

THE STANDARD

NO. 103-VOL. IV, NO. 25.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

Subscribers of the "Chicago Enquirer" will receive "The Standard" until the expiration of their terms of subscription to that paper.

CONTENTS:

Notes of an English Trip.
Encouraging Letters Concerning the New Plan of Campaign.
Over the Border—Things Booming in Canada.
What We Should Do.
Now Comes Montana's Chance.
Smoke on the Horizon.
In One Cause—Henry George's Liverpool Speech.
Editorial Notes.
The Single Tax Idea.
Little Homes and Little Farms.
Editorial Reform.
The New Democracy.
A Christmas Story.
The Single Tax Club House.
They Held an Experience Meeting.
Now's the Time to Strike in Ohio.
Strava Wishes Show the Wind.
Mother Antonio's Lad (a story).
Concerning the Fortunes of T. Thompson, Gambler & Co.
What Do the Animals See?
To Help Single Tax Strangers.
Queries and Answers.
Mazing Laws at Washington.
New Ideas, Methods and Inventions.
Art Publications.

I got back from England on Sunday in the *Etruria*, and greet again the readers of THE STANDARD. I had intended, when I left, to write from the other side, but from the time my veteran friend Thomas Briggs grasped my hand on the deck of the steamer in Southampton water to the last discernible flutter of a handkerchief from the Irish single tax men who said good bye to me at Queenstown, I found too much to see, to hear and do, to allow of writing. It may be worth while now, however, to jot down some rough notes of matters that interested me and will, I think, interest the readers of THE STANDARD.

"Now that the election is over, you need a rest—come, start with me to-morrow morning for a three weeks' trip to England," said William Saunders to me on the day before we sailed. When I heard the shouts from the approaching tender in Southampton and saw the placards of "Welcome"—and still more when, at the Waterloo station, the surging crowds of Mr. Saunders' constituents who had been waiting from two o'clock in the afternoon to half-past ten at night, pressed round us, I realized that I would not get much rest in England. And though I staid there longer than I intended, I didn't. But I got something much more stimulating—a vivid idea of the great progress the good cause has been making in Great Britain since I was there last—four years ago. During this time I have known, both from private correspondence and from the indications of the press, that beneath the surface our ideas were making steady and rapid way. But I did not realize how much had been gained until I got to England and had opportunities to talk with our friends there and feel in many ways the change in public opinion.

As I have often said to those who felt impatient to see tangible results from the agitation and discussion of the land question, time is a necessary element in thought. There is in the progress of ideas, a period analogous to that period in the history of a plant in which germination goes on. The seed must swell and the roots push out in darkness and silence, ere the first indication of life can appear above the surface. Our ideas have been passing through that stage of growth in Great Britain, and are now on the verge of entering—nay, they are already beginning to enter, the region of practical politics, where they will draw strength and vigor from forces that are to the diffusion of thought what the air and the sunshine are to the growth of the plant.

From all sides forces have been and are now converging to press the land question to the front in Great Britain. The Irish land agitation and the political difficulties that it has brought, the growth of a similar agitation in the Scottish highlands, the tithe agitation in Wales, the falling in of leases in London and other cities, carrying with them the transfer to the ground landlord of blocks of valuable buildings, with enormous increase of rents, the discussion of the nature and effects of mining royalties, the growth of democratic sentiment, the increasing social discontent, the decadence of the old agriculture, and the rise to political importance of the agricultural laborers, the attention that has been drawn to the condition and housing of the poor in the cities, the weakening of the trades unions—in fact the whole trend of events and of thought has been in the direction of forcing the land question upon public attention. And that a few individuals should be deemed to be the absolute owners of the land on which, and from which, a whole nation must live, if they are to live at all, is a thing so utterly monstrous, so clearly opposed to the first and strongest perceptions of natural right, that it can only be maintained on condition that it is not

discussed. No matter how timidly it is begun, there is in the nature of the human mind only one end to any discussion of the right of landlords to levy tribute on their fellow creatures for the use of what was here before man came. And even the agitation and discussion of such palliatives as "free trade in land," leasehold enfranchisement, judicial rents, laborers' allotments, landlord purchase, etc., has but helped to swell the strong current that is urging thought (in many cases insensibly) to the recognition of the equality of natural rights in the element indispensable to all human labor and all human life.

Our friends who "have seen the cat" have, without much organization or outward demonstration, been working away on the other side of the Atlantic as they have been working here. But other forces, even those of opposition, have been aiding their effort. And now the advance that has been going on in thought is beginning to push into the sphere of practical politics.

From every point of view it is evident that the land question or the labor question—call it by which name you will, for they are both names for the same things, the injustices and difficulties that spring from the divorce of the two prime factors of production—is the burning question of the immediate future in Great Britain as in Ireland. That something must be done about the land even the most blindly conservative are beginning to see. And as motion seeks the line of least resistance, so, in all degrees, is the growing animosity to landlordism, the awakening appreciation of general rights to the use of land, beginning to concentrate on the line of the single tax. Of the many indications of this, the two most significant, because in themselves they become causes which set powerful agencies at work, are the recent declaration of the general conference of liberal associations at Birmingham in favor of the taxation of ground rents and the opposition of the liberal party in the house of commons to the appropriation of £5,000,000 more for the purchase of Irish estates under the Ashbourne act. To my view these have the same importance in English politics as President Cleveland's message of a year ago which turned the face of the democratic party against protection and towards free trade had in American politics.

The establishment of a peasant proprietary, by buying out the agricultural landlords in favor of the agricultural tenants, has up to this time been the social aim of the Irish parliamentary party—their idea of the final solution of the land question—their notion of what "the land for the people" meant.

It has also been the idea of Mr. Gladstone and the official liberal party. While Mr. Gladstone's administration was co-ercing Ireland in the endeavor to stamp out the land league, it placed a land purchase clause in the bill which instituted judicial rents. And that not working, Mr. Parnell, as soon as he got out of Kilmainham prison, started a land purchase joint stock company of his own, which bought an estate at a big price and undertook to sell it to tenants, but which seems to have passed into oblivion, if not into bankruptcy.

In 1855 after passing the act for the assimilation of the county franchise with the borough franchise—an act which placed the ballot in the hands of some millions of crofters, cotters and agricultural laborers—Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country. In spite of the fact that the Irish vote in England and Scotland was cast for the Tories, he went back to St. Stephen's with a strong majority. Then came his change of front on the Irish question and the introduction of the home rule bill, accompanied with a proposition for the buying out of Irish agricultural landlords to an extent which it was estimated would require from £120,000,000 to £150,000,000. The home rule scheme was a hybrid one. It had been framed by Mr. Gladstone without consultation with important colleagues, and contained a clause justly objectionable to British feeling—the elimination of Irish representation from the imperial parliament. But what the Tories made even more use of than this, in their appeal to the voters, was the purchase proposition. They set forth in the most vivid ways they could devise the immensity of the sum for which John Bull was to be made responsible in order to buy from Irish landlords farms for Irish tenants. They pleaded the walls with figures a yard long, and calculated how many railroad trains would be required to draw the amount it put in sovereigns and how many steamers to carry it if put in shillings. This time

Mr. Gladstone had the Irish support, but he was defeated, and the present government resting on a coalition of Tories, and liberal unionists came into power.

During the interval between Mr. Gladstone's parliamentary defeat and the general election, the Ashbourne act appropriating £5,000,000 for the purchase of Irish estates on behalf of the tenants, came down from the House of Lords, and was passed through the House of Commons with liberal acquiescence and by liberal votes. It has taken hold, for it was really what Davitt called it at the time—a "landlord's relief bill," at the expense of the nation. In order to make sure that the tenant would buy, it asked nothing whatever of him except that he should consent to have his rent reduced in the present and receive a fee simple estate in the future. This is based upon a government advance to the landlord of the price agreed upon with his tenants, the tenants being charged with three per cent interest and one per cent annual contribution for a sinking fund. This in forty-seven years, it is calculated, will reimburse the government.

The £5,000,000 first appropriated has been quickly exhausted—having gone, as the liberals now charge, into the pockets of the London companies and the great Tory landlords who have interest with the present government, while John Bull has received in return for his solid cash the privilege of recouping himself by collecting rent from an Irish tenantry for forty-seven years.

The tiger has tasted blood. The Irish landlords are naturally eager to convert into money, at the risk of the general taxpayer, properties that under existing conditions no sane private investor would think of purchasing. And Irish tenants are ready enough to avail themselves of a reduction in the rents they are now paying, with an assurance of ownership in forty-seven years.

The Tories were not honest in their opposition to Mr. Gladstone's purchase scheme, but merely acted on the principle of any stick being good enough to beat a bad dog with. Even then the more thoughtful must have realized that the only way to save the Irish landlords was by buying them out, and the only way to check the land movement was by creating, at whatever risk, a larger class of land owners. But political parties, struggling for power, are not governed by the more thoughtful, and great as was the bribe offered by Mr. Gladstone to the Irish landlords it was not sufficient to overcome their dread of the home rule which was to accompany it in his scheme, or to silence their hope that a Tory government might bring back the good old times, when to promptly pay his rent was in Ireland deemed the first duty of man.

Now that they are themselves in power, now that the depth and strength of the land movement are better appreciated, now that the Irish landlords, and their English and Scotch creditors, are pressing for more money, and now that the conservative effects of increasing the number of land owners have been shown, the Tories very naturally turn to the same policy that in the political exigency of the last general election they denounced. But not to turn too sharp a corner, all that the government ventured to do at this session was to propose to appropriate £5,000,000 more for Irish land purchase.

The liberals, too, are in a different position. Mr. Gladstone is not in power, but in opposition. The whig element in his following has largely deserted him. He feels, as some of his recent extra-parliamentary utterances show, the rapidly gathering strength of the land movement in Great Britain, and realizes that the radical element in the liberal constituencies have already passed the point at which they would tolerate the idea of buying out Irish landlords or any other landlords.

