treasury. But that is the situation of President Cleveland. He must either remit taxes or discover new forms of expenditure in order to make ends meet, and bring the national income down to the level of the national expenditure. No other issue is possible. Hence arises a clear issue between the two great parties. The democratic party goes for the reduction of customs duties; the republican party will not tolerate any abatement of the taxes, and they have to discover a new mode of expenditure. Mr. Blaine has already found the path that the republican party must inexorably follow. He proposes that the imperial surplus should be used to relieve the local taxation of land. His motto is, Keep up the customs and keep down the land tax.

During the American civil war the sympathy of English radicals was wholly with the republican party. Although not from principle, it nevertheless became from necessity a liberation party, and its triumph was the death knell of the worst form of slavery the world has ever known. But now must not be misled by party shibboleths, and still less by party names. The whirligig of time brings about strange turns. The democratic party, which up till 1864 was conservative in the worst sense, has now become the party of progress; and its triumph will mark the greatest advance that the world has yet seen. If it conquers, we shall see on the great American continent a practical realization of the dreams of Henry George, and an immense progress toward the better distribution of wealth. For a democratic victory means precisely the reverse of Mr. Blaine's motto; it means the appropriation of natural values for the benefit of the whole people, instead of the enrichment of a few. Industry will be relieved, idleness will be diminished. It will be easier for industry to secure comfort; it will be harder for idleness to revel in luxury. You must either tax land or you must tax labor. In old countries like our own the immense weight of taxation is thrown upon the workers; in our columns Mr. Baileiff is showing with startling effect how cleverly the drones in the hive manage to take the honey from the working bees. In America a large part of local or state taxation is borne by the land, and is a burden upon nobody; it merely intercepts a part of the value of the raw material of the earth on its way to private pockets. But through the policy of protection the imperial taxes are imposed upon industry, and not upon land. The success of the democratic party would result in throwing imperial as well as local taxes upon the land; the success of the republican party would create the very evil which old countries have so much to deplore.

President Cleveland unwittingly states a profound truth when he says that he opens a crusade for free trade as it is understood in England. English free trade is a compromise by which the manufacturer is benefited without depriving the right of the landlord to live in idleness upon the labor of the working classes. Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden struck at the duties that were imposed for protective purposes; their duties did not go from the products of the workingman's industry for revenue only, and these duties are required merely to enable landlords to escape an adequate and just land tax. But the policy of the democratic party, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the United States, will drive them much further than Cobden or Bright ever dreamed of; it will lead in America to the total abolition of all customs. The principle enunciated by President Cleveland in his letter accepting the democratic candidature, the principle of abolishing taxes on raw material in order to stimulate industrial enterprise, will lead him much further than he thinks. What is raw material? When that question comes to be faced, the democratic party will find that there is no middle course left to them. That which, from one point of view, is a manufactured article, is, from another, raw material. Silk ribbon is a manufactured article compared with the silk as it is obtained from the silkworm; it is raw material in the making up of ladies' hats. Flour is a manufactured article to the baker. Sugar is a manufactured article to the confectioner who uses it to sweeten his tea; it is raw material to the confectioner or

the jam preserver. To proclaim the principle that raw material must be free from taxation is to order that industry may flourish like starting an avalanche. It is fatal to the system of protection, and it leads straight to land taxation as the only practicable fund for defraying the imperial expenditure of the American people. We are on the eve of a great social and economic struggle, which in its final issues will be more memorable even than the abolition of slavery. It is now a question of the emancipation of the white man and of the deliverance of the American people from the mischievous doctrines of land tenure which they carried with them to the continent of America from feudal England. Slavery, we ought in justice to the American people never to forget, was another evil inheritance from the old country; but just as the genius of a free republic proved strong enough to rid the body politic of that dangerous poison, so, we are persuaded, will it prove able to destroy the much more subtle, but not less pernicious, doctrine that they inherited from their old monarchical home.

The Campaign in Pennsylvania.
PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—The single tax Cleveland and Thurman committee of Pennsylvania is getting down to business and will do effective work in the campaign. About \$300 has been subscribed, and the committee has thought best to concentrate their efforts and confine their work principally to Philadelphia and the coal regions, although it is all they can in other parts of the state where they see an opportunity for effective work.

Mr. J. C. Frost leaves this week for Schuylkill county, which is the stamping ground of Congressman Brumm, who voted against the Mills bill. He will distribute single tax and free trade literature during the day and speak every night. By this means it is hoped to defeat Brumm, who pretends to represent the interests of labor.

In Philadelphia the committee have secured Musical Fund hall at Ninth and Locust streets for October 17, 24 and 31.

Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost will speak October 17, and will be followed by Thomas Shearman, Louis Post, and if the committee can induce him, come William Lloyd Garrison. Every single tax man in this city and vicinity should make it a point to attend these meetings.

A. H. STEPHENSON.

Single Tax Men and Democratic Candidates in Massachusetts.
CAMBRIDGEPORT, Mass.—The single tax free traders of Massachusetts, like their brethren of New York, are active. In the districts where advanced tariff reformers have been nominated, they will lead their democratic support.

Among the democratic candidates upon the state ticket Hon. William E. Russell, the candidate for governor, deserves and will receive a complimentary vote. He has made a record as an aggressive reformer. Against the majority of his party he ably seconded the efforts of the labor party and labor organizations to secure the secret ballot law, and in a public statement upon the subject declared that the existing system opened the door to bribery and corruption, and that workingmen could not secure honest representation. In his administration as mayor of Cambridge he has shown executive ability of a high order. At the present time he is making an active campaign upon the tariff issue.

WM. H. HANNAFORD.

Treasurer Single Tax League of Boston.

Single Tax Ideas in the Air.

EAST ORANGE, N. J.—I have attended quite a number of democratic meetings and have heard speakers give reasons for the higher wages of this over other countries that sounded much like the single tax gospel. One gave as the chief reason, that we had cheaper land; others used the phrase "natural opportunities," while most of them dwelt upon the immense extent of our territory and wealth of natural resources.

Whence these ideas and expressions if not from the single tax men? The question of wages is being discussed everywhere, and this gives us an opportunity we could not have made for ourselves, because as voters for Cleveland we can now find ready listeners among democrats. E. C. ALPHONSE.

Prof. Garland's Western Trip.

On his recent western trip Professor Hamilton Garland of Boston, on his way out, delivered speeches at Indianapolis, Chicago and Minneapolis. He stopped for several weeks in Brown county, Dak., and by talks to the farmers and letters to the papers aroused a good deal of thought. One of the most successful meetings was on his return trip, when he spoke before the East side democratic club of Minneapolis. The St. Paul Globe, a democratic paper, gave a very full report of this meeting. On his return trip he also spoke at Osgood, Iowa, at an agricultural fair, Parkersburg, W. Va., Baltimore, Md., New York city and Worcester, Mass. For the rest of the year he will be in Boston and is willing to speak at New England towns within reasonable distance of Boston.

Going to Elect Tom Johnson.

CLEVELAND, Ohio.—We are going to elect Tom L. Johnson. The growth of single tax free trade—the revival of pure democracy and the sloughing off of old machine men and ways—is simply wonderful here.

L. A. RUSSELL.

The Queens' County U. L. F. Endorses Cleveland.

The New York Commercial Advertiser on October 4 published the following:

Timothy J. Schully, secretary of the united labor party executive committee of Queens county, has written a letter to the democratic national committee, in which he says: "The united labor party of Queens county, by their delegates assembled, have adopted tariff reform as their basis for this campaign and endorsed Cleveland and Thurman as fitting candidates to represent the issue. As members of the above party, believing that taxation should be limited to the products of the workingman's industry, we find that tariff reform is a step in that direction. It is a further pleasure to notify you that the above endorsement was executed by a unanimous vote; a rare thing. Out of 1,500 votes cast in our country last fall for Henry George, I think you may safely figure on 1,400 or 1,500."

Profits Higher, Wages Lower.

The New York Times had an article in Tuesday's issue entitled "Michigan's iron mines." After giving the output for the year, etc., it says:

The season, which promised poorly at its opening, is proving one of the best that the iron owners have had for years. Wages of miners, mechanics and laborers are slightly lower than last year; iron is selling at a little lower price, and lake transportation charges are lower than last year.

Where's Your Protective Tariff?

One million men idle in this country and 300,000 annually being added from Europe to help these idlers. It cannot be said that these men are idle from choice, but from necessity.

A PROTECTION CATECHISM.

1. Is demand for goods demand for labor? If not, why not?
2. When we buy foreign goods do we set foreigners at work? If not, why not?
3. When foreigners buy our goods do they set us at work? If not, why not?
4. Will foreigners send their goods into this country unless we send our goods out? If not, why not?
5. Does the importation of goods reduce wages here? If so, how?—(STANDARD, Oct. 6, 1888.)

A Protectionist's Price His Hand.

PORTLAND, Me.—"A Protection Catechism," published in your last issue, is a series of questions which I presume you would like some "protectionist" to answer. Thus believing, I will attempt it:

1. Is demand for goods demand for labor? If so, why not?
A. It is; and if the demand is supplied by foreign labor, it will rub home labor to just that extent. Will it not?
2. When we buy foreign goods, do we set foreigners at work? If not, why not?
A. We do; but why not buy home goods, and so set our own people at work?

3. When foreigners buy our goods do they set us at work? If not, why not?
A. They do; but why not buy home goods and so set their own people at work?

4. Will foreigners send their goods into this country unless we send our goods out? If not, why not?
A. Not unless they have a surplus and we have a shortage, and I cannot understand how it is desirable that they should. I think every country should supply its own wants as far as possible, and not put to the expense of transporting goods for distant lands. In fact, it is necessary to the independence of any country to be able to supply its own needs.

5. Does the importation of goods reduce wages here? If so, how?
A. It does. By lessening the demand for labor here, it increases the supply of labor and drives it into unfamiliar employments, while in the meantime wages go down to the lowest ebb. I am old enough to have experienced this long since and know that I am talking about it.

S. T. TATLOW.

Politics are Humming at Cornell.

ITHACA, N. Y., Oct. 6.—Politics are humming here at Ithaca and at Cornell university. Four mass meetings have been held within four days—one republican, one prohibitionist and two democratic.

The significant feature of the two democratic meetings, and that which most gladdens the hearts of our single tax electrical reformers, is the bursts of silence which inspired professors, students and citizens whenever any allusion was made to Hill.

Political straws here indicate a wind, fast rising to a cyclone, that will on November 6th shake one Hill down to its foundation.

On Monday evening Congressman McMillan, of the ways and means committee, addressed a large audience enthusiastic for Cleveland and reform. Hill was only mentioned once or twice in a sort of "one too" manner.

At the students' republican mass meeting on Wednesday, the first speaker called upon was Professor Wheeler, who proved to be for Cleveland, though he was conscientiously refrained from saying more than to advise the students to study well the questions of the hour, and to decide without fear or favor. Another professor who spoke was for tariff reduction.

The call for the students' democratic mass meeting for Thursday evening was signed by twenty-five of Cornell's leading professors and instructors. The portraits of Cleveland and Thurman and Hill, with the national flag, hung over the stage. Hill's picture so offended the first comers that one of them, a prominent student most active in circulating the call, tore it down, expressing doubt as to their ability to secure speakers if it were left in sight. To quiet suspicion and to prevent the need of an explanation, the other pictures were also taken down. It was considered safe to leave the flag.

The meeting was addressed by three of Cornell's leading professors, Wheeler, Tuttle and Burdick, and a prominent alumni, S. D. Halliday, who made eloquent speeches in favor of Cleveland and taxation reform.

Professor Andrews, our new and popular professor of political economy, who always speaks favorably of George and the single tax, sat on the platform, but for lack of time did not speak.

STUDENT.

NOTES FROM CORRESPONDENCE.

John H. Stolsenburg of New Albany, Ind., sends us a free trade song. Here are a few verses:

Look! the boys are on the march,
Cried the son of toil;
Look! the boys are on the march,
Cried the son of toil.

All the claus are in array,
They will drive the trusts away
And the "combinations" shall decay,
Cried the son of toil.

When will heavy taxes cease?
Cried the son of toil;
When will heavy taxes cease?
Cried the son of toil.

When our trade is freer made,
When big tariffs are not laid,
And when labor's promptly paid,
Cried the son of toil.

And will labor then be sure?
Cried the son of toil;
And will labor then be sure?
Cried the son of toil.

Yes, our rights shall then be clear,
While our work shall last the year,
And fair wages bring good cheer,
Cried the son of toil.

Will our commerce yet be free?
Cried the son of toil;
Will our commerce yet be free?
Cried the son of toil.

With our ships on every sea,
Trade and commerce shall be free,
Home and Land and Liberty,
For the sons of toil.

Thomas Williamson, Lynchburg, Va.—I was glad to see the explanation of the payment of the tax on the value of land under a boarding house on the single tax plan. I have had to meet this objection most frequently: "That some citizens would not contribute, under the single tax plan, to public expenditure at all." I have always answered: First, that the land value belonged to all and hence all contributed; if the land values were used for the common expenses; and secondly, that all had to use some land either directly or indirectly, and that where this use was conjointly to the extent of that use. For example, suppose I own a house and land (using present style of speech). If I take boarders I make them pay their share of the land value tax and also enough on their food and lodging to make a profit on my outlay. I make nothing on the rent, but on the house improvements, food, fuel, etc. But, suppose I have accommodations for nine boarders; each pays one-tenth of the land value tax, just as if each of us were using one-tenth of the land. As to food, fuel, lights and lodging, I make them pay a fair percentage over and above the capital I expend in providing such accommodations.