As for Mr. Parnell and the Irish party they are put by this changed situation in a peculiar, not to say delicate position. Since Mr. Parnell came out of Kilmainham in 1882, and in fact for some time before, the whole weight and power of the Irish party has been thrown against all radical expression on the land question. They have nuzzled Davitt, they have smothered Bishop Duff, they have ostracized John Ferguson. The whole influence of the party has been exerted in turning the movement on its social side at least into an agricultural tenants' beneficial society, in educating Irish sentiment into the belief that "the land for the people" meant, not, all the land for all the people, but some of the land for some of the agricultural tenants. Now come their enemies offering to make the agricultural tenants the

owners of their land on most liberal terms. But not only do the Irish leaders realize that what the Tories say is true—that the conversion of tenants into prospective owners, under the operations of the Ashbourne act, is to shear the Irish national party of its power, but political necessity requires their keeping in touch with English liberals.

Thus it comes that in the debate, of which it was my good fortune to hear the most interesting and important part, the position of both parties was reversed. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell opposing what they had before supported, and the Tories supporting what they had in the general election denounced. Both sides were hampered by their memories, and on the one side the bill was defended as a matter of temporary policy, and on the other side opposed on matters of detail. There were only a few voices, like that of Dr. Clarke, representative of the far northern Scottish district of Caithness, to declare that the Irish landlords had nothing to sell that did not in right belong to the Irish people, and that to substitute a larger for a smaller class of landowners would be but to continue and fortify the injustice by which the rest of the people were deprived of their natural rights.

But for all this the debate was significant. It showed not the inconsistencies of men or of parties, but the impulse of an advancing tide, forcing into changed relative positions the chips and corks that float upon its surface. It meant that English political divisions are aligning themselves to the great issue that is coming to the front; that the primary force of a growing perception of natural rights is bringing to its aid the secondary forces of party organization and political conflict.

The Tories have taken a decisive step towards the last refuge of landlordism—purchase. The liberals and the Irish parliamentary party have taken as decisive a step against it. It makes little difference if the immediate step is as small as one as was the Mills bill in relation to the tariff question. It is sufficient to bring the essential principle into popular discussion.

In parliament the liberal leaders may be the first step oppose purchase on matters of detail, as Mr. Mills and his fellows opposed protection on matters of detail, declaring that they were not free traders. But among the rank and file discussion must go on there, as it has gone on here, on the question of principle. The masses make no fine distinctions such as politicians do in minimizing a change of front. The popular machinery and weight and party feeling of the liberal party are now enlisted against purchase, and in radical clubs and local liberal associations support of Mr. Gladstone and opposition to the conservatives must now mean opposition not to any particular scheme for buying out Irish landlords, but opposition to all propositions for buying out any landlords.

On the Sunday after the debate on the Ashbourne act had begun, I visited a number of the London radical clubs (all organizations supporting Mr. Gladstone) in company with Mr. Saunders, Mr. Briggs and Mr. Patrick Hennessey. Pleading the Yankee weakness for asking questions, I tried to get at their feeling with regard to settling the land question by buying out the landlords. The response everywhere to this proposition was a unanimous and howling no; and everywhere there was the same emphatic declaration in favor of taxing them out. Everywhere and in all other ways that I could get any indication of the feeling of the masses that constitute the strength of the liberal party I found it the same.

Lord Randolph Churchill, when he declared that he would vote for the £5,000,000 bill because it was only a little thing, and so monstrously bad in principle that another one of the kind could never be passed, was right as far as the popular vote is concerned. What with their present majority the Tories may be able to do before appealing to the country may be impossible to say; but with the masses of Great Britain, buying out Irish landlords or English landlords, in whole or in part, is past talking about. But the liberal party must deal with the land question. What shall it propose? The line along which both internal and external forces must inevitably drive it, is that indicated in the declaration it has already officially made in favor of the taxation of ground rents—that is to say, the line of the single tax.

In short the Birmingham declaration and the debate on the Ashbourne act have the same significance in English politics

as President Cleveland's message and the Mills bill had in American politics. The idea of putting all taxes on land values is about to receive the same kind of aid from the liberal party in England, only far more directly and powerfully, that has resulted and is resulting to it here from the attitude in which the democratic party has been placed.

Nothing that I could say could show this more forcibly than the simple fact that before I left England I received a number of official invitations from local liberal associations to address them on the land question. Four years ago, when I was last in England, no liberal association would any more have dreamed of asking me to address them on the land question than a Pennsylvania democratic committee would have dreamed of inviting me to favor them with my views on protection.

Of the same sort of significance was the invitation which I received, and gladly accepted, to address the united committees of London for the taxation of ground rents. This body is largely composed of men who are working to put more taxation on land values. But they are ready to work, so far as both go together, with those whose aim is to put all taxation on land values.

And of still greater, and even more gratifying significance to me, was the reception given me by the council of the Liverpool financial reform association, a verbatim report of which, copied from the *Financial Reformer*, is printed in this issue. It indicates the complete junction of the absolute free traders with the single tax men. The Financial reform association was founded in 1843 by the more earnest friends and followers of Richard Cobden, and is the representative of that remnant of free traders who have never taken a tariff for revenue only to mean free trade. It is incomparably more energetic and influential than the Cobden club, of which American protectionists make such a scarecrow. It is in fact, in its influence upon public thought, by far the most influential association of the kind in the three kingdoms, for its *Financial Reform Almanac* is the text book and vade mecum for all the radical politicians and speakers in the three kingdoms. As far as seen, the Financial reform association has declared, clearly and decisively, for the single tax, so far at least as needed revenues are concerned. This is all that is necessary for us.

What President Muspratt said of the steps by which the Financial reform association has been led to the single tax, is known to those who have for some years read the issues of the *Financial Reform Almanac*. It has been doing a wonderful work in educating the British people to the fact that the natural rights of Englishmen to the soil of their native land have been gradually lost, and the tenants of the state made virtual owners, by the process of shifting upon the masses of the people the burdens originally imposed on the landlords.

In this respect I found a wonderful advance wherever I went on this trip. The more intelligent of the masses already know that the proposal to put taxation on land values is not what it was said to be when I first went to England, a "new fangled Yankee idea," but the return to a principle which has in England all the sanction of antiquity.

It may be mentioned incidentally that the American protectionist referred to by the Rev. Harold Rylett is Nathaniel McKay whom the protectionist ring sent over to England prior to the last campaign to get up matter for frightening American workmen. This McKay is, I believe, the degenerate son of the famous Boston ship builder, whose fleet clippers in the days ere "protection to American industry" had taxed the American flag off the ocean were one of our national boasts.

That union of effort between free traders and single tax men, which, so far as Great Britain is concerned, is indicated in the address presented and the speeches made at the Liverpool rotunda meeting, went on very rapidly on this side of the Atlantic during the last campaign and is going on rapidly still. One striking indication of this is the editorial of the *New York Times* on the single tax idea, which is reprinted on the fifth page of this issue of THE STANDARD. The real truth is that any free trader who gets past the illogical halting house of a tariff for revenue only, must become, if he follows his own arguments, a single tax man. Whether a single tax man limited, or a single tax man unlimited, makes for the present no essential difference. If we

can go together as far as putting all present taxation upon land values, those who do not want to go further will then be perfectly free to stop.

Other significant evidences of the change in English opinion with regard to the single tax were the opportunity afforded me by the Guild of St. Matthew to address a meeting of clergymen of the established church in Zion college, the opportunity afforded me by Dr. Parker of addressing a magnificent congregation at his mid week service in the City temple, and the conference of Congregational ministers which I met in Memorial hall at the invitation of Albert Spicer, who is probably the most influential layman of that denomination in England. This meeting was a private one, only Congregational clergymen being admitted, but it was a very gratifying one to me. The Congregationalists are the old Cromwellian independents, and their political influence in England is very great. Mr. Spicer, who is the liberal candidate for the next parliament from Monmouth Boroughs, was until some ten years ago very bitterly opposed to us, regarding us as communists and confiscators. But a trip to Australia led him to note the results of speculation in land, and on the homeward voyage he read "Progress and Poverty." I also participated in a debate at the Streatham "mock parliament" before a much greater audience than the real parliament could have afforded. In Southwick, near Birmingham, I addressed a meeting of Knights of Labor, consisting of representatives from all over the Black country, where the order is taking firm root. Nothing could exceed the enthusiasm of these men or their intelligent appreciation of the bearings of the land question. The order in this part of England at least is doing a work that the order in the United States has been so largely diverted from by the conservative influence of Master Workman Powderly.

I passed the better part of two days in Glasgow, speaking one night at the City hall, and being entertained at a tea the next. I met many of my old friends, and got the most encouraging reports from all parts of Scotland. The Bridgeton division men have got their member, Sir George Otto Trevelyan, fairly planted on the line of the taxation of ground rents, and he has sent them a donation to their funds. They have also got their local candidates pledged. The Henry George Institute holds meetings every summer Sunday, when the weather is good, on the green, and on other Sundays in their hall. In short, not to go into details for which I have now no space, the good work is going on far better and faster than I had hoped.

Of the great meeting at Lambeth Baths, of the banquet given me in London, and of many other things which much pleased and encouraged me, it is not necessary to speak. The main impression of the trip on my mind is of the great progress of our ideas on the other side of the Atlantic, and of the far more rapid progress which the future promises. So large are the opportunities that seem to be opening there that I told our English friends before leaving that I would come back in two months and do what I could to help them. Whether here or there it is the same cause. HENRY GEORGE.

The Christmas story on the fifth page of THE STANDARD is by Hon. Sam W. Williams of Vincennes, Ind.

Raising the Banner in Switzerland.
Lucerne Star.
The great landlord is a person who has been unknown in Switzerland since the peasants, goaded by the robbery and wickedness of the nobles, took up arms against them and expelled them, one and all from the land. The ruined castles, which now picturesquely crown so many high points, are related, as cause to effect, to the prosperous agricultural condition of the fertile valley upon which they look down. Nevertheless, the old yoke of the aristocrat has been succeeded in many communities by the new yoke of the usurer. The pressure of the latter has at last brought about the extinction of the "free land" agitation into the north of Switzerland. A meeting has just been held in the Stadthaus at Basel to discuss the question of the reform of land ownership, and has resulted in the constitution of a "Swiss society for the canonization and communalization of the land." The society has organized a series of meetings for the coming winter with a view to the propaganda of the theory of common land ownership among the Swiss.

He Will Contribute Toward the Lecture Bureau.
JAMESTOWN, N. Y.—The idea of a lecture bureau is a very, very good one. In that way we could send out the very best lecturers at moderate cost. In the case of the establishment of such a bureau I pledge myself to pay to it as per capita tax twenty-five cents per quarter. F. G. ANDERSON.

What Will the Eleven Hundred and Ninety Do?
A cable dispatch announces that there are 1,900 applicants for ten vacancies among the Irish land sub-commissionerships.

ENCOURAGING LETTERS.

THEY ARE COMING IN FROM ALL PARTS.

The New Plan of Campaign Has Awakened Lots of Enthusiasm—At Work All Along the Line—It Looks as Though the Petitioners to Congress Will Be a Big Army.

The work of the Single tax enrollment committee starts off with every promise of brilliant success. Though the address and petitions were sent out less than a week ago, signatures are already beginning to pour in more rapidly than at any period during the work of the enrollment of Cleveland and Thurman voters.

In fact, signatures are coming in so rapidly that the chairman of the committee has not yet had time to have them thoroughly classified. They are coming from all parts of the country, and include the names of both men and women.

Many letters have been sent to Mr. Crossdale asking if women's names will be enrolled. He asks THE STANDARD to say that they will be enrolled, and that they are particularly desired.

There are also thus far cheerful indications that contributions for the extension of the work, so as to include a distribution of literature will not be lacking.

During the past week one lady accompanied a signed petition by her check for \$100. Several other contributions of from one to five dollars have been received. They are all acknowledged to the individual sending them.

The correspondence of the committee shows that the new plan of campaign has not merely met with general favor, but that it has called forth the best activity of single tax men, who are by the way eager readers of THE STANDARD, and prompt to comment on every new proposition.

Andrew B. Paul of North Adams, Massachusetts is strongly in favor of Judge Maguire's plan of invading some state, but prefers that Massachusetts shall be the one selected. His reasons are that the old Bay state is accustomed to leading in reform, and is thus far the only state that has adopted the Australian system of voting without which he has no hope of any cause anywhere. He says it only has two hundred and eighty thousand voters and he sees one obstacle to the success of his plan, which is that so many of these voters are "wedded to the hanging protection."

Mr. S. D. Guion of Brooklyn says he would like to have an arm full of single tax literature; he could use it to good advantage. He writes that one republican signed this petition because he liked the idea of putting all taxes on land value, but insisted that he was as good a republican as ever.

Two men in the government service at Washington sent for one hundred petitions each, and they think they can use them all. Another in Charlestown, Mass., insists that he can get a thousand signed.

From all parts of the country the demands come for new print as.

Dr. William C. Wood of Gloversville, N. Y., writes: "To me the principles that carried to their logical consummation must result in free trade, free land, and consequently free men, become more and more a matter of faith, and added to faith comes hope in their speedy triumph, and to hope, charity for those who willfully refusing to examine, reject them. Dr. Wood is amused apropos of Mr. George's return, when he thinks of the efforts put forth to cheapen the transporting of goods sent across the ocean, and the verdict of the people in favor of making up by taxation for any money thus saved to them."

E. E. Marsh of East Orange, N. J., strongly indorses Judge Maguire's proposal to make the single tax fight in that state.

John Horrook, who was formerly so efficient a worker in Camden, N. J., is beginning to display his old time activity in Pittsburg, his new home. Mr. Horrook addresses any meeting he can get at whether it be a prohibition meeting, a prayer meeting or a political club, and never misses the opportunity to talk single tax. He writes that the Pittsburg club has ceased to meet. It is to be hoped that Mr. Roberts and the others will see to its prompt revival now that the work has been renewed.

Dr. R. Webb of Orange Valley, N. J., strongly indorses Judge Maguire's proposition, and says he could do good work in that neighborhood if he had an abundance of tracts.

A. C. Hughes, secretary of the Single tax club at Youngstown, Ohio, sends samples of tracts and leaflets, that club is issuing to arouse the people of Ohio to an understanding of the disadvantage of the existing methods of taxation. Mr. Hughes says their club is growing so rapidly that the hall will hardly accommodate the members. One of their methods of work is to put, wherever they have opportunity, a letter sticker on which is printed "Single tax will do it."

Mr. F. S. Arnold of Poughkeepsie, New York, says that the single tax men of Dutchess county were greatly cast down by the result of the presidential election, but now that work has been resumed in some form they are beginning to pick up heart. He says, "Your letter has awakened us, and the pushing of the petition with all the attending opportunities for distributing literature, for conversation, and the touch of shoulders will soon give our work enough to do and bring our cause to the front."

Joseph Dana Miller writes that the single tax league of Hudson county, N. J., has become for the present a ballot reform league. It desires to communicate with single tax leagues throughout that state prior to holding a general conference to agree upon the form of a bill for ballot reform. The presidents and secretaries of such organizations are urged to put themselves into communication with Mr. Miller, and to offer any suggestions as to the best methods for work.

George F. Lewis, of Victor, Ohio, is an old gentleman in his seventy-seventh year, with all his means invested in real estate, but he has the vigor of mind that makes easy the acceptance of new ideas, and no fear that a tax on land values with exempt improvements will ever injure the useful members of a community. Mr. Lewis expresses his amazement at the way farmers in some parts of the country cling to the support of "this robber tariff."

He continues: "In pressing the claims for tariff reform, I have been astonished at the stubborn unreasonableness of some democrats in their adhesion to the fallacy that a high tariff assures a higher rate of wages to all workmen." One respectable farmer on whom I urged the levying of the single tax on land value said it would ruin them all.

Mr. Lewis says that the chief difficulty in arguing with these people is that they will not listen to arguments of any kind.

East New York Men Settling Down to Their Winter's Work.

BROOKLYN.—The single tax society of the Twenty-sixth ward, Brooklyn, held a well

attended and altogether successful meeting on Saturday evening at Liberty hall, East New York avenue, between Rockaway and Stone avenues.

The next meeting will be held on December 22 at 8:30 p. m., at the same place. Action will be taken concerning a change of meeting place and the hiring of "Liberty hall" as a permanent headquarters. There will also be the usual singing and reciting, besides the debate on the land question. Single tax men of the neighborhood are cordially invited.

MAX O. NEWMAN, Secretary,
2120 Dean street.

OVER THE BORDER.

Things Booming Up in Canada—Our Friends Have Captured the Mayor of Toronto and Some of the Aldermen, and They are Making a Dead Set for the Provincial Legislature—The Anti-Poverty Society, Too, is Working the Preacher.

Toronto, Canada, Dec. 12.—I take advantage of a few spare moments to let you know how matters are progressing with us.

I know there is a superstitious belief in the United States that we in Canada are hopelessly given over to fossilized torpor, but there is no more ground for that belief than there is for that other American superstition, Protection to American labor. As a matter of fact, I doubt if there is a city in the world to-day of equal size so thoroughly permeated with the George idea as this good city of Toronto. You find it cropping up everywhere.

A week ago last Monday the city council received a deputation of our anti-poverty society asking the council to unite in the movement for an exemption of \$600 in the assessment of all dwellings, as a step toward the abolition of the taxes on the products of labor. The mayor and many of the aldermen favor the idea and a petition on the same subject is presently being presented from the city council to the provincial legislature which has the making of assessment law for this province of Ontario. On the same evening the question of this exemption was decided favorably by the Young men's liberal club, an independent organization on the same side of politics in general matters as the provincial government. The young liberals last year voted down a resolution in favor of the George idea, but the discussion of the \$600 exemption was wholly upon the head and shoulders of the principle, and the resolution was sustained by a practically unanimous vote. I do not know that there is now a majority of straight out George men among the members of the club, but I do know that the best working members are nearly all of our way of thinking and that, except in a specially packed meeting, a straight resolution affirming the principle of confiscating rent for public purposes would be carried by two to one. The young liberals will send a strong deputation to urge upon the provincial government the propriety of the exemption of \$600 on dwellings. The anti-poverty society sent a deputation of this same kind to the government about a week ago. Five out of the six ministers of the crown were there and the discussion was a lively one. Some of the ministers are hopelessly in the dark on the subject, but they will grant what we ask in a year's time if not in the session of the legislature just about to open, for there are one or two of the best of them who see the cut almost as plainly as we do.

Last Saturday evening the Osgoode legal and literary society debated the "George question" as we call it here, and the decision of the chairman was that the single tax men had by all odds the best of it. There was a large audience present the majority of whom evidently sympathized with our views. This Osgoode society, I may explain, is an old established literary and literary society of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

STANDARD readers may remember that the Anti-Poverty society asked the ministerial association of this city to hear a deputation who would try to set the preachers right on this question, they having said some absurd things about our views. They declined, and not in the kindest way either, we thought. Some of the preachers, however, evidently feel that when things are not right and they don't know how to set them right, they ought at least to report fairly the views of those who claim to know how it ought to be done. Consequently Rev. John Burton, the leading Congregational minister of the city (a man of wide sympathies and of more advanced views than many of his confreres) was asked to read a paper on this subject. This he did on Monday. He has organized a club of lawyers and students, and has been the training school of some of the finest speakers and public men we have in Canada.

SHALL WE INVADE NEW JERSEY?

Judge Maguire's Idea Seems to Have Struck Popular Favor.

In an article in last week's STANDARD Judge Maguire suggested that Single tax men concentrate their strength for a campaign in one state, and named New Jersey as the best suited for the purpose. Here are some letters which have been received bearing on the judge's plan:

Will Back His Indorsement With a Dollar A Week.