W. L. Boreman, Parkersburg, W. Va.—Since Professor Garland spoke here a good many have questioned us who before would have nothing to say.

PUSHING CAMPAIGN WORK.

The speakers who have been addressing single tax meetings held under the direction of the committee report large attendance and the greatest attention and enthusiasm on the part of their audiences. Especially interesting have been the occasions where the speakers have answered questions.

On Thursday of last week a meeting was held at 413 Grand street, in the Eighth congressional district, addressed by J. R. Abrahams and W. O. Eastlake.

The Cooper union meeting, at which W. J. Gursuch and Thomas G. Shearman spoke, was held on Friday. The full report is in another column.

W. B. Estell and William McCabe spoke on Saturday at a meeting held at 105 Second avenue, the headquarters of the Ninth congressional district branch of the free trade club. Despite the terrific rain storm it was a good meeting.

In Brooklyn, at Temperance hall, a meeting was held the same evening. Rev. S. W. Lauder presided, and Louis F. Post and W. O. Eastlake spoke. A short account will be found in another column.

At Paterson, N. J., Henry George spoke on Monday night. It was the largest meeting held during the campaign, although both parties have had meetings. Mr. George's speech was enthusiastically applauded.

On the same night W. J. Gursuch and John H. Dougherty addressed a meeting at McTamm's hall, Brooklyn.

A branch of the Free trade club in the Eleventh congressional district opened headquarters the same evening, Monday, at No. 541 Eighth avenue. Addresses were made by William T. Grunwaldt and J. R. Abrahams. The rooms were crowded and the audience enthusiastic.

On Tuesday, Louis F. Post spoke at Elizabethport, N. J., and Henry George and Thomas G. Shearman at Fairport, Brooklyn, E. D. The Elizabethport meeting was the largest political gathering held there in five years. The hall was packed with people all the close of the meeting, and Mr. Post's speech was received with enthusiasm. The Brooklyn meeting was also very large and successful.

The meetings for Wednesday were in New York, at Wenden's hall, West Forty-fourth street, addressed by Thomas G. Shearman and Louis F. Post; in Brooklyn, at New Tura hall, Sixteenth street and North Fifth avenue, addressed by W. O. Eastlake and John H. Dougherty.

On Thursday, October 11, the Eighth congressional district single tax men will hold a meeting at New Windsor hall, 412 Grand street. A. J. Steers and Fred C. Leubuscher will speak.

On Friday, the 12th, the Seventh congressional district single tax men will meet at the committee rooms, 12 Union square, to complete their organization. Their temporary organization was formed last week, when H. B. Epstein was elected temporary chairman and F. J. Jones temporary secretary.

The Sixth congressional district will be organized on Saturday, October 13, at Greenwich hall, corner Christopher and Hudson streets, at which time and place a mass meeting will also be held. The general public is invited.

The Ninth congressional district will hold a meeting at the headquarters of the Ninth congressional branch of the New York free trade club, at 105 Second avenue, on Saturday evening, Oct. 13.

At Cooper union, Thomas G. Shearman will answer questions about the single tax and free trade on Friday, October 19.

Hugh O. Pentecost will speak at Cooper union on Wednesday, October 24.

A grand rally will be held on Thursday, Nov. 1, at Cooper union. There will be addresses by Thomas G. Shearman, Louis F. Post, Hugh O. Pentecost and Henry George.

In Philadelphia Hugh O. Pentecost will speak at Music fund hall on Wednesday, Oct. 17; Thomas G. Shearman will speak there in the same hall on Oct. 24, and Louis F. Post and William Lloyd Garrison on Wednesday, Oct. 31.

In Brooklyn, there will be a grand rally at the Rink on Tuesday, Oct. 23. Thomas G. Shearman, Louis F. Post, Hugh O. Pentecost and Henry George will speak.

At East New York, Louis F. Post will make a short speech and answer questions at Schiell's assembly rooms, corner Atlantic avenue and Vermont avenue, on Monday, October 15.

Thomas G. Shearman will speak at Albany on Tuesday, October 16.

At Passaic, N. J., Louis F. Post will speak on Wednesday, October 17.

Henry George will speak at Harrisburg, Pa., on Thursday, October 25.

Here are a few extracts from the committee's correspondence as space will permit us to publish:

James McMann, Lansingburgh, N. Y.—I voted for Mr. Cleveland in 1884 and will vote for him in '88, and against Hill in the state.

John Huffer, New Haven, Conn.—I send my name to be added to the roll of single tax Cleveland men. I am a free trader in the full sense of the word. I voted for Blaine in 1884.

Fred T. Wilcox, Ashtabula, O.—Inclosed find my name, with two others, who were, as myself, formerly republicans. Have been a regular reader of THE STANDARD from almost the beginning. Two of us arranged with our new dealers to keep it on sale. Now it is widely read here, and benighted Ashtabula is conceded to be the single tax hotbed of the county. Our Knights of Labor assembly is doing glorious work for the single tax cause. All but a few have "seen the cat," and we live in hope that those few will come around before November.

James Pollard, Stanton, Minn.—Enroll me and my friend, whose name I inclose—both life-long republicans. The more single tax is talked here the more the people get perplexed in their old notions, and are constantly burrowing the ground to keep the weeds down, and hope to see a fair crop in time to vote for Cleveland Thurman.

Morris Cole, Union City, Mich.—Read "Progress and Poverty" four years ago. Have been traveling almost constantly ever since, north, south and west, and never let a chance pass to advocate the single tax, converting not only the three persons whose names are inclosed, but dozens of others, with more to follow.

Edwin Pope, Paterson, N. J.—I voted in 1884 for Gen. Butler, but shall cast my vote this year for Mr. Cleveland. He has pointed out to us the road to freedom. I perceive a great change of thought with reference to the tariff, even in this hide-bound city, and there is no doubt of a still greater change taking place before election day. THE STANDARD is the best paper I have ever read. I would rather go without my meals on Sunday than not have it.

F. G. Brown, Fort Worth, Tex.—I inclose signed blanks. This will be the first time I have voted the democratic ticket, although I have been a voter since '61. I have been a single tax man ever since I heard Henry George's speech on the steps of the sub-treasury building on Wall street, New York, two years ago. I formerly considered that what

I did not know about the labor problem was not worth knowing. I vote for Cleveland with the hope that his majority may be so large that it will encourage him to take more steps and longer ones forward. I can say from my own knowledge that the single tax idea is gaining in Texas.

Alfred Pettit, Newark, N. J.—I always voted the republican ticket. Was converted to the single tax about a year ago. Am hard at work trying to convert my friends.

Locke Craig, Asheville, N. C.—Inclosed find my signature for enrollment. I am condemned as a George man, but the democratic clubs keep me busy addressing them and discussing the tariff with republicans, and evidently do not realize that they condemn under the name of Georgeism the same ideas which they applaud under the name of democracy. Hereafter the majority of democrats in this district will be democrats who are for absolute free trade.

J. W. H. New York.—Under the beautiful system of protection to American industries I am compelled to work fourteen hours out of every twenty-four (Sundays magnanimously excepted). So you see it is utterly impossible for me to take any active part in any movement, no matter how heartily I may endorse it.

M. L. Gable, San Francisco, Cal.—Inclosed find list of eighteen single tax men who wish to be enrolled for Cleveland and Thurman, among them Judge James G. Maguire. I expect to get more signers before long.

Thomas F. Burns, Hyde Park, Mass.—I inclose list of three single tax men who will vote for Cleveland because they believe in free trade. They voted for Butler in 1884.

Richard W. Jones, Brooklyn, N. Y.—I authorize the enrollment of my name among the single tax Cleveland voters, who will vote so because his movement is in our direction. I was bred and born a protectionist and republican. I shall also work for Miller and against Hill.

Usurfruct, New York.—The monopolist may rest secure so long as the workman wastes his time in futile strikes. But just as soon as the workman makes up his mind to vote for freedom the monopolist's name will be Dennis.

Dan Meagher, Sacramento, Cal.—Inclosed find a few signatures which I picked up yesterday among my shopmates. Could have got more if I had more time. They are all from the machine shops, where about 2,000 men are engaged in building locomotives, cars, and manufacturing bridge materials. A large part of the scrap iron we use comes from England. If we could get free coal, free pig iron and free steel billets we would defy Pennsylvania.

H. W. Benedict, Auburn, N. Y.—I send you herewith five more names for enrollment. They were obtained at a meeting held to form a Cleveland and Thurman campaign club. There were a goodly number of single tax men there.

James Corning, Meriden, Conn.—Here are twelve signatures. We want literature. We will cheerfully distribute it.

Mark F. Roberts, Pittsburg, Pa.—Please enroll me as a single tax Cleveland voter. We had a club of forty-one members, all save one or two, protectionists. I am certain that ninety-five per cent of them will now vote for Cleveland and Thurman, and the first step toward true free trade." The democrats, thanks to the splendid editorials in the Pittsburg Post, are loud in their denunciations of the tariff fraud and robbery.

Samuel E. Sperry, Brooklyn.—With this I send you fifteen more signatures. As soon as I can give time to the business I will get more.

F. A. Clark, Newark, N. J.—Inclosed find six names for the single tax roll. Four of the men voted for Blaine four years ago.

John Bennett, Philadelphia, Pa.—Inclosed find a small contribution to the campaign fund. I am sorry that I cannot send more, but it is a hard fight to maintain an existence in this highly protected locality. We are rapidly learning by bitter experience that the producer gets none of the fat of protection.

J. M. Amsterdam, N. Y.—Enroll me as a single tax man who will vote for Cleveland and Thurman. All our single tax men of last year are with us for Cleveland and against Hill.

J. H. Griffes, Chicago.—I send you a list of fifty single tax Cleveland voters. No one was asked to sign who had not seen "the cat." There is no such thing as the united labor party in Chicago. Out of all those requested to sign the enrollment only three refused, because they believed in independent political action.

C. S. Hopkins, Buffalo, N. Y.—Had a red hot discussion in a hotel here with about a dozen protectionists and a miscellaneous audience of seventy-five. I laid out the protecs so completely that the democrats had a low feast, and the evening democratic paper published an account of it.

In the Ninth District.

NEW YORK.—The heavy rain storm of last Saturday evening did not have the slightest dampening effect on the single tax free traders of the Ninth congressional district. They were on hand sharp on time, at their club room, 105 Second avenue, to listen to the promised addresses on the question of the campaign. The meeting was rapped to order by Edw. Zimmerman, who, after a few preliminary remarks, introduced W. B. Estell, a coal miner of Freehold, Pa. Mr. Estell gave an interesting description of the life of a coal miner, the hardships he endures, his beggarly requirement, and the life of miserable poverty that as a rule the miner and his wife and children have to endure. Mr. Estell dwelt at length on the wages paid to miners for the past fifteen years. He showed that before a tariff was put on coal the miners had more work and better daily pay than they got after the first duty was put on; and since then wages had fallen and work had become shorter, until now the average earnings of coal miners were one-half what they used to be. Mr. Estell said that the coal miners of Pennsylvania had of late been thinking over the causes that have led to the slough of despond in which they now find themselves; and now they are seeking for the measure that will bring them relief. It would not be long before the miners of Pennsylvania would be in line in favor of the single tax and values. There were a good many of them standing on the platform. The result of the change of thought would be made evident in the coming election, when the republican majority would be considerably reduced. If the single tax campaign for this election had been commenced in Pennsylvania last spring that state would now have been debatable ground.

William McCabe followed with a short speech, after which the meeting resolved itself into a debating club, and a discussion ensued which lasted until after 13 o'clock. Five visitors who had been inquiring into the ideas involved in the single tax theory, but who still had some lingering doubts, had them thoroughly removed, and announced their intention of joining actively into the movement. It was a pleasant evening, despite the rain outside, and was a profitable one to all who attended.

SINGLE TAX.

A Scaresaw That Don't Scare.

IN view of the great popularity of the single tax theory, it is somewhat ridiculous for the Milwaukee Sentinel, after having exhausted itself to find reasons why Congressman Smith should not be supported for re-election, holds up as a sort of scarecrow to the public the statement that he is a "Henry George man." According to all indications it will not particularly injure a man's chances for popularity to be an advocate of an idea that is growing at a prodigious rate in public favor.

Commerce.

Thou mother queen that ever reigns
Unconquer'd, ever victor, ever
Thine is the blood that lifts its veins
In thee its life had birth;
Without thee, wealth—though never told—
Were lifeless pyramids of gold.

Nature's arm before thee lowers;
Thou scarrest deep her face,
With her own resistless powers.
Annihilating time and space;
In thy iron-trod footprints lie
These foes to thy prosperity.

Thy giant slaves, with spurring heel
Bear o'er the seething sea,
And thy vast webs of burnished steel
Earth's treasures haul to thee.
Thy couriers outstrip the sun
And roll the wheels of progress on.

Yet far from perfected remains
Thy lofty destiny,
For foolish children cling in chains
About thy leashed and tamed
Impeding thy

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
200 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$1.00, in advance. Single copies, 10 cents.
Entered as second-class matter, October 13, 1888.
Postoffice at New York, N. Y., 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.

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

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscriptions in every portion of the United States, to whom should 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 the printer.

Single copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1888.

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

THE STANDARD advocates the abolition of all taxes upon industry and the products of industry, and the taking, by taxation upon land values irrespective of improvements, of the annual rental value of all those various forms of natural opportunities embraced under the general term, Land.