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., Dec. 17.—If a concerted effort is made to invade New Jersey as suggested by Judge Maguire in THE STANDARD of December 12, I will back my indorsement of the plan with a subscription of a dollar a week until all state and municipal taxes in that state are levied on land values. I think it practicable to accomplish it within a few years. The effect will be to compel a similar measure in every other state the products of which compete with those of New Jersey.

I am a free trader, but I think the general argument can be more plausibly sustained from the point of the expediency of a tax on improvements than from the point of the inadvisability of a tariff.

As we progress the discussion by reason of the opposition it will arouse, will become more radical and will pass from expediency to justice. I believe when the public conscience has been quickened by an appeal to natural law in the direction of free trade, that the appeal to natural law in favor of free trade will be better listened to.

Let us remember also that there are other free traders than ourselves, and first assuring them of our co-operation, we can leave that special work more to them while we talk land.

But let us discourage the formation of a separate party. Let us indorse those democrats or republicans who favor our views. We, who, in the Second assembly district of Westchester county voted for Bradford Rhodes (a republican) as certainly voted for the Australian ballot as if we had elected a man on that sole issue.

Though the land tax is so important in its results, the amount of legislation it will require is so little, and the private claims on legislative attention are so many, that it would require much more time to push forward our measure if we only voted for straight single tax men than if we voted for those of other parties who favor in perhaps a smaller degree our plan.

What we want is, not offices, not a chance at private legislation, but a change in the tax laws. Let the political fight for the crumbs, but let us get the loaf.

All to whom I have spoken of Judge Maguire's plan approve it. I urge a full discussion; pending that, I ask others to duplicate my subscription.

Our warfare during the past year has been desultory—all along the line. Let us follow the Napoleonic plan of campaign by massing our forces against the enemy's weakest point. The landowners' weakest point is where a multiplicity of interests—those of the farmer, the miner, the artisan, the working farmer, and the day laborer (all our natural allies), are each found to be opposed by the landowner's interest, and where no unfortunate clause in the state constitution shields him.

Concentrate on Dakota.

BELLEFONTAINE, O.—The colonists were defeated at Bunker Hill and the federal army at Bull's Run, but the former were victorious at Yorktown and the latter at Appomattox. Free trade likewise will win. I heartily approve of Mr. Bailey's proposition to concentrate our whole strength upon Dakota.

F. M. MARQUIS.

A Telegraphers' Single Tax Club.

A meeting of telegraphers of this city was held at the International hotel on Friday evening, December 7, for the purpose of organizing a single tax club. Mr. E. F. Howell presided. A permanent organization was effected and the following officers were elected: President, E. F. Howell; vice-president, Thomas W. Grier; secretary, William A. Wasson; treasurer, William J. Pappert.

This club has been formed for the purpose of spreading the single tax doctrine among telegraphers. This will be done by a systematic distribution of single tax literature, and by holding public debates from time to time. There is a good field for work among telegraphers, as comparatively few of them have the slightest perception of the single tax idea.

For the present the efforts of the club will be confined to work in New York, but as the membership increases it is intended to extend its influence.

The secretary will be glad to hear from telegraphers, or any persons engaged in kindred pursuits, who may wish to co-operate in pushing the work. Communications should be addressed to W. A. Wasson, secretary, 1,626 Madison avenue, New York.

What Democrats Should Do.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—In 1854 Cleveland and Hendricks received a plurality of 23,003 of the popular vote; in 1858 Cleveland and Thurman received a plurality of 98,261. Here is the victory. It needs no elaboration—it speaks for itself. In this campaign the democratic party advocated a great reform—the shifting of the burdens of taxation from those who could best bear them. The verdict of the election was not the verdict of the people. No democrat should feel disheartened at the result of the election. Whatever advantage was gained was on one side. It was an "educational" campaign, and was a gigantic success, no matter what some so-called democrats call it. It proved this, if nothing more—that free trade is not odious to the majority of the American people. All democrats should busy themselves with disseminating free trade literature, and in 1892 will see whether or not an educational party can succeed.

HENRY C. LONG.

A Suggestion About a Name.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y.—Have just received the blue book of petitions from Mr. Crossdale. This idea of combining enrollment with petitioning is a masterly move, and I think will be successful. I think I shall be able to return several of the blanks signed; perhaps all ten.

May I make a suggestion? It would be that we single tax people call our organizations "Unions for the Abolition of Taxes on the Products of Industry." Why do I do it because people are greatly ruled by names. Free proof, witness the protective tariffs. Let them be called "taxes on foreign commerce," or "impediments of exchange of commodities," and how differently people would look on them. And so with the single tax on land values. By proposing to only tax land values we will arouse animosities and antagonisms that we would avoid if proposing simply to exonerate industry from any taxes on its activity and fruits.

F. G. A.

Ballot Reform in West Virginia.

PARKERSBURG, W. Va., Dec. 15.—Printed heads for petitions to the legislature of West Virginia for the adoption of the Australian system of voting, together with a copy of the proposed bill, will be furnished free to any persons who may apply to me for them.

T. E. QUINN,
Chairman Com. Electoral Reform League.

dent in New York and Brooklyn at the present time to carry every legislative district in Hudson, Essex, Union, Bergen and Passaic counties, and thus hold the balance of legislative power, if they were voters in these counties.

New Jersey has been for a long time cursed with two systems of taxation—one for the railroad corporation and another for the people. The rate of taxation for the railroad is one-half of one per cent and until late years they paid, if they wanted to, on what they please to call "their" valuation, while the rate of taxation upon the people has run from one to two and a half per cent.

I urge that we offer up a vote of thanks to our Californian friend for his advice, that "We invade New Jersey."

WILLIAM O. McDOWELL,
20 Spruce street.

ANOTHER SUPPORTER OF VERITAS VINCI.

But He Suggests a Simplification in the Plan of Operations—Some Sound Ideas.

TACOMA, Wash., Ter.—I write to support the idea of Veritas Vincit—to concentrate all our ideas on one state, but think his plan too cumbersome for practical use. The pay roll of one hundred and sixty-seven men would be immense to start with. It would be much better to appoint one man at a time, and to begin with one township. Get a list of voters in the township; forward to each voter a copy of "Protection or Free Trade" or "Progress and Poverty" or "Social Problems," and after a week or ten days had elapsed send him THE STANDARD for a month. This spending about forty cents on each voter, plus expenses of management. As soon as one township is finished start and address take up another, always picking out the townships that are the least populated, or those most difficult to get at. Do not try to organize, but leave the people themselves free to form clubs, etc.

I am but a poor devil of a house painter, but I will give \$10, at the rate of a dollar a month, to start such a work. I feel confident of success, and hope that at least ninety-nine more men will send their names into THE STANDARD to start the ball rolling.

The voters are the ones that count. Each voter represents about five at least of the population. If he is not able to see the cat, some one in the house that he lives in will. I also feel confident that at least ten per cent of those we reach will become subscribers to THE STANDARD, which in itself will be an immense gain. I trust that the readers of THE STANDARD will give this matter their earnest consideration, and that some such idea will be carried out.

F. C. CLARKE,
1309 K Street.

Commence With Rhode Island or Delaware.

MARATHON, Tex.—I believe we should concentrate our energies upon one state, and say either Rhode Island or Delaware. We have money and talent enough to cover the whole of either of these states, and to make a personal appeal to almost every voter. After capturing that state we could try another.

I. B. WALLACE.

Concentrate on Dakota.

BELLEFONTAINE, O.—The colonists were defeated at Bunker Hill and the federal army at Bull's Run, but the former were victorious at Yorktown and the latter at Appomattox. Free trade likewise will win. I heartily approve of Mr. Bailey's proposition to concentrate our whole strength upon Dakota.

F. M. MARQUIS.

A Telegraphers' Single Tax Club.

A meeting of telegraphers of this city was held at the International hotel on Friday evening, December 7, for the purpose of organizing a single tax club. Mr. E. F. Howell presided. A permanent organization was effected and the following officers were elected: President, E. F. Howell; vice-president, Thomas W. Grier; secretary, William A. Wasson; treasurer, William J. Pappert.

This club has been formed for the purpose of spreading the single tax doctrine among telegraphers. This will be done by a systematic distribution of single tax literature, and by holding public debates from time to time. There is a good field for work among telegraphers, as comparatively few of them have the slightest perception of the single tax idea.

For the present the efforts of the club will be confined to work in New York, but as the membership increases it is intended to extend its influence.

The secretary will be glad to hear from telegraphers, or any persons engaged in kindred pursuits, who may wish to co-operate in pushing the work. Communications should be addressed to W. A. Wasson, secretary, 1,626 Madison avenue, New York.

What Democrats Should Do.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—In 1854 Cleveland and Hendricks received a plurality of 23,003 of the popular vote; in 1858 Cleveland and Thurman received a plurality of 98,261. Here is the victory. It needs no elaboration—it speaks for itself. In this campaign the democratic party advocated a great reform—the shifting of the burdens of taxation from those who could best bear them. The verdict of the election was not the verdict of the people. No democrat should feel disheartened at the result of the election. Whatever advantage was gained was on one side. It was an "educational" campaign, and was a gigantic success, no matter what some so-called democrats call it. It proved this, if nothing more—that free trade is not odious to the majority of the American people. All democrats should busy themselves with disseminating free trade literature, and in 1892 will see whether or not an educational party can succeed.

HENRY C. LONG.

A Suggestion About a Name.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y.—Have just received the blue book of petitions from Mr. Crossdale. This idea of combining enrollment with petitioning is a masterly move, and I think will be successful. I think I shall be able to return several of the blanks signed; perhaps all ten.

May I make a suggestion? It would be that we single tax people call our organizations "Unions for the Abolition of Taxes on the Products of Industry." Why do I do it because people are greatly ruled by names. Free proof, witness the protective tariffs. Let them be called "taxes on foreign commerce," or "impediments of exchange of commodities," and how differently people would look on them. And so with the single tax on land values. By proposing to only tax land values we will arouse animosities and antagonisms that we would avoid if proposing simply to exonerate industry from any taxes on its activity and fruits.

F. G. A.

Ballot Reform in West Virginia.

PARKERSBURG, W. Va., Dec. 15.—Printed heads for petitions to the legislature of West Virginia for the adoption of the Australian system of voting, together with a copy of the proposed bill, will be furnished free to any persons who may apply to me for them.

T. E. QUINN,
Chairman Com. Electoral Reform League.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO.

Here are some expressions of opinion from single tax men in various places as to plans for work in the future.

About Professor Garland's Idea and Other Matters.

IN ONE CAUSE.

THE FREE TRADERS OF ENGLAND
STRIKE HANDS WITH THE SINGLE
TAX MEN OF AMERICA.

The Financial Reform Association Declares
For the Tax on Land Values—Proceedings
of the Great Meeting in Liverpool
to Present an Address to Henry George.

The following verbatim report of the
presentation of an address to Henry
George by the council of the Financial
reform association we take from the Decem-
ber issue of the *Financial Reform*, the
organ of the association:

On the 20th of November Mr. George was
presented with an address by the council of
the Financial reform association. The meet-
ing was held in the Rotunda lecture hall,
which was crowded to its utmost capacity,
many being unable to obtain admission. Mr.
Musspratt, the president of the association,
who occupied the chair, in his introductory
remarks said:

President Musspratt's Speech.
I am sure it is not necessary for me to say
very much to introduce Mr. Henry George to a
Liverpool audience. (Applause.) Mr.
George is known as an eloquent expounder of
the principles of land nationalization. (Hear,
hear.) "But," I have been asked, "what has
the Financial reform association to do with
land nationalization?" and I found it very easy
to answer. (Hear, hear.) The answer is, Mr.
George and the Financial reform association
have been working on converging lines for a
great number of years. Mr. George was first
known in this country by his wonderful and
stirring and eloquent book, "Progress and
Poverty." (Applause.) In that book he
showed, and I think conclusively showed,
that the monopolization of the land by a com-
paratively few individuals was the cause—at
any rate a very large cause—of the misery
amongst a large portion of the population.
(Applause.) But he also, in his economical
studies, found that the want of freedom
of exchange was also another cause of
the misery of the people, and that, therefore,
Mr. George has become the ex-
pounder not only of land nationalization but
also of freedom of trade. (Hear, hear.) Well,
the Financial reform association started with
these principles—economic government,
just taxation and perfect freedom of trade;
and they very soon found out that without
direct taxation you could not have perfect
freedom of trade, and that in order that tax-
ation should be just it must be direct. Their
further studies led them to look to the history
of taxation in this country, and what do you
think they found? They found that it had
been the policy of some 250 years to take off
the taxation from the land and put it on the
industry and labor of the community. (Hear,
hear.) They were therefore driven to this
conclusion, that in order to obtain perfect
freedom of trade and just taxation it was ab-
solutely necessary that we should have a land
tax. (Hear, hear.) Therefore you see
that the Financial reform association and Mr.
George have, as I said, been working on con-
verging lines; because, after all, what is a
land tax? A land tax is simply the resurrec-
tion of a portion of the rent derived from the
land, which rent is produced by the labor
and industry of the people. (Hear, hear.)
Therefore, what can be more just, what can
be more right, what can be more equitable
than a land tax? Because if you tax the
land you thereby practically get from the
labor and industry of ever; individual a por-
tion of the cost of government. (Hear, hear.)
We have also found in our studies as to
what constitutes freedom of trade, that it is
not only necessary that you should have free-
dom of exchange, but that you should have
freedom to produce. But how can you have
freedom of production when the first result
of the labor of the people has to go into the
pockets of the landlords in the shape of min-
ing rents, and in the shape of the share of
rent for all the land in the immediate neigh-
borhood of large towns? Do you suppose that
the rent of the land at Bootle and the neigh-
borhood of Liverpool is caused by any ex-
tortion of the lords of Derby? (Laughter.) Why,
the whole value of the land has been pro-
duced by the industry of the laboring popula-
tion of this town! Therefore it is one of the
principles of the Financial reform association,
in order to have perfect freedom of trade,
that we should have direct taxation, and a
great portion of the direct taxation must take
the form of a land tax. (Applause.)

I will not occupy time any further, because
I know you have come here, not to listen to
me, and not to listen even to the expounding
of the principles of the Financial reform as-
sociation, but to hear Mr. George; but before
calling upon him I would like to ask the secre-
tary to read the address which the Financial
reform association propose to present to him.

**Mr. Calbre, the secretary, then read the fol-
lowing address:**

The Address.
Henry George, Esq.: Sir—As members of
the Council of the Financial reform association
we take this opportunity to express our ap-
preciation of your efforts on behalf of free
trade in America, and our congratulations
upon the marked success with which those
efforts have been attended. We fully recognize
the self-denial and the heroic courage which
prompted you to sink your personal
aims and devote your energy to endeavoring
to secure the election of Mr. Cleveland, in
whose programme you perceived an effort,
and not till then, shall we know what serious
foreign competition means.

In regard to the land question, although
there may be some difference as to the means
there is no difference as to the object we both
seek to attain, viz: that the land be used to the
benefit of the whole people, and we feel that the
subject is important and so pressing that it is
our duty to look for the points of agreement,
not of difference, between all engaged in land
law reform. We have been driven to the study
of the land question. Our objects are
economic government, just taxation, perfect
freedom of trade. We have found that these
objects are intertwined and inseparable; un-
less you have perfect freedom of trade you
cannot have just taxation or economic govern-
ment, and, further, that to attain these
objects a radical reform of our land laws is
necessary. When we study our question from
the historical point of view, we can trace a
slow but constant transfer of taxation from
land on to labor, and coincident with that the
practical enslavement of an ever-increasing
portion of the community. On the economic
side we find that a few landlords have mono-
polized that which is intended for all, and
that it is this concentration of political
economy that the terrible destitution of a
great portion of the community can be traced.

For forty years we, as an association, have

been endeavoring to educate public opinion
on these questions, and we would gladly ac-
knowledge the great assistance we have
received from the dissemination of your
thoughtful writings. At our annual meeting
held in Liverpool last year, a resolution was unani-
mously carried calling for the repeal of the
duties upon tea, coffee, chicory, dried fruits,
gold and silver plate, and the tax upon car-
riages, and the substitution of a tax upon land
values.

A tax upon land values will be a great step
towards just taxation. By the repeal of what
John Bright termed the breakfast table duties
the cost of living will be reduced, and thus a
great boon be conferred upon the laboring
classes, and a further step be taken in the
policy of giving to man freedom to exchange
the products of his labor for the products of
the labor of others. But above all, by a tax
upon land values, based upon the use value of
the land and levied, whether the land be put
to use or not, the laborer will be allowed ac-
cess to the land to produce for himself those
things necessary to his existence, for the land-
lord cannot afford to pay taxation on land
which brings him in no rent. You also advocate
a tax upon land values, and when we consider
the appalling misery and destitution which
prevails in our land, and which we claim a
tax upon land values as a means to relieve, we
feel it our duty to sink all differences as to
the amount of that tax should be, and do
our best to co-operate, as far as possible,
with you in your work.

Wishing that all men in your efforts, we are
on behalf of the council of the financial re-
form association

**EDMUND K. MUSSPRATT, President,
J. W. S. CALBRE, Secretary.**

The Chairman: I have very much pleasure,
Mr. George, in presenting you with that ad-
dress. (Applause.)

Henry George's Reply.

Mr. Henry George, who on rising was re-
ceived with loud cheers, said: Mr. Chairman,
members of the council of the Financial Re-
form association, and Englishmen (applause):
I am both gratified and honored by this ad-
dress. There is in all the three kingdoms no
body of men from whom it would give me
greater pleasure to receive the right hand of
fellowship than from the Financial Reform
association of Liverpool. (Applause.) For
years before you did me the honor of permit-
ting me to become one of your number I had
known you through your work. I recognized
in that work the extension, the pushing for-
ward of the great principle for which Richard
Cobden fought—(applause)—the great prin-
ciple, that if carried forward to its full conclu-
sion it would not merely unify this great English
speaking race all over the world, but will lead
to that time the seers have foretold and the
poets have sung of, when wars shall be no
more and national quarrels shall be hushed in
the fraternalism of mankind. (Loud ap-
plause.) I am glad, as an American, to re-
ceive your greeting. To the man who really ap-
preciates what free trade means; to the man
who really sees that the true interests of man-
kind are concurrent and not diverse; that we
can only truly advance by the advance of
others; that we can only truly profit when
others have their just due—to him all the pre-
judices of nationality and race and religion,
all the hates, strifes and old bitter-
nesses sink into contempt and are buried out
of sight, and where we meet we meet as citi-
zens, and in that sense we are all one in truth
a citizen of the world. (Loud applause.)

I am an American free trader (applause)—
in the full and true sense of the term, and as
an American free trader I welcome and am
grateful for the assistance of the free traders
of England. This is no mere national ques-
tion. It is a world wide question. It concerns
us all. And as one nation pushes forward it
will light a beacon for the advance of others.
(Applause.) Especially significant to me to-
day is the fact that I recognize Mr. Presi-
dent, in the welcome you give to me some-
thing deeper than a congratulation or a com-
pliment to a man. I recognize something more
even than the union of those on both sides of
the Atlantic, who would strive for the free-
dom of trade. I recognize in it the beginning
of a union of forces that will carry out free
trade to its full and complete realization,
that will bring about that time of which
Richard Cobden dreamt, in which there shall
be no degrading poverty, no aggregations of
wealth and no strutting of the aristocracy, in
which they are surrounded; but in which
labor getting its full free earnings, capital get-
ting its just dues; all the elements that, work-
ing together, aid in the production of wealth,
having each their own full share, the funda-
mental cause of all our social difficulties shall
be gone, and mankind released from the strain
that now embitters and degrades so many,
shall have the leisure that I believe the
Creator intended, for the cultivation and de-
velopment of their highest powers. (Loud
applause.)