We hold that to tax labor or its products is to discourage industry.

We hold that to tax land values to their full amount will render it impossible for any man to exact from others a price for the privilege of using those bounties of nature in which all living men have an equal right of use; that it will compel every individual controlling natural opportunities to either utilize them by the employment of labor, or abandon them to others; that it will thus provide opportunities of work for all men and secure to each the full reward of his labor; and that as a result involuntary poverty will be abolished, and the greed, intemperance and vice that spring from poverty and the dread of poverty will be swept away.

A WHISK FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Amoskeag manufacturing company is a corporation which produces wealth at Manchester, N. H. The reason why the company does its wealth producing at that particular place is because a special opportunity of nature exists there, giving to the labor employed in certain processes of production a vastly greater efficiency than would attach to it at most other places. A day's labor in the Manchester mills will produce more gingham and grain bags—which are what the Amoskeag company principally makes—than it would if applied elsewhere. Because at Manchester the Merrimack river falls fifty-four feet, and thus provides power to run an immense amount of machinery, by the use of which the efficiency of labor is enormously increased. The Amoskeag manufacturing company is not the only wealth producing concern that utilizes the natural opportunities of Manchester. Locomotives, boots and shoes, stockings, machinery and other things are produced there, not for home consumption, but for the use of people all over the United States.

This state of things is not regarded as an evil by the inhabitants of other cities and states. The western farmer, when he packs his grain in an Amoskeag bag, or buys a dress of Amoskeag gingham for his wife, does not curse the government for permitting the Amoskeag company to send its products into his home market; nor does he sigh for the good old days when farmers' wives wove cloth on hand looms. He knows that while the folks in Manchester are weaving gingham for him, he is growing wheat and fattening hogs for them; and that by this division of labor he gets vastly more gingham than if he did his own weaving, and the Manchester people more wheat and pork than if they cultivated their own fields and fed their own pigs. Free trade enables him to enjoy the benefit of that fifty-four feet fall of water at Manchester, and them to enjoy the benefit of the soil and climate of the western grain belt. For all practical purposes, he weaves his cloth at Manchester and they grow their grain on his farm.

Unfortunately, however, though there is no obstacle to the free interchange of products between Manchester and other parts of the United States, there are very serious artificial impediments to a similar system of exchange between the people of the United States and the people of other parts of the world. And this limitation of freedom works injury to both the Manchester manufacturers and to the farmers and others who consume their products. Men on the other side of the Atlantic, who would gladly employ the western farmer to raise wheat for them, are forced to employ Russian farmers instead, because our laws forbid Americans to accept pay for wheat in any form in which those transatlantic men can offer it. The consequence is that the farmer, selling less wheat, has less money with which to buy Amoskeag gingham. In just the same way the Amoskeag people are hindered from making gingham and bags for men in the West Indies, in Canada, in South America, in Africa, in Australia and in Asia. And in consequence they have less money with which to buy wheat and other things they would like to have. The net result is that the whole American people have less wealth than they otherwise would have, and vastly less than they need—less gingham, less bags,

less wheat, less pork, less boots and shoes, less stockings, less steel rails, less sugar, less everything. The productive power of the entire country is crippled. Men who know how to produce things, are forced to stand idle, either because they themselves are forbidden by law to accept what other people offer in exchange, or because other men are prevented in that way from utilizing their industry and are consequently destitute of means to purchase their product. Smith is out of work because Brown, having nothing to do himself, cannot afford to employ him. Brown in turn is idle because of Jones's lack of employment. Jones depends on Robinson, and so on. Each one wants what the others would like to furnish. And outside the tariff fence within which they stand at a deadlock is an eager crowd, asking nothing better than permission to set Robinson to work and thus start the impulse of production along the whole line. Shut out from the markets of the world the whole community suffers in much the same way as the people of New York did during the three days of last March, when the blizzard prevented men from coming to the city to buy and sell, and preserved to New Yorkers their own home markets.

But notwithstanding this limitation of the market for its production, the Amoskeag manufacturing company has done very well—at all events, during the past year. The treasurer, Mr. Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, has just issued his annual report; and though we have not been favored with a copy of the document, we can gather from the *Mail and Express* and other journals that have received it a sufficient knowledge of its contents. The company has greatly increased its production, has issued a stock dividend of 33 1-3 per cent—increasing its capital from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000—and has paid in cash dividends \$300,000, or ten per cent on its original capital. It has also increased the efficiency of the labor of its employees by making many improvements in the shape of new buildings and machinery; and especially by acquiring the right to raise the flashboards of the dam an extra foot. This last improvement, Mr. Coolidge states, "will be of much value to us in the time of drought, as we can store one foot more of water each night to be used during the day." It is noticeable, too, that all these betterments have been paid for out of profits. The company is to be congratulated on its success in the past, and on its prospects for the future. It has made lots of money, and has wisely fitted itself to make a great deal more. Hereafter a day's labor in its mills will produce more gingham and more bags than ever before. It is to be regretted, of course, that the laborers will derive no benefit of advanced wages from this increase in their efficiency; but, so far as the Amoskeag corporation is concerned, one might expect to see it eagerly anxious to secure a wider market for its products by the removal of every restriction upon commerce. Limited free trade has made it what it is. Absolute free trade would open for it a still more splendid career of prosperity.

This, however, is not the opinion of Mr. Thomas Jefferson Coolidge. He thinks that it would be no use for the Amoskeag manufacturing company to try to sell gingham in Canada, or in Australia, or anywhere else outside the United States. He thinks that they couldn't even sell them in the United States if the people of this country were at liberty to buy them anywhere else. He tells the stockholders in his report that "it is simply impossible to manufacture colored goods and fine yarns without protection." For this he gives two reasons: First, that his company has to pay higher wages than are paid by foreign manufacturers; and second, that the company labors under a burden of excessive taxation, the local taxes alone amounting to \$90,000 a year. Mr. Coolidge asserts that the English manufacturers could furnish as much gingham for eighty cents as the Amoskeag manufacturing company can for \$1; and if English goods were allowed to come in free, the Manchester concern would have to shut up shop, and like Mr. Boudierby and the other Coketown magnates, "pitch their property into the Atlantic."

As to Mr. Coolidge's first reason, it is to be feared that when he intended his mind on the study of the foreign wages question, he didn't exhaust all the sources of information at his command. Had he asked Mr. James G. Blaine about the matter, that gentleman could have informed him, as he officially did the people of the United States, June 25, 1881, that—

The average wages of employees in the Massachusetts mills is as follows, according to the official returns: Men \$3.30, women \$3.63, male children \$2.11, female children \$2.08. According to Consul Shaw's report, the average wages of the men employed in the Lancashire mills on the 1st of January, 1880, was about \$6 per week, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent; women from \$2.40 to \$4.30, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.

The hours of labor in the Lancashire mills are fifty-six, in the Massachusetts sixty per week. The hours of labor in the mills in the other New England states, where the wages are generally less than in Massachusetts, are usually sixty-six to sixty-nine per week. Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor.

In the two prime factors which may be said to form the basis of the cotton manufacturing industry, namely raw material and labor, we hold the advantage over England in the first and stand upon an equality with her in the second.

Having the raw material at our doors, it follows that we should be able to convert it into manufactures, all things being equal,

with more economy and facility than can be done by England.

So much for Mr. Coolidge's first reason. As for his second reason, while we cannot believe that the weight of local taxes is sufficient to prevent his company from competing with English manufacturers on equal terms—seeing that the Englishmen also are not unburdened by taxation—we nevertheless admit the injustice of the system that fines the Amoskeag manufacturing company for producing wealth, and tender our respectful sympathy to him and his fellow shareholders, as well as to the gingham weavers and bag users, who ultimately pay the taxes with several profits added. If Mr. Coolidge will read THE STANDARD and study the doctrine of the single tax he will comprehend the injustice even better than he does at present. The Amoskeag manufacturing company ought to be taxed for the value of the natural opportunities it uses, or prevents others from using—the fifty-four feet fall of water and the bare ground on which its buildings stand. This would be just; because that fall of water and that land owe their value to the pressure of population, and not to anything the company has done. If the Amoskeag stock holders were the only people in the United States, or even in New Hampshire, the falls and land would still be as valueless as they were two hundred years ago. But beyond this the company should not be called upon to pay a single cent of taxes; and the exaction from them of \$90,000, or \$9,000, or \$900, or \$90, or \$9, or ninety cents, is absolute robbery.

But suppose Mr. Coolidge's fears of foreign competition to be well founded. Suppose a British manufacturer can produce and sell to a consumer in this country for eighty cents as much gingham as the Manchester mill can deliver for \$1. With wheat at a dollar a bushel, that would mean that with free trade an American farmer could produce, by producing a bushel of wheat, as much gingham as he can now get by producing a bushel and a quarter. Has Mr. Coolidge the colossal impudence to insist that American farmers ought to give him and his fellows five pecks of wheat to the bushel, while everybody else gets only four pecks? Or, to put it another way, does he think that his company ought to be allowed to call twenty-eight inches of gingham a yard and get as much for it as another man would charge for full measure? Are the Amoskeag stockholders really such a helpless, degraded, un-American set of paupers that they cannot make an honest living by honest work, but must come whining for permission to rob their fellow citizens by charging one dollar for eighty cents worth of production? Mr. Coolidge ought to hide his head for very shame at the mere thought of laying himself open to such an imputation. At all events, he may as well make up his mind that the American people are making up their minds that if they must have paupers they will support them openly in public institutions as paupers, and cease to license them to collect alms at their own sweet wills under cover of the law. As Mr. Coolidge himself whimpers in the closing paragraph of his report:

I am struck by the fact that all the arguments used by the president and his party in this political campaign are arguments which would be just as strong after the tariff had been reduced ten, twenty or thirty per cent as they are now. They all lead directly, by the overthrow of the protective system piecemeal, to complete free trade.

So they do. And we are glad that Mr. Coolidge sees it.

On the whole, however, we don't believe that Manchester, N. H., will be called upon to provide poor house accommodation for Mr. Coolidge and his friends. The Amoskeag people will not go out of business when the British gingham and bag weavers come into our markets, even if the Englishmen do offer to sell gingham and bags cheaper than the Manchester mills can afford to. They will add another foot or two to their flashboards, and so increase the efficiency of their labor. Or if that is impossible or insufficient, they will import some more English machinery, or better still, set Yankee ingenuity to work inventing improved American machinery. Only one thing we are confident they will not do. They will not reduce the wages of their hands. For if they could do that they would have done it already.

AN ILLUSTRATION, AND WHAT IT ILLUSTRATES.

In the northern part of New Jersey there is a protection touter called the *Sussex Register*, which seems to be running a race in absurdity with the *New York Press*. Recently it put forth a characteristic specimen, all about the erection of some large factory in Philadelphia. Neither the factory, nor its owner, nor the kind of goods it is to produce is named; but this nameless factory is to employ 5,000 men—whether Italians or Huns is not stated. As steam power is to be used, many boilers of great size are required. In the bidding for the chance to make these boilers, an Ohio firm, not named, got the contract for \$138,000, against the next lowest bid of an English firm, not named, which was \$138,010. "That is to say," observes the *Sussex Register*, "the English company would make the boilers, transport them across the ocean, land them, pay the duty, haul to factory and set in brick, for \$10 more than the cheapest American competitor would do it."

It strikes us that from the protection standpoint the extra sum is rather small for the payment of extra wages. As it is stated that 3,000 men will be employed twenty-three days on the job, those men

could not possibly get in extra wages more than one three-thousandth of \$34,492—the difference between the American price and the English price minus the tariff. This is \$11.49 each for twenty-three days work, or fifty cents a day. As wages go, fifty cents a day extra is worth thinking of; but when the steel monopolists, the coal monopolists, the iron monopolists, and all the other monopolists, whose exorbitant prices, made possible by tariffs for their benefit, were paid out of the fifty cents, and they must be paid out of that, how much would be left for the Ohio workmen? And when, besides these deductions, the boiler manufacturers' ordinary profits on the extra price he is compelled to pay for material in consequence of the tariff on it, and the extraordinary profit which the tariff helps him to get, were deducted from what was left of that fifty cents, how much of the remainder would the Ohio workmen get? And when out of the remainder of that remainder the Ohio workmen were compelled to pay an exorbitant price for their coal, their clothing, much of their food, most of their luxuries, their house room, their furniture, and what not, all increased in price on account of the tariff, how far would the remainder of the remainder of their fifty cents go toward doing it? And that they must pay more for protected articles is proved by the very transaction in question; for does not the *Sussex Register* show that these American boilers cost at least \$34,502 more than they would cost if there were no tariff? and is it not to make high prices that the tariff is imposed? and if it did not make higher prices would it not be utterly useless?

But the specific point the *Sussex Register* makes of this transaction between the nameless Philadelphia factory and the nameless Ohio machinery establishment is that the duty of twenty-five per cent on machinery has saved this contract of \$138,000 to America. Let that be conceded, and yet, if there were no tariff on either iron, coal, steel or machinery it would be also saved to America. Any mechanic knows that we can build machinery cheaper than English manufacturers can, and when we do not it is because our machinery establishments are crippled by tariffs on the tools and materials they use.

And what is the advantage after all of saving the contract to America? If keeping work at home is a good thing that contract should have been saved to Pennsylvanians; but it wasn't. It went to an Ohio man against the higher bids of two nameless Pennsylvanians.

One hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars was sent out of Pennsylvania to Ohio. Ohio is \$138,000 richer and Pennsylvania is \$138,000 poorer! The nameless Ohio manufacturer has received \$138,000, and the nameless Pennsylvania factory has lost as much! Isn't that bad for Pennsylvania? Of course not, for what really has been done is to compel Pennsylvanians to produce things to be sent to the Ohioan to pay for the boilers, and if the boilers had been bought in England Pennsylvanians would have been compelled to produce things to be shipped to England in payment. To Pennsylvanians it makes no difference except that they must pay more than the boilers are worth. But what in that case would the Ohioans do? Well, if there was nothing else for them to do they would at least have to produce for themselves the things which Pennsylvanians must now send to them.

The net result of the transaction is that the nameless Pennsylvania factory pays thirty odd thousand dollars more for its machinery than it is worth, which is divided between the nameless Ohio manufacturer, the Bessemer steel monopoly, the iron kings and the coal barons, and workmen both in Pennsylvania and Ohio must take the best wages they can get in competition with whoever may come along from anywhere able to do their work; for, though the *Sussex Register* says the Ohio workmen will get their share of this \$138,000, every workman who has been at work long enough to go through the experience of a strike or a lockout, knows they will get nothing of the kind, but, instead, the very lowest price that in a glutted labor market in which all the world competes the employer can force them to take.

Suppose, however, that it is a particularly good thing to have an Ohio boiler manufacturer make boilers for a Pennsylvania factory, so good a thing as to make it desirable for the people of the United States to pay a subsidy to have it done. Even then is not a protective tariff the most expensive and least satisfactory way of accomplishing the result? Would not a direct bounty be better? Let us see. The English firm offers these boilers for \$138,010. If the duty were taken off they could discount that amount by \$34,502 and deliver the boilers for \$103,508. Then, to secure the contract for the Ohio manufacturing, and prevent the Englishman's boilers from invading our territory, let us levy a direct tax on the people, and say to the Ohio concern, "If you will deliver these boilers for \$103,498, and employ American labor, we will pay you out of the treasury of the United States \$34,503, which will give you \$138,000, the price you are getting now." Consider the advantage of this method. The Ohio concern would get \$34,503 with which to pay their workmen high wages, and as the workmen would know how much extra their employer received they could call him to account if he put it into his own pocket instead of giving it to them; while the Pennsylvania factory would get its boilers for \$103,498, instead of \$138,000, and thus save in the item of

boilers alone the handsome sum of \$34,503 with which to pay their operatives higher wages or employ more of them.

True, this bounty would come out of the people; but it does now, not only the bounty, but a profit on the bounty. But protectionists will not accept a bounty for a tariff, although it would better accomplish all they claim for a tariff, because the humbug of "encouraging home industry" must be disguised in some complex method. A direct bounty would be so simple as to expose the fraud to the commonest understanding.

AN UNFORTUNATE DISCOVERY.

Harney's Peak is in the territory of Dakota, which, as all the world knows, is in the United States of America. Dakota is part of that boundless west to which our statesmen are in the habit of referring when they tell us about the marvelous wealth of our country, the fertile prairies and rich mines she holds in trust for us, her children, and all the rest of it. And Harney's Peak is, if all said about it be true, the very richest part of Dakota. For Harney's Peak is full of tin, the mining experts say; and tin, as we all know, is a metal in general and constant demand.

This is fortunate indeed. We need tin badly, and are likely to stand more in need of it every year. We need it for use in our growing canned provision and oil business; we need it for our roofing, for our kitchen ware, for a dozen other industries, every one of which is hampered by the want of cheaper tin. When once the Harney's Peak mines are opened we shall be able to get tin more easily than we do now, and can therefore use it for many more purposes. Truly, this is a favored land of ours.

Ah! but wait a bit. Don't let us be too rapid in our prognostications. All that is what might be, if things were different; but then, you see, things aren't different. Harney's Peak is in the United States, but the tin in Harney's Peak doesn't belong to the people of the United States, by any means. It belongs to the few individuals who first happened to notice it, or who bought it from the men who noticed it. And they have hied them over to London, where they are trying to sell the tin as it lies in the ground, for \$15,000,000, to a lot of Englishmen who never saw Harney's Peak, and probably never will see it, and who will never dig an ounce of tin ore, but who will manage to make money out of the Harney's Peak mines all the same. Because they will have the privilege of forbidding or allowing whatever men they please to dig the ore; and it is a mathematical certainty that no man will strike a pick into Harney's Peak without first agreeing to give those Englishmen a sufficient share of what he digs to make them pretty comfortable.

It is interesting, though not altogether pleasant, to project the mind into the future and consider what will happen if those Englishmen buy that tin mine, and the deposits turn out as rich as the present owners insist they are.

In the first place, that patriotic American from the south of England, Mr. Robert P. Porter, and that other patriot from the north of Wales, Mr. John Jarrett, will at once begin to howl for a protective duty on tin. Here, they will make haste to tell us, is a rich tin mine in our own country that can give employment to at least a thousand men, and that can't be developed without protection. The cost of mining tin ore, they will say, is all labor; so that even if we do have to pay a little more for our tin for a time, the money will stay in the country, and we shall really be getting the tin for nothing. Consider, also, what a thing it will be for the farmers of Dakota, who will have a market for their breadstuffs among the tin miners right at their doors. With a heavy duty on tin the country will be prosperous, without it the country will be ruined. And so on, and so on. Anyone who reads the protectionist papers knows the style of talk.

Well, suppose the duty on tin imposed, and imagine the result. Will the workers in the tin mines get better wages? Hardly. There are plenty of Italians and Hungarians landing in New York, and the emigrant fare to Dakota is by no means high. Will the Dakota farmer get a better price for his grain? Hardly. Why should a buyer pay more for wheat at Harney's Peak than at any other town in Dakota? Will tin ware advance in price? Why, certainly. The men who use tin in making tin ware, having to pay more for their raw material, will naturally add the increased cost, with a profit besides, to the prices of their finished goods. Will the tin mining shares advance? Why, certainly, again. The whole of the tribute squeezed out of the American people in the shape of an extra price for tin will be sent across the Atlantic and shared among the mining stock holders in dividends.

And then, when the next treasury report is issued, Mr. Porter and other protectionist apostles will point to the record of imports and exports, and laugh for joy. "Just look here," we shall hear them say, "our exports have increased by so many millions of dollars; while our imports have actually fallen off. We are becoming a self-supporting nation, and selling lots of stuff to other nations, too!" And they will write editorials and make speeches, lauding the protective system, and showing by statistics the wonderful things it has accomplished. And once every month the treasurer of the mining company, in his London office, will prepare a neat little document, directing the managers of the mine in De-

kota to pay to John Smith or order so many thousand dollars for balance due from sales of ore, which document he will sell for cash to an English banker, who will send it over here to pay for breadstuffs and provisions that would otherwise have had to be paid for in goods. And when the English stockholders in the Dakota tin mine get their shares of the American tribute, they can, if they please, send the money over here, buy land in Dakota with it, and live at ease forever after on the black-mail American farmers will be forced to pay them for the privilege of living and working in the United States.

You see, the great advantage of the protective system is that it preserves America for Americans. Another advantage is, that it often enables Englishmen to do the preserving, and to charge pretty roundly for it, too. It is a blessing all round.

GETTING PAID FOR IDLENESS.

Since THE STANDARD last went to press, two sugar refineries in Brooklyn, employing between them about 1,000 men, have been closed by order of the sugar trust.

As in the case of the Boston establishment previously shut down, the owners of these refineries will not cease to make money because they have ceased to make sugar. Curious as it may seem, they will actually command more wealth than they would have done had they kept on producing wealth. Idleness is more profitable to them than industry. The men in their employ will be worse off because deprived of the opportunity of earning wages by making sugar. The people who use sugar will be worse off because there will be less sugar for them to use. But they themselves will be better off because through the operation of the trust they will be able to compel sugar users to pay them an extra price for the sugar they have already made.

That this power to gain money by doing nothing depends wholly upon monopoly is evident. Were each refiner operating separately, without agreement or collusion with his fellows, not one of them could make anything except by producing sugar. The moment a refinery shut down it would cease to pay a profit. It is only by combining into a trust that the sugar refiners of the United States are able to exact from the people a reward for idleness.

Equally evident is it that the trust rests, in the last resort, upon the protective tariff. Against the competition of new refineries in the United States the trust is amply able to defend itself. Few capitalists would be inclined to invest the very large amount of money required to establish a refinery, in the face of the assured deadly opposition of a syndicate whose wealth is measured by scores of millions of dollars. But against the competition of the world at large the trust has absolutely no protection but the tariff wall. Sweep away the tariff, allow any grocer or housekeeper who wants a barrel of sugar to send to France, or Germany, or Belgium for it, and the foundation of the American sugar trust would be destroyed. Nothing then could enable the refiners to exact tribute for idleness but an international trust. And an international sugar trust, in the existing conditions of commercial jealousy among European nations, would be a flat impossibility.

The trust rests upon monopoly. The monopoly rests upon the protective tariff. But the effect of the trust—the chief purpose of its being—is to cause less sugar to be produced. Therefore the effect of the protective tariff is to diminish the production of sugar.

How does this compare with the assertion of protectionist writers and speakers that the purpose of the tariff is to stimulate production?

The retail buyers of sugar, and of things of which sugar forms a part, are, in effect, the producers of sugar. The farmer, who, at some cross roads store, trades a dozen eggs for a pound of sugar, really produces the sugar, since his demand determines the direction of labor toward sugar production. He puts into the great magazine of exchanges a dozen eggs, and takes out a pound of sugar; and when he sweetens his coffee he does it with the product of his own industry just as truly as if he had raised a crop of sorghum and made the sugar for himself. While tending chickens and collecting eggs he is, so far as those eggs are intended to be exchanged for sugar, in reality refining sugar in New York, or Boston, or Philadelphia, or wherever else sugar can be refined with most advantage to himself.

Now, what protection says to the retail purchaser of sugar—the man who really produces the sugar—is this: "You must refine your sugar at certain designated places, no matter whether it costs you more labor to do it there or not." What free trade tells him is: "You are a free man. Refine your sugar where you will." Which of the two offers most of justice? And would not the effect of free trade be to increase the production of sugar?

The protective system diminishes the production of sugar—compels people to go without it, and forces workmen to stop making it. Free trade would increase the production of sugar, and by encouraging its use, encourage workmen to make it. Consider how in one direction alone, to say nothing of many others, new industries would be developed.

Buying her sugar in France, Germany, and Belgium, Great Britain has built up an enormous business in the production of

jams, jellies, and preserves. Her goods are sold all over the world. Despite our protective tariff of 35 per cent they have forced their way into this country and compelled our own producers, except of the finest grades of goods, to retire from our markets. Not only does this industry give employment directly to a very great number of men and a very large amount of capital, but it has indirectly added immensely to the wealth of the country. Farms are planted with small fruits, ships and sailors have more work, commission merchants, forwarders and clerks are provided with employment. And all because Englishmen have the sense to refine their sugar where they can do it to most advantage. Yet Great Britain is not by any means a good fruit growing country. There is not a fruit used in her preserve-making industry that cannot be raised to most advantage on this side of the Atlantic.

Now as to what might be done in the direction of this one industry we have expert testimony. The firm of Gordon & Dilworth of New York is one of the largest producers of sweetmeats and preserves in the country. And they affirm unhesitatingly that if they were allowed to produce the materials of their manufacture where they can do so to most advantage—if they were relieved of tariff taxes upon sugar, glassware, pottery, lumber, nails, corks, paper and tin, they could compete with the English and Scotch manufacturers on equal terms in Great Britain, with advantage in the other markets of the world, and with overwhelming superiority in the markets of the United States.

And as with sugar, so with every other product of industry. Deprive men of the privilege of producing where they will—compel them to waste their labor in producing at points of less advantage—and the inevitable result is less production and less opportunity for industry. Freedom is economical. Restriction can never be otherwise than costly.

A SIGNIFICANT ADMISSION.

The Press of this city generally utilizes its editorial page to tell its readers about the wonderful prosperity of American workmen—the splendid wages they receive, the silk dresses their wives and daughters wear, the perfectly lovely time they are having generally. It is true that the news columns of the paper knock these pretty romances into slinders by telling actual facts about actual men, women and children. But the Press is so constituted that it doesn't mind that; and it apparently has no dread of the possible effect upon its readers. It seems to think that when a man believes in protection his logical faculties are benumbed.

But the other day the Press editorial page took on a new appearance. Probably the regular editorial writer was away, and the news editor undertook to supply his place. Anyway, the Press, in double headed type, said this:

It is, we think, generally conceded by labor organizations of all kinds that wages in nearly all industries, trades and crafts have reached what, from their point of view, is the danger line. That is the line beyond which American labor ought not to go if it expects to retain a standard of living superior to that of European labor. As a matter of fact, in some of the unorganized trades and occupations and in the unskilled labor market, wages have already gone below the danger line.

If this is not believed by wage earners of all kinds, the Press wishes those who are interested would inquire of Mr. Powderly, who leads the Knights of Labor, or of Mr. Gompers, the leader of the federation of trades, if, during the last twelve months, any trade or craft backed by these powerful and useful organizations has been able to secure a single raise in the scale of rates of compensation anywhere.