THE FREE TRADE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

Let me say to you, from my side of the
water, that the great struggle for free trade
has commenced in the United States—has
commenced in a way that makes it absolutely
certain that it never can go back, but must
go on to complete realization. Our last
campaign, in which Mr. Cleveland was de-
feated, was only the preliminary struggle.
Our whole national development has been
absorbed by the great slavery struggle. Un-
der stress of that question economic ques-
tions had hardly been discussed in the United
States. When the war came, when a press-
ing need was felt for enormous revenues, our
protectionists sprang to the front, and, seiz-
ing the opportunity, induced congress to levy
tax after tax upon a people so earnest and so
patriotic that they were ready to give every-
thing for the cause of the Union and ask
hardly what tax was imposed. Time has
gone on. Neither of the great parties dared
to set against themselves the powerful
interests that had been enlisted in that sys-
tem of taxing, and the whole people, in the
face of a few, until last December Mr. Cleveland
sent to congress his tariff message. Judged
from the standpoint of a free trader, it was a
poor, weak and timid thing. It asked only
for some reductions in protection. Neverthe-
less it was enough to bring up the question,
and the democrats in the house, following his
lead, formulated a bill—weak again and
timid—proposing only something like five per
cent reduction in the average rate of duty
and the repeal of some articles of free im-
port. Nevertheless it was a challenge to pro-
tection. The men who were interested in
maintaining those taxes upon the body of
their fellow citizens for their own selfish ben-
efit saw in it a menace to the whole system,
and the battle was set. The attack, I am
sorry to say, was weak and timid. Yet I don't
know that I need say that, for it is natu-
ral. When a great wrong is first attacked,
it is always timidly. (Hear, hear.) To a very
great degree the battle was fought on the
defensive. Nevertheless, it did bring out dis-
cussion, and the campaign, taken as a whole,
has done a work of education in economic
matters such as has been never before done
in the history of the republic. Mr. Cleveland
was defeated, but that, to the war that has
commenced, is like the defeat of Bull Run
was to our civil war. (Applause.)

FREE TRADE AND THE LAND QUESTION.

Your address compels me for throw-
ing myself into that fight on the side of tariff
reform. I deserve no compliment for that.
Had I failed to do so I would have been false
to my deepest convictions. For years and
years, ever since from a protectionist I be-
came a free trader, for years and years,
ever since the time when I first realized that

poverty and want—that festering poverty
that grows up in the midst of wealth in your
great cities, and of which we may see the be-
ginnings in our remotest states—was not due
to natural laws—(hear, hear, and applause)—
was not caused by the niggardliness of the
Creator, but was simply due to our selfish-
ness; to the wrong in which we, by our
human enactments, have denied to the masses
of men rights which the Creator has intended
them to enjoy. (Applause.) Ever since I
fully realized the relations between land and
labor, and since I fully understood what the
land question meant, I have looked to the be-
ginning of the tariff controversy in the
United States, to the struggle between pro-
tection and free trade, as the beginning of a
struggle that could not rest until industrial
slavery was fully abolished and the natural
and equal rights of men set forth in our De-
claration of Independence were at last fully
secured. (Applause.)

I am a free trader. If I were asked what
phase of my best belief my position would
not be that of a land nationalizer. That is
I have never used for myself. It would
be rather a free trader. But by free trade I
mean a good deal more than a mere tariff for
revenue. By free trade I mean the carrying
of the principle of freedom to its fullest
extension in industrial and economic affairs.
By free trade I mean, as your president
has said, the sweeping away of all restric-
tions upon freedom. (Hear, hear.) The light
that Richard Cobden and John Bright began
in this country over a generation ago has
gone in to the United States, and I believe
it will not pause as it has paused for some
time in this country. That our protectionists
are so strong that they will fight bitterly and
fight long, makes it only more certain that
our victory, when it comes, will be more de-
cided, and that we will carry the movement
to greater lengths. (Applause.) I want them
to resist, I want them to win some victories,
and at first beat back the advancing wave—
I want this, that the wave may mount higher.
(Applause.)

REAL ADVANCE IN NOMINAL DEFERENCE.

Our campaign in the United States demon-
strated the advance that has been going for-
ward for some years. I knew when it began
that the people who were counting so confi-
dently upon the vote of the workingmen in
the manufacturing centres and in the great
cities were mistaken in their calculations. I had
addressed many audiences in different parts
of the United States—audiences of men em-
ployed in the protected industries—and I had
never failed to announce myself as an ab-
solute free trader, and I knew that in the new
ideas that had been permeating the masses,
in the recognition of equal rights to the use of
the materials of the universe, there had been
growing up a spirit, there had been spreading
abroad a light, that swept away from men's
minds the fallacies of protection. And I was
right. Among the very classes in the United
States that the protectionists counted on most
confidently Mr. Cleveland has gone ahead.
In the manufacturing cities, in the great cen-
tres of industry, there has been an advance.
There the protection delusion has shown its
weakness. It is among the communities that
are more difficult to reach, among the farm-
ers, those who have never heard of free trade,
the question discussed, that the protectionists ap-
peared with most force, and to that class as
their victory due. But what the towns think
to-day the country will think to-morrow
(hear, hear), and the workingmen of the towns
are certain in a little while to be reinforced by
the farmers of the country. During that
campaign, while our democratic friends were
for the most part half-hearted, while for the
most part they took the illogical position of
saying that protection was a bad thing, and
therefore those who had never heard of free
trade on the tariff, there were some of us—
many of us, for we have been growing in the
United States—who stood upon the platform
of absolute free trade, who did not call our-
selves tariff reformers, but tariff abolishes.
(Applause.) We want to sweep away the
whole accursed thing. (Hear, hear.) And
that cry has gone forth in the United States.
(Applause.) We are the men who have been
making converts, and who have been advancing
—we are the men from whom in the future
the great leaders of the free trade country will
come. Often the question has been asked me
"Why, if free trade is a good thing, if, as you
say, free trade is in the interests of the work-
ing classes, why is it there is so much paper-
ism in Great Britain? Why is it that English
wages are so low?" My reply has always
been that free trade has not yet triumphed in
Great Britain—that free trade has yet to win
its victory in Great Britain (hear, hear,
and applause), and I am gratified by this re-
ception to-night because your association,
Mr. President, has been the representative of
those Englishmen who recognize the fact that
those Englishmen who knew that the task
that Mr. Cobden began has not yet been
completed, and who wanted to carry forward
England to true free trade, and in carrying
forward England to carry forward the world.
(Applause.)

THE ROOT OF POVERTY.

You say, Mr. Chairman, our lines have been
converging. If we have aimed at truth they
needs must converge. (Hear, hear.) Truth
is one, and no matter how you approach it,
if you go on and on, you will see clearer
and clearer all other truths as you go.
One line that leads to justice must meet
and unite with another line. I recognize Mr.
Cobden that, being with John Bright at a time
when the latter had suffered the most griev-
ous domestic affliction—when he had laid a
loved one in the earth—Cobden said to him:
"Come away with me. There are women and
children in England to-day dying of starva-
tion, of starvation made by the laws. Come
with me, and we will not rest until we have
abolished those laws." (Loud applause.) C-
bden is dead and his work only begun. John
Bright's life work is probably over. Many peo-
ple have been converted to free trade country. Yet
in England women and children still die of star-
vation. (Hear, hear and "Shame.") It is not
must it not be, of starvation made by the law?
(Cries of "Yes.") Either by human law or by
Divine law that is certain, and to my mind the
man who says that it is the result of causes
that are beyond control, that this dire pov-
erty and misery are the result of natural
laws is worse—a thousand fold worse—than
any Atheist. (Loud applause.) That the cause
of the poverty, the cause of the starvation, the
cause of monstrous wrong in the world, the
cause of wealth, of ignorance in the midst of
lightenment, of the direct abasement and em-
barrassment in the midst of the highest civiliza-
tion, comes from the single fundamental fact
that the masses of our people have been dis-
inherited. (Loud applause.) Charities may con-
tribute thousands and tens of thousands,
philanthropists may confer, may establish
schools and found institutions, legislatures may
appoint commissions and enact sanitary regu-
lations, ministers of the gospel may go into
the slums and try and preach the light, and
the glory of Christ's message, but all in vain.
(Hear, hear.) It is but the seed, so long as
you do not go to the root of the evil. So long
as the human being is a land animal, so long
as man can only live on land and work on
land, so long as all wealth is simply the raw
material of the land worked up by human
labor—it is inevitable that if the land of
any country be treated as the property of
one class of that country, no matter how you
manage, no matter what inventions may be
made, what improvements may be carried

out, there must be at the bottom of the social
scale brutishness and vice and ignorance and
want and starvation. (Applause.) Nothing
is clearer.

PROGRESS OF ENGLISH THOUGHT.

So rapidly has thought advanced in En-
gland that I don't think it is to-day neces-
sary for me to stand here and attempt to
prove the equal rights of man to land, to in-
sist upon the obvious fact that every child
that is born in this England of yours is at the
moment of its birth seized with a right to the
use of the land of England equal to that of
the eldest son of your proudest duke. (Ap-
plause.) That truth has been forcing its way
among the masses of your people. To-day
over a century after they were uttered, the
truths of these words of the American Declara-
tion of Independence is beginning to be
recognized: "We hold these truths to be self-
evident, that all men are created equal and
are endowed by their Creator with certain un-
alienable rights." (Applause.) If I rightly
judge English opinion to-day, that perception
has taken a hold upon the masses of your peo-
ple that can never be lost. Now a great ques-
tion arises and is pressing to the front, How
shall we recognize those rights? (Hear, hear.)

THE QUESTION OF METHOD.