And after thus confessing the complete failure of the protective system to do its acknowledged duty by the workmen, the Press goes on to explain that the cause of low wages is that "the demon of cheapness is abroad in the land." Things are altogether too cheap, it thinks, and that makes the present trouble. If the Mills bill should pass they would be cheaper yet, and there would be worse trouble. Hence an argument for protection. The Press doesn't point out that this is a still stronger argument for the sugar trust, and the cotton seed oil trust, and the steel rail trust, and all the rest of them. Perhaps it expected its readers to see that without being told. Or perhaps, on the other hand, it thought they hadn't sense enough to see it.

The direct tax law of Great Britain interferes even with marriage and other settlements. Any deed whereby any definite sum or share is settled upon or for the benefit of a person, for every £100 or part of £100 is taxed £1.30. If a British subject desires to settle £25,000 on his wife the government exacts a tax of £300, and if the settlement is £100,000 the tax is £1,200. Is such a tax likely to be so popular as a customs duty, which the man who pays it does not feel, and which helps along American industries?—Mail and Express.

On mature consideration we think it is. The American workman, of course, will feel badly at having to pay \$80 every time he settles a paltry \$30,000 on his wife; but, on the other hand, he will be able to settle upon his children free of tax. And when he gets very weary of the tax on settlements, he can abolish that impost, and lay all taxes upon land values.

A bright weekly paper, the Journal, has been started in Cohoon, under the editorship of Richard Monk. It warmly supports Cleveland and Thurman because of their attitude on the tariff question, and as warmly opposes Governor Hill because of his veto of the ballot reform bill.

MEN AND THINGS.

Mr. Edward H. Ammidown, president of the American protective tariff league, informs the public, through the Mail and Express, that he sent last month the following letter to a vice-president of the league in Virginia:

NEW YORK CITY, Sept. 12, 1888.
H. C. Parsons, Natural Bridge, Va.—DEAR SIR: I think if you can arrange for a joint discussion on the Mills bill in ten or more cities in Virginia, and assure our speakers liberal and attentive audiences, we can promise men with a national reputation and fully armed with facts for a fair and high debate of this simple economic question. Yours very truly, EDWARD H. AMMIDOWN, President, etc.

It is further stated, that in accordance with this suggestion, Mr. Parsons communicated with the chairman of the democratic state committee, suggesting a series of joint debates; and that to this communication no official answer has yet been returned.

We sincerely trust that the Virginia democracy will, even at this late day, accept the challenge so boldly made. At the same time, we must remind Mr. Ammidown that he himself, speaking for his tariff organization, has declined to put forward a champion to debate the issue of protection or free trade here in New York. The challenge was sent to him weeks ago, and declined. It is still open. We trust Mr. Ammidown is not afraid to do in New York what which he urges his vice-president to do in Virginia.

And while we are about it, we ask Mr. Ammidown's attention to the following advertisement inserted some days since in the Press, of this city. It would be blasphemous to say that protectionists do not read the Press, advertisements and all. Yet up to date not a protectionist out of the whole lot of them has answered this advertisement:

WANTED: A protectionist to make an address before the Tenth congressional district Single Tax Cleveland club, explaining how tariffs increase wages, and to answer questions put by the audience. Address BENJAMIN DORLIS, Chairman, 12 Union square.

The republican national committee have done a righteous thing. They have advertised that they will pay \$25,000 in rewards "for information resulting in the arrest and conviction of any persons guilty of violating the election laws in the impending national election in the cities of New York or Brooklyn, by false or illegal registration." Two thousand dollars is to be paid for the first conviction, \$1,000 for the second, \$500 for the third and \$250 for each subsequent conviction until the \$25,000 shall be exhausted. Annexed to the advertisement is a certificate from the Garfield national bank, showing the deposit of \$25,000, to be specifically applied to the payment of the rewards.

The trouble about protection is that it never protects all round. Somebody always has to pay for protecting the other fellow. Here are the farmers of the colony of Victoria, in Australia, meeting in convention in Melbourne to insist that something should be done for them. They are forced to pay heavy prices for manufactured goods, they complain, because of the protective tariff; and yet the much protected Victorian manufacturers unpatriotically go to New South Wales for their wheat and wool, for no better reason than that the New South Wales people can afford to sell wheat and wool cheaper. So the Victorian farmers want a whopping tariff laid on wheat and wool and things of that sort; and as wheat growing is a younger infant industry than wool growing, they modestly ask for a bounty on wheat production. The only thing they don't want to see protected is labor. They think that costs altogether too much and ought to be made cheaper. And so they entreat the government to renew the system of assisted immigration and thus help them to get their wheat raised and their wool clipped at lower prices. Just where the laboring man comes in in the Victorian scheme of protection, it is rather hard to see.

A female World reporter lately assumed the character of a sewing girl looking for employment, and visited several New York establishments, in which the highly protected industry of clothing manufacture is carried on. Her experiences were interesting.

Her first visit was to a vest factory, where she was offered the choice of binding vests at four cents each, or finishing necks at half a cent to two cents. Declining work at these prices, the reporter passed on to an overcoat establishment, where she secured a job. By hard work she succeeded in finishing two overcoats in the course of the day, for which she received twenty-five cents. Here is her description of the place:

In this shop the slaves worked from seven o'clock in the morning until seven in the evening and seven days in a week. At eleven in the forenoon and three in the afternoon the factory was invaded by soda water and bread men. Nearly everybody invested in a pint bottle of soda, for which they paid two cents, the water being cut up in chunks weighing about four ounces, and the same price was accepted for a cheese sandwich. Fruit peddlers offered a big apple or a small pear for a cent, and by a series of questions I learned that many of the workers were able to subsist on the investment of five cents a day or fifty cents a week, the extra fifteen cents paying for half a pound of coffee, which was prepared in the beer cans over the furnace fire. Besides vendors of sausage, shoe strings, shirt buttons, handkerchiefs and notions in general, there were agents from various lotteries, the representative of the Louisville concern being the most successful. There was absolutely no retiring room for the unfortunate sewing girls to go to, and no provision whatever for creature comforts.

When the day's work was over, the reporter, by offering to provide a breakfast, induced the girl who had been sitting next her during the day, to ask her home to tea. It was not an ideal home to which they went:

In one room my little collaborer lived with her parents and six little brothers and sisters, the youngest being a babe of three months, the next two years, and the others under

seventeen years, that being Anna's age. The two youngest children were asleep on a pillow beside the kitchen stove, three played house on a dirty mattress that was tied up in a rope and used as a seat, and the fourth child clung to the mother's skirts, crying piteously. All the bedding was hung out of the window; and on the sill were crowded cans containing milk, drippings and perishable groceries. The mother could not speak English, although she understood much that was said. In spite of the breakfast and fresh biscuits we had brought she did not accord me a welcome sufficiently cordial to justify my remaining; and to be frank I was not sorry to quit the wretched abode, with its suffocating smell.

All this in the city of New York, in the year of grace 1888.

Mrs. Sophie Schreckner, of 455 West Thirtieth street, is a woman who has committed many crimes. To say nothing of her wickedness in coming into the world in the first place, when she might have known there was no room for such as her, she has been guilty of getting married, of having two children, of becoming a widow, and of trying to make an honest living as a washerwoman. For all this it was proper that she should be punished, and she has been punished accordingly. One day last week, having nothing to eat in the house, she sent her two ragged, bare-footed little ones out to beg. A policeman arrested them, and a police justice turned them over to a charitable society. Now that Mrs. Schreckner has been deprived of her children, perhaps she will reflect upon the misdeeds we have enumerated, and make up her mind to cease intruding herself into a world where she clearly is not wanted.

A convention of Kentucky tobacco growers have adopted a foolish resolution recommending that no tobacco be planted in this country during 1889 and that the crop of this season be withheld from the market until next summer. They give as a reason for this extraordinary proposal that there is more tobacco now on hand than can be sold at a profit, and they have summoned a second convention for October 15 to arrange the details of the plan.

If the tobacco growers in the convention had possession of all the tobacco growing land in the country, they might, with the assistance of the blessed tariff, carry out this little scheme successfully; but as it is, the only effect of their trying to carry out their resolution would be to encourage everyone else to plant tobacco. If the convention persevere in their nonsense, they will find next year that there will be just as much tobacco planted as ever, and that their saved-up crop of 1888 will only help to break the market down. They are trying to form a trust without knowing how to do it. Trusts rest on monopoly. No monopoly, no trust. If these Kentucky gentlemen want to form a tobacco trust, they must begin by buying up all the tobacco lands.

A certain Mr. Proutt of Chicago, said to be a Christian scientist, comes before the public with a scheme for making 6,000 families rich, if not absolutely without work, at all events with very little labor. He proposes that the 6,000 families shall go west in a body, take up each 100 acres of land, and found a city, which, supposing each family to consist of five persons, will start into life with a population of 30,000 souls. The land within the city limits, Mr. Proutt estimates, will at once be worth \$15,000,000, and that in the suburbs \$9,000,000, making \$24,000,000 in all, or a neat little property of \$4,000 for each family.

Mr. Proutt's idea is ingenious, only he hasn't worked it out quite far enough. To make his proposed city truly prosperous he must arrange for a second detachment of 6,000 families to follow the first. These will not take up any public lands in or around the city, because the first lot will have gobbled it all; but they can rent land from the first comers. In this way the wealth of the city will be increased from \$24,000,000 to \$48,000,000 at least; and the first batch of emigrants will reap the reward of their prudence and sagacity by making the second lot work to support them.

Getting in Good Work at Lynn.

LYNN, Mass., Oct. 7.—I inclose you a list of eight Cleveland and Thurman single tax voters which I obtained in my few leisure moments. But one voted for Cleveland four years ago, two were independent and five were republican.

Mr. Theodore Perkins, secretary of our land and labor club, and other members are circulating enrollment blanks.

THE STANDARD is doing immense work in the enlightenment of the people in this section, the most gratifying evidence of which is the number of young men who are to be found on the streets and in the labor headquarters discussing the tariff question from its true economic standpoint. Their political opinions are not a little surprised and mystified at the information displayed by, and the readiness of the replies of, the young free trade advocates.

The rapid progress of free economic thought was also emphasized at a democratic meeting here last week, when the speaker, Mr. Russell, nominee for governor, said: "Whatever may be the views held by the people relative to the influence of the people in maintaining wages, I am of the opinion that neither free trade nor protection has anything to do with them," which elicited hearty applause from a considerable portion of the audience. Again, the nominee for lieutenant governor, Mr. Curran, speaking of the extortionate taxation of the tariff, asked, "And what do you receive in return?" I shouted, "Nothing." "That's it, exactly," he returned; "you receive nothing." And the applause of 3,000 people indicated that their eyes were being opened.

W. W. GRAY,
President Land and Labor Club.

Teaching Brooklyn Democrats.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—A single tax Cleveland and Thurman meeting was held last Saturday evening at Temperance hall, Brooklyn. Notwithstanding the very heavy rain that lasted all the evening, about a hundred people were present, most of whom were evidently desirous of hearing straight out free trade arguments. Rev. S. W. Laidler presided and delivered a first rate speech on the tariff bill just presented by the senate committee, and advocated absolute free trade. The other speakers were Louis F. Ford and William G. Eastlake. Their speeches were received with great enthusiasm. Our

THE CAMPAIGN "STANDARD" FUND.

"Credo's" idea of a "sowing society," whose members should pledge themselves to the payment of twenty-five cents monthly "for the purpose of disseminating the single tax doctrine through the medium of THE STANDARD," seems to have met with some approval. Here are two of the letters that have reached us on the subject:

MORRISTOWN, N. J.—Inclosed find twenty-five cents for monthly subscription to single tax sowing society, to be used in circulating THE STANDARD. The idea of some kind of association, with regular dues, is much more likely to bring forth contributions than the plan of miscellaneous giving, even for a particular object. A. C. KIP.

BALTIMORE, N. Y.—"Credo" made a suggestion which I think is the best I have yet seen, and that one who would suggest that some kind of card be printed, upon which each member could be kept a memorandum when he paid, and thus be kept in mind of it. Our cause is making rapid strides. Three-fourths of the democrats are anti-protectionists already. R. FREEST.

We want to see how many more STANDARD readers will pledge themselves to support "Credo's" idea. The plan proposed is certainly simple and feasible enough. There are few friends of the single tax movement who cannot spare twenty-five cents a month for the purpose of placing THE STANDARD before people who otherwise might not be likely to see it. And anything like concerted action in this direction would supply the means of reaching a very wide circle. We hope to see the applications for membership in "Credo's" "sowing society" come tumbling in.

But it must not be forgotten that there is special work to be done now, that cannot be delayed. The end of the campaign is drawing near; and when it shall have closed an opportunity will have vanished. Men's minds just now are open for the discussion of economic principles as they have not been for a generation past. To force the doctrine of the single tax upon their attention now, in the heat of the campaign, while they are thus peculiarly ready to receive it, is the object of the campaign STANDARD fund. Were the fund twenty times what it is, it would still be all too small for its work. To swell its resources promptly is at present the most effectual way that single tax men can take of aiding the cause they have at heart.

Here are some of the letters from contributors:

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—I send you one dollar for the STANDARD campaign fund, and regret that I cannot increase the amount, as I know of no better way of spreading the single tax doctrine than by placing THE STANDARD and free trade tracts in the hands of our opponents.

Unfortunately for me I am not yet of age, so I shall not have the pleasure of casting my first vote for Cleveland and Thurman and Miller this year. However, I hope at the next presidential election to be able to assist at the polls in the election of the candidate who comes nearest to supporting the single tax doctrine. GEO. N. OLCOFF.

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA.—I send list of names and \$3 for campaign fund. The single tax idea seems to be gaining friends. I am buying five or six copies of THE STANDARD each week, putting them where they will do good. A. O. FITCHER.