It is perfectly obvious, it needs no discus-
sion, that a man has by the use of his brain
equal right to the use of the land of his
country. That is clear. And yet there is an-
other truth that is equally clear. For the
best use of land there must be an individual
right of possession that must be certain.
We cannot leave land a common. We cannot
treat land as we treat the air, and let any
man take at any time what he wants of it.
Men will not sow a field unless they be
assured that they will be able to reap the
crop. No man will put a great building upon
a lot to which his title can be blown away at
any time. No one will open a mine unless he
be assured that he will be able afterwards to
profit by his labor. These are the two great
principles—that the rights of all men to the
use of the land of their country are equal, and
that there needs must be individual posses-
sion. But they are easily reconciled. Indi-
vidual possession need not necessarily mean
individual ownership. It is perfectly clear
that equality could be secured if the com-
munity were to treat the land as common
property and let it out to the individuals who
wished to use it, taking for common use the
rents paid by the individuals who had ob-
tained a benefit greater than fell to the mass
of their countrymen. That mode of solv-
ing the land question is, I think, that
which is proposed by those who generally
speak of themselves as land nationalizers
in the narrow meaning of the term. Such a
plan, if carried out, would secure perfect
equality, and, as Herbert Spencer says, "every
individual could pay his rent quite as well to
his neighbor as to the state." (Hear, hear,
and laughter.) Nevertheless, there is a complex-
ity attached to that method which is repellant
to a man who has perceived the full beauty of
economic laws. It is repellant to free traders
who believe that in leaving matters as far as
possible to individual impulse you will
secure the best interests of the whole.
There is too much interference about it, and it
raises in the beginning the idea of compensa-
tion. Those are going to take this land from
the present owners, therefore you ought to
compensate them. (Loud cries of "Yes" and
a voice "Yes.") Well, I really think there
has been some advance since I was here last.
(Applause.)

It is unnecessary for me to say that I don't
believe in compensation. It is not necessary
for me to say that, to my notion, if anybody
is to be compensated it should be those who
have suffered from the system, not those who
have gained by it. (Hear, hear.) Nevertheless,
there is a practical difficulty. Nevertheless,
compensation has strength to many men's
minds.
But there is an easier way still than I have
described—a way in which this difficulty can be
avoided. It accords with all our customs and
habits of thought that, when private property
is taken for public uses the holders shall be
compensated (hear, hear), but it does not ac-
cord with our habits of thought and our
practical sense that a man who is leaving his
land to be compensated for having it taken
from him. (Hear, hear, and applause.) If you
will think of it, it is perfectly clear that to
take the simple and easy way of taxing land
values would lead to the same point as tak-
ing land and letting it out. People are
used to paying taxes to the state; they are
not used to paying rent to the state. Call
your rent taxes, and the thing is done. (Ap-
plause.) There is everything in a name! I
remember that when I was a boy in the
city of Philadelphia, I was educated in a
very strict faith. My people and the people
whom I knew in my childhood, the people
who went to our church and other churches
of the same kind, had a notion that the
theater was a very bad place, and they would
not go to the theater on any account. (Laughter.)
There is a celebrated fellow citizen of
mine of the name of Barnum (laughter), the
man who came over here and bought Jumbo.
(Laughter.) Barnum came to Philadelphia
and he recognized that prejudice, and he saw
that, although there were a number of thea-
ters running for the ungodly, a theater he
could get the godly to go to would pay ex-
tremely well. But he did not start a theater.
Oh, no! He started a lecture room, and ran
in that lecture room theatrical representations.
It was crowded every night in the
week, with two matinees in the afternoons.
(Laughter.) Now it seems to me, and it has
seemed to me from the beginning, that the
pleasant way of getting rid of the land-
lord was not by the simple dispossessing him,
but by simply taxing him out. (Applause.)

THE GOOD OLD ENGLISH WAY.

And this method has enormous advantage
to conservative thought, as pointed out
by your president. This is no Yankee notion,
as some people said it was when I came over
here a few years ago. It is a going back to
the good old English custom. (Hear, hear.)
It is a matter of fact, as your president has
pointed out, that absolute property in land—
that treatment of land which accords to it the
same full right of ownership that by natural
law attaches to things produced by labor—
came by a gradual series of usurpations.
Theoretically, Great Britain to-day is not
the owner of land, that is the crown, the
representative of the whole people; and all
those people who rent land and sell land
are merely tenants of the crown—that is to
say, of the English people. (Hear, hear.)
They got that land originally with the under-
standing that they should pay rent, and for
many years they did pay rent, sometimes in
money, sometimes in services. (Hear, hear.)
In this is the explanation of the otherwise
astounding fact asserted by such men as Hal-
lam the historian and Thorold Rogers, who
has made a study of the history of social con-
ditions during the earlier centuries—the
astounding fact that six centuries ago, when
all the arts of production were but in their
infancy; in that rude, dark time, as we are
accustomed to call it, the condition of the
man who had nothing but the power to labor,
the condition of the mere laborer in Great
Britain, was far better than is the condition
of millions now. In those rude times one por-
tion of the land maintained the expense of
the sovereign and the civil list. Another por-

tion of the land maintained the expense of
public worship, of charities, of the care of the
sick and of education. And a third portion of
the land—the military tenures—bore the cost
of the fighting. The people who held these
lands had to fight themselves and to bring
other men to fight. (Hear, hear.) There was
no taxation on tea, no putting on of an in-
come tax when war was declared. (Hear,
hear.) There was no monstrous debt. Those
obligations were gradually thrown off until
the appropriation of the common wealth, en-
ding finally, after the restoration, in the
entire abolition of what was left of the mili-
tary dues, the feudal tenures proper, and the
substitution of indirect taxes, falling on the
masses of the people. Now, to secure the
rights of every Englishman in English soil,
all you have got to do is to go back the way
you came and re-impose on landlordism the
taxes that landlord parliaments have shifted
off on labor. (Applause.)

THE FREE TRADE PRINCIPLE.

In doing that you would carry out the prin-
ciple of free trade to its legitimate conclusion.
When England adopted the free trade policy
it was thought by enthusiastic free traders of
the day that the world would soon follow its
example. The world has not. The real truth
is this, that you have never yet shown the
world the full advantages of free trade. You
have never carried it out to that point where
its influence in the elevation of the working
classes would be to strikingly apparent.
(Applause.)

Now see what the argument is. In our
country we have a monstrous protective
tariff, a system of taxation that is imposed
simply for the purpose of making prices high,
so that the people who have certain things
to sell can force the rest of their fellow coun-
trymen to pay higher prices. Our whole sys-
tem aims at keeping goods out of the country.
That is the only way in which it can protect.
Now what are goods? Why, they are good
things, as their name implies. (Hear, hear.)
They are the things we all want, we all de-
sire to get. We call that man rich who has
or can command many of them. We call
that man poor who wants them. And when
we say that a nation is increasing in prosper-
ity, we mean what? Simply that its wealth
is increasing—not its land, not its population;
but that it is increasing in goods, in commodi-
ties—that there are more of them in the coun-
try. And that is the wealthiest country that
has the most of such commodities. It is very
stupid to put on a tariff to keep those things
out. We ought to welcome men who bring
them into the country, instead of fighting them.
(Hear, hear.) There would be a good deal
more sense in imposing a tariff on those
who are going to carry goods out of the
country than on those who bring them in.
Therefore we ought to sweep away that tariff.
And therefore, going further, we ought to
sweep away even a tariff levied for revenue,
because a tariff levied for revenue necessarily
operates in that way, and necessarily it op-
erates unjustly. It is not worth my while go-
ing into the argument before you to-night,
but whoever goes into it will see that a revenue
tax is the most unjust way of raising a
revenue. Here, for instance, you raise a
great part of your revenue by a tax on tea.
Now the poorest worker drinks as much tea
as the richest lady—more I think. There are
lots of your population, a great part of whose
living consists of bread and tea. Yet you
make the poor working girl, the man who
has a large family to support, and has
hard work to do it, pay as much in that tax
as your greatest millionaire or richest duke.
(A voice: A hundred per cent more.) And so
on through all your indirect taxes. (Hear,
hear.)

Free trade, in its narrow sense means
that there ought to be free freedom of ex-
change. And why? Because exchange is a
mode of production. Production is not com-
pleted until the man who is going to use the
thing gets it, and trade is that mode of pro-
duction which enables all the other econo-
mies. If each man had to make himself
everything he wanted, he would have to want
mighty little. (Laughter.) If every man had
to be his own tailor, his own clock maker, his
own house builder, his own farmer, his own
butcher, his own doctor, his own dentist, and
so on, the result would be absolute starvation.
Trade permits the division of labor, the cul-
tivation of skill, the development of ingenuity,
the acquirement of knowledge. It enables us
to avail ourselves, though we remain in one
place, of the advantages nature has given to
other places, of the special adaptabilities of
other people. Thus trade aids production.
Now then, if it is stupid to keep things out
of the country by taxes and duties, it is clearly
as stupid to prevent their production in the
country by taxes and duties. (Hear, hear.) If
you tax houses you necessarily restrict the
building of houses, and there will be fewer
houses built. If you tax vans and wheels—
(groans)—you will certainly have fewer vans
and fewer wheels. (Laughter.) Therefore
the principle of free trade condemns all such
taxes. (Hear, hear.)

THE MORAL SIDE OF THE ARGUMENT.