PULASKI, N. Y.—Your weekly pleas for recruiting funds are irresistible. Much as I need funds for other purposes, this burden enlarges and will not drop. I inclose a dollar, hoping this will relieve my sense of duty somewhat, and convert some blind soul. If this does not relieve me I may squeeze out more! C. V. HANBOTTLE.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—Inclosed I send my name to be added to the list of single tax voters who will vote for Cleveland and Thurman. I voted for Blaine in '84, but am now a free trader in the full sense of the word. I send \$2 for the campaign fund. Wish I could send more. JOHN HOFER.

PORTLAND, ORE.—Inclosed find express order for \$7, of which \$5 is to pay for my subscription to the campaign STANDARD fund for October and November, and for the remaining \$2 please send me forty copies of THE STANDARD of September 1, containing speeches by Henry George and William Lloyd Garrison. S. B. RUGER.

FULTON, N. Y.—Inclosed find postal note for \$1.50. Put the dollar in the campaign fund, and for the balance send me two hundred copies of Judge Reid's "A republican's reasons for supporting Cleveland."

I also inclose an enrollment blank signed, as I am a thorough convert to the single tax. I could not do otherwise. I have always been a republican, and voted for Blaine in 1884. I shall not vote for Hill. The believers in the single tax here number very few, but we are fighting as stoutly as we can. E. C. ROGERS.

NEW YORK CITY.—Inclosed find \$2 for the campaign. Wish I could send more, and may do so before the campaign is over. The STANDARD arrives every week, and is the best paper I ever read. E. B. SWINNEY.

NEW YORK CITY.—I inclose \$1, to be used as you judge best. I would have sent in my contribution sooner, but was out of work and could not afford to do it. Now I will do my best, and try and send you as much every other week. I always buy my STANDARD at a news stand, read it from beginning to end, and then put it in my barber shop. A. GRANGER.

NEW YORK.—Some time ago I noticed in THE STANDARD your suggestion to let friends read it might be possible to largely increase its circulation by each one asking some newsdealer who had not been keeping it on sale to procure three copies weekly, with the understanding that one copy would be taken immediately upon their arrival, and the remaining two at the end of the week if not sold. The idea seemed to me to be a very good one, and so when a man who had recently lost his eyesight, and who had a wife and little ones dependent upon him, set up a news stand in the lower part of the city near the office where I am employed, I asked him to get three copies; told him I would take one as soon as received, and stipulated that the other two were to be displayed so that people passing might know that THE STANDARD was kept there for sale, agreeing to take them if they were unsold at the end of the week. The first week I was a day late in calling for my copy, and upon inquiring for it, was informed that four copies had been procured and sold. I told him to get more and to supply the demand, and that I would see that none were left on his hands at the end of the week. That was about two months ago, and my blind friend now sells from thirteen to eighteen copies weekly, of which number I usually take three or four to mail to acquaintances who I think may be attracted by something which I see (and which) in the Standard. Thus your suggestion put in practice by one of the friends of the

cause has not only been the means of helping a blind man to support his family, but what is of far greater importance (even to him, I hope), has done something toward helping forward the crusade which I have faith to believe will eventually lead to a far higher and nobler development of mankind than has ever been dreamed of on earth. Of course I do not know that all these copies are sold to people who had not been previously buying it elsewhere, but it is fair to presume that a good part of them are; and it is in the hope that many others may be encouraged to try the plan that I write of my success with it. FRED J. MILLER.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., Oct. 3.—Inclosed find \$1; apply where it will do the most good; will try to send another before the campaign closes. I have a mother and niece dependent upon me besides my own family, hence the smallness of my contribution; wish I could make it a thousand. Every single tax man who is imbued with the glorious principle ought to contribute a little. Leo Miller, H. Martin Williams and Thomas Hudson, three single tax men, good and true, are making their voices heard in this state. The single tax doctrine is gradually taking hold of the masses, and has already passed the stage of ridicule in this locality.

A significant thing happened a few nights ago. When I was reading THE STANDARD, our chief operator, a man who has seemingly cared very little for questions of a political or economical nature, came up behind me and looked over my shoulder, and said: "What's George got to say this time?" I read him a portion of one of Mr. George's answers to a question at the last Cooper union meeting. He said: "I told you that man George was the largest head of any man in this country to-day. I believe he is right, and the great strength of his doctrine lies in the fact that he bases it on the teachings of Christ and the Holy Bible." I was a little surprised.

I am getting up a list of names for enrollment. L. P. CUSTER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—Inclosed please find one dollar from one of the 50,000 to whom you appeal in this week's issue of THE STANDARD. I wish I could afford to do more. I get my STANDARD from the newsdealer here instead of subscribing for same at the office of publication, as I think this induces dealers to keep it on their counters and thus bring it more into public notice. I also inclose money for tracts. GEO. D. LIDDELL.

DETROIT, Mich., Oct. 3.—I inclose check for \$5, being matured installment of my subscription to the campaign fund.

I heard Mr. Blaine speak to-day. He fought shy of tariffs, trusts and troubles generally, and confined himself to a demagogic thrumming on the pension veto string and other irrelevancies. Yet he was who said that any departure from the issue that a high tariff makes wages high to the laborer was a weakening of the campaign. Query: Is Mr. Blaine weakening? HERMAN KUEHN.

CHICAGO, Ill., Oct. 3.—By transfer of the list of the Labor Enquirer my name is now on your subscription roll and will be renewed from time to time as it expires. I accidentally came across THE STANDARD on its sixth issue, and having read "Progress and Poverty" I immediately sent for the preceding numbers, and haven't missed a number since, frequently purchasing several, and encouraging different newsdealers to keep it on sale.

I am reminded by receipt of Mr. Crossdale's circular of September that I have not been quite so active in urging the circulation of THE STANDARD as I might have been, and therefore inclose payable to you an order for \$3 for which please send me ten copies of THE STANDARD until after the November election, and I will endeavor by that time to get as many or more permanent subscribers for a longer time. Recognizing the press as the great educator, I don't know any better way for quiet single tax men to be useful than to urge his friends to read THE STANDARD and thus induce voters to think. I find where this can be accomplished every honest truth-seeker is sooner or later convinced, and most frequently in turn becomes a propagator of the truth.

Thousands of quiet people every day say God bless Henry George, and I hope every one will try and get as many subscribers for THE STANDARD as he can, so that the issue may be so large that its columns may be in great demand for advertisements and thus enable a reduction in the price of subscription and increase its circulation. I have found that I can induce many men to buy single copies who do not feel able to pay down a year's subscription at once.

I will in a day or so send what signatures of single tax Cleveland men I can get. Please send this week's issue for first numbers of STANDARD for my club.

As one of the tribe of Abou Ben Adhem I salute you. J. HARRIS, 76 Market street.

The subscriptions to the fund for the past week have been:

E. C. Alphonse, East Orange, N. J.	1 00
T. Edward Ferguson, Brooklyn (monthly contribution)	2 50
George Datch, Pittsburg, Pa.	1 00
W. F. Ellis, Cleveland, O.	1 00
Rome Adams, Oak Hill, N. Y.	2 00
A. Granger, City	1 00
M. A. Segin, Memphis, Tenn.	72
Herman Kuehn, Detroit, Mich.	5 00
J. H. H. Kelley, Bu. Ind. N. Y.	1 00
S. W. Mendelson, City (monthly contribution)	1 00
M. Williams, Bowling Green, Ky.	10 00
F. B. Swinney, City	2 00
Dr. Stewart, Colquhar, Pa.	1 00
J. L. G. Boston, Mass.	5 00
G. D. Liddell, Providence, R. I.	1 00
F. A. Simms, Lynn, Mass.	50
P. Custer, Indianapolis, Ind.	1 00
N. O. Oloff, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1 00
O. A. Fitcher, Mt. Pleasant, Ia.	2 00
H. Gonzales, Milwaukee	1 00
E. C. Rogers, Fulton, N. Y.	1 00
L. Prang, Boston, Mass. (monthly contribution)	5 00
Fourth Industrial Co. M. & L. O. M. city	5 00
F. N. B. Cincinnati, O.	15
Richard Freney, B. H. H. N. Y.	25
A. C. Kip, Morristown, N. J.	25
J. W. Wakeway, City	1 00
R. T. Stapleton, S. I.	1 00
A. R. Wynn, Toledo, O.	1 00
R. Macdonald, Flushing, L. I.	5 00
G. W. Bartlett, Fulton, N. Y.	1 00
T. W. Roberts, City	25
Credo, Newark, N. J.	25
John Hoffer, New Haven, Ct.	2 00
James Perry, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00
Jacob Jordan, Troy, N. Y.	2 00

Total for the week.....\$61 47
Previously acknowledged.....3,316 44
Total to date.....\$3,377 91

The Outlook in the West is Very Cheering.

CHICAGO, Ill., Oct. 3.—Six months ago I favored independent action, but soon saw how futile it would be, and now am convinced that by joining the democrats in their one short step toward freedom we not only compel them to go further than they intended and give the movement such impetus that it can never be checked until the whole tariff infamy is swept away, but have advanced the single tax cause more than would have been possible in a generation by independent political action.

I have traveled much through the west in the last six months, and am daily surprised at the steady and rapid growth of our principles. Everywhere men who a year ago were shocked at the mere mention of the single tax, are now interested, willing, even eager listeners. The heaven is working, and I bid all our single tax friends to be of good cheer, renew hope and courage, and

press forward with unflinching step. The promise of morning brightness, and some of us will live to see the noon tide glory of the perfected liberty that can only come when justice is done.

One good sign of the times is that where I buy what STANDARDS I can pay for, and where not long since many numbers remained unsold each week, for the last month the supply has been exhausted on the first day after arrival, and it is now common to see them being read audiously on railroad trains and street cars, in hotels, and wherever men have a few minutes leisure; and what is more, the reader invariably passes the paper to some one else, pointing out some articles that meet his thoughts. It is the great political educator of the times.

WM. SPALDING,
Room 16, 175 LaSalle street.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Almost everywhere it has been a gray and pleasant season, a little rapid in its onward course at some places, proportionately slow at others. At Newport and Lenox, where society people most do congregate, it may almost be said to have been brilliant. The most opulent hospitality has prevailed, a hospitality that has been untrammelled by the influence of cliques, and that, excluded where education and refinement gave a right to enter. Consequently no injurious scandals, having their origin in envyings and backbitings, have darkened the air. But the summer days with all their varied and multiplied pleasures have passed without a cloud.

John Nolan, old, sick and homeless, was picked up in the street the other day by the police of the Twenty-third precinct. He said that he was eighty-five and had been so long in his feebleness dependent on his children, who had little to do for him, that he felt it to be his duty to rid them of the burden. So he crept into the street and gave himself up. The old man either could not or would not tell where his children lived, and was taken to Bellevue hospital.

The first meet of the Essex county hounds took place Saturday afternoon at the Country club house, Hutton park, Orange. Tea was served in the club house by Mrs. John Wilmerding, Mrs. Douglas Robinson, J. M. Powers, Mrs. Lydie and a host of Orange matrons, from half-past 3 until half-past 5 o'clock. There was a high-jumping contest at 4, and the hounds' meet took place shortly after 5 o'clock. The meet was a success on Wednesday and Saturdays throughout this month, and the hunt ball will then wind up the Orange season.

The Evening News of October 3 said that Robert S. Nicholas, aged thirty-eight years, of 28 Bowery, attempted suicide the night before by jumping off the dock at the foot of Market street. He was rescued, and is detained in the Gouverneur ship hospital. He said that as he was unable to find work he had no desire to live.

Persian, Chinese and Japanese furnish designs for fashionable tea gowns at present. One of the most beautiful of these gowns has just been imported by Mrs. Macdonald of Chicago. It is in the Yeddo design, and the back and sides composed of a rich brocade in deep pink covered with great butterflies in gold, purple, mauve, crimson and pale green. The butterflies are all hand embroidered, and each one has two genuine rubies for eyes. There are eighty-eight on the robe. The front is of China crepe, a delicate gold in color, and this is lined with surtise pink silk and bound with a bright green silk cord; which also forms a girdle and is tied in front. The full angel sleeves are of brocade lined with pink and embroidered in tiny white swans. The gown is said to have cost \$1,500.

Two miserable looking children, George, aged nine, and Lizzie, aged six, the offspring of Mrs. Sophie Schreckner, living on the top floor of 415 West Thirtieth street, were arrested on Sixth avenue this morning for begging. The children had neither shoes nor stockings, and were shivering with cold. They were taken to the Jefferson market police court, where their father, John Schreckner, was dead, and that their mother took in washing. The mother was able to make enough money to pay last month's rent, but having paid that, she found herself without a cent, as they were without bread, the mother sent them out to beg.

A new dinner table wrinkle is a dish of dark colored jelly, in the center of which is an electric light. The effect of its sudden illumination "is just too splendid for anything." Mrs. M. E. Van Wier, of No. 38 East Sixtieth street, called at the morgue last night and identified the body of the man who died suddenly in a lodging house on No. 16 Sixth avenue yesterday morning. She says that he was Lee Byrne, a native of Ireland, sixty years of age, who ten years ago was a millionaire white goods dealer in New Orleans.—[New York Herald, Oct. 5.]

Baron Barthold Hognigen Huene, who was married to Miss Annie Lothrop, eldest daughter of George Van Ness Lothrop, recently minister to Russia, made a handsome bridegroom in his full dress white uniform of the Chevaliers of the empire of Russia. It was indeed an unusual sight to see such bride and groom in white. Baron Huene is a man of wealth, this being one of the requirements in his regiment, the outfit alone costing \$5,000.—[New York Telegram.]

The poormasters of Hudson county went to the almshouse at Snake hill on Friday and examined all the paupers confined there. They decided that half a dozen of the men were able to earn their own living. They were put out. Among them was John Weisender, seventy-three years of age, of Union Hill. Owing to his age he cannot secure work, and it is said he has no friends to take care of him. He once paid \$6,000 a year in taxes on Union Hill property. Frederick Wagoner will try to get him readmitted to the almshouse. Among the paupers who were not turned out by the poormasters is Gottlieb Jung, another resident of Union Hill. Some time ago a

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

How?

NEW YORK.—How can we compete with Europe in our own market without a duty sufficient to cover the difference in the price of labor here and there?

In the first place, Europeans will not send anything into this market unless we send things to them. The more things we send out, the more things we send out, the more things we produce, the more things we produce, the supply of labor being the same, the higher will wages be.

In the second place, the price of labor, computed in time, as by the day, week, month or year, has nothing to do with the problem. Low time-wages may be paid for work which is so inefficient that higher time-wages will be paid for the same work. A dollar a week in harvest to a man with a cradle is higher wages than ten dollars with a reaping machine. The question is whether, when measured by the work they do, our workmen get higher wages than are paid abroad. If they do not, then we can produce, so far as the cost of labor is concerned, cheaper than they produce abroad, though our daily wages be higher.

In the third place, labor is not the only item of cost. We could pay higher wages, measured by product as well as by time, and yet undersell a country in which the raw material was dearer than here.

It will! It will!

HYLETON, Ill.—(1) Will your single tax break the power of corporation thieves who are using our government to hold us down while they rob us?

(2) Will it choke off the deadliest vampire, trusts, not all of which exist because of our tariff?

(3) Will it head off the schemers and foil the plotters?

(4) Will it scatter the horde of hungry hyenas who are gnawing at our vitals?

(5) Will it, in time, leave to us the fruits of our toil?

(6) If, as you will pay for the free parks, free libraries, free colleges, free street railways, and other free things which you claim the single tax will provide.

T. D. HICKLEY.

(1) Directly, no. But indirectly, yes. Indirectly, by making men independent; by securing to all an opportunity to make a decent living by honest labor; by giving all greater leisure, and by lessening ignorance. It is not the "government," but want and fear of want, stunting drudgery and blinding ignorance among the people, that corporations use to hold us down while they rob us. Moreover, the single tax would be a recognition of justice in government, a long step in the right direction, which would make the next step easier to take.

(2) Yes, except such as are based on patents.

(3) Many, and the worst.

(4) As hordes of hungry hyenas usually gather around a dead carcass, it will probably scatter them, for it will kill off the lion, landlordism, which provides the carcass.

(5) Yes; and nothing short of it will.

(6) They will be paid for out of the common fund, which is now diverted to private use.

Some men use land on which, with a given amount of labor and capital, they can produce, say, 10; others are thereby forced to use land on which, with the same labor and capital, they can produce only 8. Now the first, obviously, have an advantage of 2. This is due to the better opportunity for work, in the exclusive possession of which they are secured by the state. Then if they pay this difference of 2 to the state for the common good, they will be paying only what they have not earned; and out of the aggregate of these payments free public works can be maintained without taking from any one the fruits or any part of the fruits of his own toil.

Running Down Farms.

UTICA, N. Y.—As a farmer who regards THE STANDARD as the best paper he ever read, I see this objection to your land theory: One man might rent a well improved farm and "run the land out," as they say, making as much money out of it as possible; he might then leave and rent another good farm and run that out; and so on. Would not the system tend to run farms down?

JAMES C. HANSON.

You are misled by the supposition that it is proposed to have the government own farms and rent them. Even if this were the plan, it would not result as you fear; but as no such plan is intended it is not worth discussing.

Under the single tax farms would be owned precisely as they are now. The difference would be, that instead of paying taxes on everything he has, the farmer would pay on the value of the land alone. His buildings and improvements of all kinds, together with his stock and his purchases at the store, would be exempt.

Now let us suppose that a farmer buys a well improved farm. What he would buy would be the improvements, for the land itself would have little or no selling value. Having got the farm, if he allowed the improvements to deteriorate, he would hurt himself in two ways: First, he would be allowing his own property to lose in value, and would thereby reduce his wealth; and, second, this kind of property being exempt from taxes, the lower it fell in value the higher would be his taxes relatively to his wealth, for the tax on his

land would not decline. On the other hand, if he improved the farm still more, he would acquire greater wealth; and as that wealth would be exempt from taxation his taxes relatively to his wealth would fall; for the tax on his land would not increase.

But suppose, while keeping up his improvements, he "runs out" the land itself by bad cultivation so that its value falls and brings down his taxes. Do you think any farmer would do that? Can you run down the natural qualities of your soil without reducing your crops? Of course not. And what interest would you have in so using the land as to make small crops? The better your crops the lower are your taxes relatively to your wealth.

When you once understand that the single tax is to monopoly a death dealing tax, and to labor a vitalizing exemption, and appreciate what you already know, that the farmer is not a monopolist, but a laborer, you will "see the cat," and questions like the one you ask will no longer trouble you.

War Taxes.

ALMA, Wis.—Please answer this question in THE STANDARD: If the single tax should be accepted and introduced by the government, by what means and in what way can a tax be raised to pay the expenses of a war? I have submitted this question to our local single tax men, who answer as follows:

There would be no war if the single tax was once fully accepted and introduced by the government of the United States. The single tax is based upon the broad and fundamental principle of the brotherhood of all men, and it is the harbinger of the Prince of Peace, once adopted in the United States every throne in Europe would topple, and the whole world would ask for freedom. Had the United States been really a free country, imperialism would now be a thing of the past.

A government backed by single tax men would not hesitate in case of a war, when citizens are called upon to lay down their lives in defense of country, to take from every millionaire nine hundred and ninety-nine dollars in every one thousand, and pay the expenses of a war as we went along. Had this been done during the late rebellion, we would not now groan under the immense public debt then contracted, and every penny would have been paid long ago. We believe that "the earth belongs to the living," and we now see one generation paying the debts contracted by another. The institution of a great public debt tends to subvert human rights nearly as much as indirect taxation.

By the way, how early did you get up this morning? What country now "pays the expenses of a war?" None. Every country now leaves such small matters to future generations.

During the feudal age no public war debts were made. Each baron in war furnished his quota of men and paid for them, and he did it with funds raised on the single tax plan by reason of his ownership of the soil. We now see the community, the only ground land lord, could collect this fund quite as readily as a feudal baron or an Assor and expend it with as good grace. By the way, have you ever read "Progress and Poverty" if not, do so, please.

THE ALMA SINGLE TAX CLUB,
per T. B. President.

I am not entirely satisfied with the above answer.

DR. GEORGE SELLE,

You should have stated the point in respect to which the answer of the Alma single tax club is not satisfactory to you.

If war funds were raised by bonds, as they are now (and there is nothing in the single tax itself to prevent that), the bonds would be paid by a tax on land values alone, instead of taxes on labor, by which such bonds are now paid.

But, as you are told in the Alma club's letter, the single tax sentiment takes its root beneath mere fiscal policies in the religion of human brotherhood, and once in the ascendant in any country would prevent all wars but defensive ones. If war should come, however, and land taxes were insufficient, it would not regard property as more sacred than life. It would propose, respecting property, what is now done respecting men, and when volunteering fell off it would resort to the draft. It compelled to confiscate property at all it would confiscate the property of present and not that of future generations.

What is a Commodity?

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—In this week's "Queries and Answers," in reply to the inquiry, "What is a Commodity?" you define it as anything which is "exchanged in commercial intercourse," adding that derivatively it means "anything that affords a convenience." The person who asked the question also asks, "Is labor a commodity?"

Would it be a correct definition to say that a commodity is any product of labor that satisfies human desires, or simply "any product of labor"? If I make a coat and use it myself it affords me a convenience, and is therefore as much of a "commodity" to me as it would be to another if I had exchanged it with him for something else. When in terminology land ceased to be wealth and became a natural opportunity, labor ceased to be a commodity and became a factor. And the definition I suggest shuts out labor from being classed as a commodity by its own terms.

Many of the apologies for social wrongs obtain their strength from the plausibility of vicious definitions; and in arguments, when I deny that labor is a commodity, I find a strong defense in the definition I have given, as it cuts the ground from under the feet of the opponent and makes him immediately ask, "What, then, is labor?" From that point on, as we all know, the argument is easy.

B. C. KEELER.

The function of definitions is not argument, but to enable debaters to use terms which convey the same meaning to both. It is immaterial, therefore, whether one definition or another be given to the word "commodity," provided the definition be

agreed upon. In general use, however, the term "commodity" does not signify anything affording a convenience, but a thing in commercial exchange. If you spoke of ditches, bridges, wells, or orchards as commodities, you might cause confusion, for though these are labor products, they are not usually regarded as commodities.

Labor is not a commodity, either logically or in common understanding. It is sometimes metaphorically spoken of as a commodity, but every one understands, or will readily see, that what is really referred to is not labor, but results of labor.

Inequality in Distribution.

NEW YORK.—I have been trying very hard to make my cousin, a very intelligent and well read young man, open his eyes and "see the cat," and we often indulge in discussion concerning the tariff and its effect upon wages. He persistently denies that the facts will sustain the logic. To-day he commenced, after a lengthy discussion, with: "Henry George is logically correct, but—" "Hold on, there, one minute," said I, "dictate to me what you were about to say, and I will write to THE STANDARD and get a reply that will make your hair curl." He dictated the following:

"Henry George is logically correct, but in considering the different causes of the unequal distribution of wealth, we must take into consideration the different natural abilities, mental and physical, of the human race."

My reply was chapter 6 of book 3, "Progress and Poverty," a copy of which he has had in his possession for some time. Could I have done better? **CHARLES H. MITCHELL.**

You could not. Different wages paid to men of different abilities, mental and physical, are, as stated in the chapter to which you refer, "based upon wages paid to those who can only do the average amount" of labor; and "wages in the occupations requiring superior abilities and skill must depend upon the common wages paid for ordinary abilities and skill."

Higher wages for superior work do not make an unequal distribution of wealth; they only give to Paul what Paul earns, without in the slightest degree robbing Peter. Let 10 be common wages, and let there be ten common workmen; then, the product will be 100, and each workman gets what he earns. Let 10 be common wages, and let there be ten common workmen and one extraordinary workman whose productive power is double that of his associates; then the product will be 120, of which the ten common workmen will get 10 each as before, while the extraordinary workman will get 20. But the extra wages of the latter makes no inequality of distribution; they are his extra compensation for his extra contribution. But now let 10 be common wages, and let there be ten common workmen, together with an eleventh man, who has the power to charge the others 1 each for the privilege of working. Then each workman will get but 9 though he earns 10, and the owner of the working privilege will get 10 though he earns nothing. This makes inequality in distribution.

Savings Banks and Workmen.

NEW YORK.—A friend of mine, who is an admirer of Mr. George's genius as a political economist, has prepared and submitted to me the annexed question, which he wishes you to answer:

(1) The savings banks of this state are the depositories of several hundred millions of dollars, which are mainly the savings of the very class that Mr. George wishes to benefit. I do not desire to enter into the question of the morality or immorality of savings banks, or of the method of investing money. It is an undoubted fact that the savings of the working people are largely invested in bonds and mortgages. How does Mr. George propose to protect, or does he propose to protect, the holders of these bonds and mortgages in the event of his system coming into practice?

(2) I am a speculator, and own a piece of land large enough for ten houses. Henry George's system has been inaugurated, and the tax becomes so heavy that I can no longer hold my land. Ten workmen appear who are willing and able to pay the tax on the land. I sell it to the ten workmen for merely a nominal sum. Each workman erects for himself and his family a charming little cottage surrounded by lawn. At the end of ten years the town has grown up around those ten houses. On the four sides are the post office, the city hall, the courts of justice and police headquarters. The land on which these houses stand has become the most valuable property in the town. The workmen, however, are no richer than they were before, and are able to pay only as much rent (or tax) as they did before. What is to become of the unearned increment in such a case? What are you going to do with the workmen and their improvements?

(3) The taxes on land values are, I presume, less now than they would be after the introduction of Henry George's system. Great areas of land are sold every year in this state for the sake of the tax. The state, in addition, owns large tracts of land which it is willing to sell. Why is it that Mr. George, or any of his trades union followers, have never tried to put their theories into actual practice upon some of these lands? It seems to the questioner that if Mr. George's theories are true, it ought to have been the object of trades unions to remove a portion of the surplus of laborers in any particular branch of industry to some of these cheap lands (the tax upon which is very small), where each man could have earned a competence, and where each would have diminished by at least one the number of competing toilers. The questioner does not remember a strike during which such an experiment was tried. He is aware that the Knights of Labor have tried a plan of co-operative farming, but he does not know of any experiment similar to the one suggested above.

(4) It is not one class, but all classes, that Mr. George wishes to benefit, as you will see if you read "Progress and Poverty" with more care than you have yet done. Deposits in savings banks are not mainly the savings of the poor, as is usually claimed. These deposits are largely made by the wives and children of rich men, by small landlords, by professional people, and generally from what is known as the middle classes. But these matters are aside; the question is whether the depositors, whoever they may be, are to lose their savings by the single tax. That the investments of savings banks are largely in real estate, bonds and mortgages is true, and that the security will be to some extent impaired by the single tax may be also true. To the extent that this security is impaired the depositors may

lose, and I shall suppose they will lose. But how will they lose? Not as laborers, but as landlords; for it is only as landlords that the single tax can prejudice their interests. Now measure the possible loss as landlords by their certain gain as laborers, and say whether they would need protection, and if so, why?

(5) The increase in rent would not jump in the way you suppose. It would gradually increase. And it would increase because and only because of the great demand for that location. And if the demand for that location was so great, it would be very remarkable if the occupants could not come to terms with some one which would enable them to rebuild elsewhere. If, however, they would not or could not pay the annual value of those lots, they would have to be treated as we now treat delinquent tax payers. But do you not think it a little bit stupid to imagine such a case? Why does the tax increase? Because there is a greater demand for the location. Why is there a greater demand? Because the same labor and capital applied there will yield a greater return than formerly. Then, inasmuch as possession of this location enables these owners to make more, what is to prevent them to that extent from paying a higher tax? It is a contradiction to say that a man now occupies more valuable land than he did ten years ago but is not able to pay any higher rent for it. Tell that to a landlord and see him grin.

(6) And I trust he never will know of a similar experiment. Your friend's first two questions indicate that he has thought of the subject with some care; but the third shows such an utter lack of comprehension of the nature, purpose and scope of the single tax, that I must recommend a course of "Progress and Poverty."

Notes.

J. Whitley, Oil City, Pa.—I think you err in supposing that there is such a difference in the price of provisions, and that your critic errs in claiming that living is cheaper here than abroad. Your critic's contention that a tariff is not a tax to the amount of the duty imposed is a mixture of truth and error. A tariff on imported goods is added to the value of the goods to the full extent of the duty. If domestic goods of the same character are a monopoly, the price will rule very nearly up to the point of value, plus tariff. If domestic goods of the same character are competitive with the foreign goods, the price will be forced down by domestic competition to the point that will yield ordinary profit; it may fall below the foreign price, and is almost certain to if the raw materials here are as cheap as abroad. When prices of domestic goods thus fall to the price of the foreign article, protectionists say the tariff is not a tax. No, not in such cases; nor is it a tariff or anything else. It is simply a dead letter. When goods can be produced and sold here cheaper than foreign goods of equal quality the foreign goods won't come here, tariff or no tariff. The one effect of the tariff in such cases is to prevent the domestic article from selling still lower by so much as it increases the cost of material and machinery.

LOUIS F. POST.

A True Statement of Principles.

BROOKLYN, Sept. 2.—The questions of correspondents, and your answers as printed in THE STANDARD, of which I am a constant reader, interest me very much, but the thought occurs to me whether a great many of such questions, the answers to which necessitate reference to figures and statistics whose accuracy cannot always be depended upon, could not be rendered superfluous and unnecessary by a clear understanding of first principles.

For example, let us commence with the fact that everything that man needs to supply his physical wants is the product of labor. That all that trade between nations or individuals is really an exchange of the products of labor.

Now, supposing these two propositions to be admitted, a denial of which by thinking men seems incredible, then it follows that if we could find some race of men rich enough and benevolent enough to supply us as a free gift with everything which we need to supply our wants, then the whole of the labor which was previously required of us to supply those wants would be rendered unnecessary, and all the time which was before occupied in such labor could be employed in education or amusement. This being admitted, then any nation which is willing to supply us with the products of labor at half price (half of the labor cost of production by ourselves) would render one-half of our labor unnecessary; if they were supplied to us at three-fourths of the price, then we would save one-quarter of our labor, and so on proportionally for any reduction in price.

Such truths as these once clearly fixed in the mind render all comparison as to cost of raw materials, labor, or machinery, or natural resources, wholly superfluous; and as in the great majority of cases we have when arguing for free trade to deal with persons who are wholly uneducated in political economy, it seems desirable that we should endeavor to simplify as much as possible first principles in order to avoid confusing the multitude by the multitude of detail, and of involving it in the fog which the uneducated mind surrounds the subject of money and exchange. Truly yours,

GEORGE WALLACE,
208 Warren street.

Henry George in Reading.

READING, Pa.—Henry George's lecture on the tariff question before the Teachers' Institute of Berks, in the opera house of this city, on the evening of the 25th, has been the heaviest flood protection has ever received in this vicinity, and has provoked more comment and discussion than any speech ever delivered here. I have met not more than half a dozen persons who declared themselves converted to the free trade principle by it, and eager knots on the streets and in stores have been talking it over, sometimes in Pennsylvania Dutch and sometimes in English, ever since. The comments of the papers are amusing. Both sides speak highly of the lecture, but the republican paper, the Times, puts him forward as a man who dares to say what the democrats think, and declares that "the more ultra free trade Mr. George's expressions were the louder he was cheered by the democrats in the audience," while the Telegram, the democratic paper, gives prominence to Mr. George's own statement: "I am not a republican, and I fancy the democrats would not claim me," and speaks of him as "the first and only free trader in the country," but shows undisguised satisfaction at the way he hammered protection theories. The Telegram is mistaken. There are already many as thorough free traders as Mr. George himself in the country, and they are increasing daily. **W. F. M.**

Pears' Soap Fair white hands Bright clear complexion Soft healthful skin.

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

No workman should be gulled into the belief that the tariff has been the means of better wages in this country.—[The Industrial West.]

They tell us that we get higher wages here. In one sense, on an average, perhaps we do, but no thanks to the protective tariff.—[Houston, Texas, Echo.]

The proof is conclusive that the politicians have used the tariff as a means to rob the people, and the manufacturers have divided the spoils in the way of furnishing a campaign fund.—[Pike County, Ill., Banner.]

If the tax imposed on the people of the United States, on the pretext that it is necessary to maintain the rate of wages, should be paid directly to the workers, it would make them all rich men.—[St. Paul Globe.]

It is true that wages average somewhat higher in this country now than thirty years ago. But the same thing is true in England and other countries. Whatever rise of wages there has been all over the world is due to the progress of civilization and not to either protection or free trade.—[Boston Globe.]

The rich people of New York are laying in their coal now. That is wise and prudent. The poor people of New York can't do that, so they will buy it by the bucket in January at the rate of about ten dollars per ton. Trusts are "private affairs."—[New York Herald.]

The history of tariff legislation in this country shows beyond dispute that no reduction of tariff taxation ever brought about a consequent reduction of wages. The ups and downs of tariff taxation have no other effect upon wages than their influence in increasing or lowering the cost of living.—[Philadelphia Record.]

A novel electric railroad is undergoing construction in a suburb of St. Paul, Minn. The railroad is an elevated structure, and the cars are hung below it close to the street level. It runs from sets of wheels, taking their power from the tracks above, which are charged with electricity. A speed of from eight to ten miles an hour is claimed for the cars.

Labor needs nothing. It has everything. Capital needs all the protection. Robbers need protection, and the robbers whom Mr. Blaine represents in this campaign need the protection of the high tariff in order to secure \$52.30 of net profit on a ton of beams made by laborers who received less than \$5.70 for their share of the product.—[Chicago Herald.]

It is not disputed that the sudden readjustment of society and values to the world's commerce, and the renunciation by the protected employers to the toilers of the immense sums now virtually exacted, might precipitate industrial turmoil. But even with that event, the losses and the disappointments would be the result of protection—not of free trade.—[Chicago Herald.]

The whole earnings of labor in the protected industries only amount to \$18 in the \$100 of product. The average tariff tax is \$17 in the \$100. If foreign labor should be twice as cheap as our own labor, a tax of \$9 on the \$100 would in good the difference in labor cost. The remaining \$38 in the \$100 is wrung from the earnings of workmen, who receive no equivalent in wages or advantage.—[Philadelphia Record.]

Buildings lighted with incandescent lights can now be supplied with storage batteries, which are charged with electricity at the coal station and then brought round to the buildings. This is a place of a very troublesome connection by wire, is a great improvement. The storage battery acts as a meter too, for it holds a fixed quantity of electricity. In railroading the storage battery system grows in favor. The underground railway of London has for some time been investigating the various systems of electrically operating railways, and word comes now that this company has decided to adopt storage batteries for running their cars, which require 600 horse power motors when run in trains.

The Beneficence of Lotteries.

DETROIT, Mich.—Lotteries are institutions which the post office department ought to have no particular right to interfere. A lottery distributes money. The distribution of money is a public benefit. Therefore a lottery is a public benefactor. Nothing can be plainer than this. It is true that these distributions of money are made to a few persons at the expense of the many, but the funds are taken from the dupes who pay them in such an indirect way that the dupes do not feel it. Any interference with lotteries is a step in the direction of the ruin of some of our industries. Think of the ticket sellers who would be thrown out of employment were the lotteries to cease! Think of the blindfolded boys who draw the numbers from the wheels! Think of the generals who superintend the drawing! But above all, remember the drawers of prizes who use that money to "give work" to our laboring classes. If the country had only enough lottery tickets to give work to every man, woman and child, what takes from the many and gives to the few enables the fortunate prize drawers to employ labor, and in that direction lies prosperity. By all means let us have a dozen lotteries in every state, so that we may become a rich and happy people.

HERMAN KUHN.

Ralph Waldo Emerson on Free Trade.
From Lecture, "Fortune of the Republic," March 20, 1838.
The genius of the country has marked out its true policy—opportunity. Opportunity of civil rights, of education, of personal power, and not less of wealth, doors wide open. If I could have it—free trade with all the world without toll or custom houses, invitation as we now make to every nation, to every race and skin, white men, red men, yellow men, black men; hospitality of fair field and equal laws to all. Let them compete, and success to the strongest, the wisest and the best. The land is wide enough, the soil has bread for all.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

FIVE YEARS REAL ESTATE FIRST MORTGAGE COUPON BONDS.

In sums of \$1,000 to \$10,000 each, bearing interest at the rate of eight per cent. per annum. Interest payable semi-annually. These bonds are secured by first mortgages on Kansas City property worth three and four times the amount of bonds. Prompt payment of principal and interest guaranteed at maturity. Interest collectible through your own bank, with New York exchange added. Secured mortgage forwarded with each bond.

CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT.
Issued in amounts of \$100 and upward, bearing interest at the rate of eight per cent. per annum. Certificates of deposit are secured by first mortgage bonds deposited with a trustee, a special deposit receipt, to that effect, from the trustee, is attached to each certificate issued, therefore making the certificates of deposit an absolutely safe investment.

When ordering securities write your name in full, also that of your city, county and state.

J. H. BAUERLEIN & CO.,
Security Building,
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

Pennsylvania Agricultural Works, 1072, 1074, 1076, 1078, 1080, 1082, 1084, 1086, 1088, 1090, 1092, 1094, 1096, 1098, 1100, 1102, 1104, 1106, 1108, 1110, 1112, 1114, 1116, 1118, 1120, 1122, 1124, 1126, 1128, 1130, 1132, 1134, 1136, 1138, 1140, 1142, 1144, 1146, 1148, 1150, 1152, 1154, 1156, 1158, 1160, 1162, 1164, 1166, 1168, 1170, 1172, 1174, 1176, 1178, 1180, 1182, 1184, 1186, 1188, 1190, 1192, 1194, 1196, 1198, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1206, 1208, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1216, 1218, 1220, 1222, 1224, 1226, 1228, 1230, 1232, 1234, 1236, 1238, 1240, 1242, 1244, 1246, 1248, 1250, 1252, 1254, 1256, 1258, 1260, 1262, 1264, 1266, 1268, 1270, 1272, 1274, 1276, 1278, 1280, 1282, 1284, 1286, 1288, 1290, 1292, 1294, 1296, 1298, 1300, 1302, 1304, 1306, 1308, 1310, 1312, 1314, 1316, 1318, 1320, 1322, 1324, 1326, 1328, 1330, 1332, 1334, 1336, 1338, 1340, 1342, 1344, 1346, 1348, 1350, 1352, 1354, 1356, 1358, 1360, 1362, 1364, 1366, 1368, 1370, 1372, 1374, 1376, 1378, 1380, 1382, 1384, 1386, 1388, 1390, 1392, 1394, 1396, 1398, 1400, 1402, 1404, 1406, 1408, 1410, 1412, 1414, 1416, 1418, 1420, 1422, 1424, 1426, 1428, 1430, 1432, 1434, 1436, 1438, 1440, 1442, 1444, 1446, 1448, 1450, 1452, 1454, 1456, 1458, 1460, 1462, 1464, 1466, 1468, 1470, 1472, 1474, 1476, 1478, 1480, 1482, 1484, 1486, 1488, 1490, 1492, 1494, 1496, 1498, 1500, 1502, 1504, 1506, 1508, 1510, 1512, 1514, 1516, 1518, 1520, 1522, 1524, 1526, 1528, 1530, 1532, 1534, 1536, 1538, 1540, 1542, 1544, 1546, 1548, 1550, 1552, 1554, 1556, 1558, 1560, 1562, 1564, 1566, 1568, 1570, 1572, 1574, 1576, 1578, 1580, 1582, 1584, 1586, 1588, 1590, 1592, 1594, 1596, 1598, 1600, 1602, 1604, 1606, 1608, 1610, 1612, 1614, 1616, 1618, 1620, 1622, 1624, 1626, 1628, 1630, 1632, 1634, 1636, 1638, 1640, 1642, 1644, 1646, 1648, 1650, 1652, 1654, 1656, 1658, 1660, 1662, 1664, 1666,