Free trade means free production, and it
is essential to free production that no man
shall be taxed for having produced a thing.
The spirit of free trade condemns all such taxes.
It condemns not merely indirect taxes, but
from that most important side—the moral side
of the question, all direct taxes that fall upon
articles of wealth are just as utterly con-
demned. The question between free trade
and protection is a moral question. This
whole question of taxation is a moral ques-
tion. The right to freely trade is just as es-
sential as the right to freely speak. (Ap-
plause.) A man cannot be a free man when
his trade is taxed. We in America are not
yet free. Free? If I buy my wife a
dress over here, as I get to the other side of
the Atlantic, and the statue of liberty enlight-
ening the world looms up before me, a cus-
tom officer comes up to me and makes me
hold up my right hand and call upon the
Mighty Father, Creator of heaven and earth,
to witness that I have nothing dutiable about
me. Well, if I do as most Americans do who
are protectionists, and swear that I have not
(laughter) I will still have to give the customs
officer my keys, and he will open my bag or
box and look through it, and in all probability
he will see that dress for my wife unless I
have put a "greenback" on the top. (Laughter
and applause.) So I am faced or black-
mailed for having done what is the very
natural right to do. Through all its stages,
from the rich man who spends, as they have
spent in this last American election, millions,
to debase and corrupt their fellow citizens,
and to prevent the abolition of taxes which
are filling our treasury with a worse than use-
less surplus—down through all its gradations
the whole system is corrupt and demoralizing.
(Applause.) And if you realize the harmony
of the natural laws you must know that it
must be so, from the fact that it is a violation
of justice. It is my right as a man to freely
exchange my labor with any other man.
(Applause.) It is my natural right, and it
ought to be my right as an American citizen,
to freely bring into the port of the great re-
public anything I choose that won't hurt any-
body else. (Applause.) It is perfectly right
to enact laws to keep out plagues, to keep out
vermin, to keep out bad things; but the enact-
ment of a law to keep out good things, to vi-
olate my natural right, must end in corruption.
(Hear, hear.) So it is with the taxes that we
levy, and that you levy upon things that are
the product of labor. A man builds a house

here, and under your system, as under ours,
your rate assessor comes round and says, "How
much is that house worth?" and the better the
house the man has built the more he is fined
for it. (Laughter.) Think of the absurdity of
it! (Hear, hear.) Have you houses enough?
Why, look at the 40,000 people living in Glasgow
in one room houses; look at the crowded popu-
lation of London and the slums of Liverpool.
The man who builds a house ought to be con-
sidered a public benefactor, but by the system
of taxation, which prevails on both sides of the
Atlantic, he is considered a malefactor, and
the bigger and the better house he builds,
and the more houses he builds, the more he is
fined. (Applause.)

Men like me have been taunted by foolish
men with not respecting the Eighth Com-
mandment. We are the men who do respect
it. (Applause.) We are the men who do
stand for the rights of property. We are the
men who believe "Thou shalt not steal" to be
the enactment by a power superior to that of
any human legislature. There is in our view
a sacred right of property, and the extension
and the progress of civilization depend upon
the respect for that right. Whatever a man
brings into being, whatever human exertion
produces from the raw materials of nature—
that belongs to the man who has produced it.
It belongs to him as against all the world.
No other individual has a right to take it from
him under any normal circumstances, nor has
any government. If a majority of votes do
not mark the distinction between right and
wrong, no government has the moral right to
take from him or to impair his right in it. But
this exclusive right of property in things pro-
duced by labor is impaired by taxes upon the
products of labor. (Applause.)

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
2 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be accepted on condition that the author's name and address be given, and that the contributor be held responsible for the contents of his communication. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

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

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

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

Sample copies sent free on application.

DISCONTINUANCE.—THE STANDARD is sent to subscribers until they order its discontinuance. If the publisher is notified of a change of address, the paper will be forwarded to the new address. If no notice is given, the paper will be sent to the last address on file.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 22, 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.

The Evening Post points its scornful finger at "men of the Henry George school" for insisting upon the negative of the question "Whether a poor man can any longer make his way in this country," and calls up from the innermost depths of the American Grocer a striking instance of how a poor man could and did make his way here. It may be well to repeat what has often enough been said by men of the Henry George school, and is elaborately explained in "Progress and Poverty," that men of this school do not claim that a poor man can no longer make his way, but that poor men can no longer make their way.

In the first chapter of Book 6 of "Progress and Poverty," this statement is made:

Industry, skill, frugality and intelligence can only avail the individual in so far as they are superior to the general level—just as in a race speed can only avail the runner in so far as it exceeds that of his competitors. If one man works harder, or with superior skill or intelligence than ordinary he will get ahead; but if the average of industry, skill or intelligence is brought up to the higher point, the increased intensity of application will secure but the old rate of wages and he who would get ahead must work harder still. One individual may save money from his wages, by living as Dr. Franklin did, when during his apprenticeship and early journeyman days, he concluded to practice vegetarianism. . . . But if the working classes generally came to live in that way wages would ultimately fall in proportion and whoever wished to get ahead by the practice of economy. . . . would be compelled to devise some still cheaper mode of keeping soul and body together. . . . And so if one individual works more hours than the average, he will increase his wages; but the wages of all cannot be increased in this way. . . . And so, the individual workman who gets his wife and children to assist him may thus increase his income; but in occupations where it has become habitual for the wife and children of the laborer to supplement his work, it is notorious that the wages earned by the whole family do not on the average exceed those of the head of the family in occupations where it is usual for him only to work.

Now in view of what "men of the Henry George school" really say, and not of what some shallow person says they say, let us see whether this story on which the Post lays so much stress does not rather bear out than contradict them. As the story runs, ten years ago a Serb from \$1.50 landed at Castle Garden. After awhile he got a job in New Jersey for \$2 a week and his board. In six weeks he started to learn hat making, and soon became an expert finisher. Then he invested \$2 in a book on hat making and studied the details of manufacturing. When the foreman was dismissed the Serb was put in charge of the shop and forthwith employed his wife. The two lived on \$5 a week, saving the balance of their united salaries until they had a capital of \$800. This sum the husband invested in a grocery business, and now he owns considerable real estate and a well stocked store, doing a business of about \$15,000 per annum.

No comment is necessary to show how how perfectly the instance verifies what is asserted, in this respect, by "men of the Henry George school."

One of the chief objections made to woman suffrage, by people who would appear to be fair, whether they are or not, is that women themselves do not want it. This objection proceeds from the theory that the right to vote is a franchise graciously conferred

by a superior; whereas the true theory of democratic government is that all the governed who have arrived at the age of discretion, which must of necessity be fixed arbitrarily, are entitled to a voice in public affairs. If the suffrage, so-called, were a franchise, the neglect of women, generally to petition for it might be reasonable ground for refusing it to those who did petition; but as it is a right, to deny it to those who ask for it, let them be never so few, is, as to them, denial of justice. But there is little truth in the notion that women generally do not want to vote; and no truth at all if it be intended to imply that women generally would not vote if allowed to. That their right to vote in school elections has largely been ignored by them, proves nothing. School elections are not usually exciting. Even men have been known to refrain from voting in these contests. In Boston last week, however, there was that anomaly in politics, an exciting school election, and the women proved their willingness and even anxiety to vote, by turning out in large numbers and voting for members of the school board. After all, let the suffrage be either a privilege or a right, the best way of deciding whether women generally want it or not, is to give them a chance to increase it.

It is hard to say whether revolutionary socialists or idiotic officials who try to suppress them are most to blame for the danger that menaces free assembly and free speech in this country. But certain it is these rights are being encroached upon. Two weeks ago the chief of police of Chicago announced that a certain procession would be prohibited from marching through the streets of Chicago; not because the proposed time, or route, was inconvenient, but because the procession was in honor of doctrines that are abhorrent to the chief of police. Soon after the Chicago authorities were seriously asked to break up anarchist Sunday schools, not because they were disorderly, but because the teachers taught objectionable doctrines. And last week the mayor of Lake View near Chicago notified the manager of a hall in that town that the hall must not be opened for an advertised lecture by a socialist on "The Power of Faith," to be followed by a discussion. If freedom of speech and assembly are coming to depend thus upon the whims of policemen and mayors, it is time to inquire whether official lawlessness is not the more dangerous anarchy of the two kinds with which we are now pestered.

The investigation by the State board of mediation and arbitration into the feather workers' strike, reveals a significant state of facts. Less than ten years ago girls employed in this trade, which consists in the preparation of ostrich feathers, got as much as \$1,200 a year. Some got more, and many got as high as \$1,000, while few got less than \$700 or \$800. But for the past six years wages have been falling until now very few of the workers get as much as \$500, most of them getting not more than from \$250 to \$300, and for the week preceding the strike wages ran from \$2.50 to \$3.50. Notwithstanding this great decline in wages, it also appeared with tolerable clearness that during the same period the profits of employers were also reduced to a low point. There are probably some causes peculiar to the trade, notably changes in fashion, which contributed to produce this condition; but the most efficient cause, doubtless, was the operation upon the trade of those general causes, which, in all directions, are reducing wages and business profits, and from which this trade was for a time sheltered. During the entire period, however, the trade was protected by the tariff, and the decline of wages and profits has been so satisfactory that employers in the trade are organizing to lobby with congress against repeal of duties.

In Austria, the land of peasant proprietors descends to all the children, while the land of the nobility goes to the eldest son. It is now proposed to extend the law of primogeniture to the peasantry. This does not appear on the surface to be a movement in the direction of making land common property, nor is it so intended; but it is about the most effective thing to that end that under autocratic government could be undertaken. There is no object lesson of the iniquity of land ownership so striking as concentration.

When General Miles was about to depart from Los Angeles for San Francisco, he was given a farewell banquet at which he expressed a desire to live twenty or thirty years so that among other wonderful things he might see the Pacific's "waters whitened by the sails of American ships carrying our products to the marts of the world." That would no doubt be a pretty sight—a sight worth living twenty or thirty years to see, but how shall General Miles be gratified with the sight of American ships if American navigation and tariff laws continue to compel American ship owners to own foreign ships and sail them under foreign flags; and how shall American producers be tempted to allow any ships to carry "our products to the marts of the world," if the marts of the world are to be prohibited by our beneficent system of protection from paying for what they get by sending products here?

The actors are now asking for protection against foreign competition. Why not? Their industry is an important one, and their right to special privileges as good as anybody's. When the fraud in-

volved in the protection pretense that tariffs on goods protect laborers was exposed, the protectionist gave us a law against importing laborers under contract. To have been in harmony with the tariff law it should have prohibited all immigration, for tariffs fall as well on goods that come here for a market, as on those which are contracted for in advance. But, difficult as it is, the law is bringing into clearer light the absurdity of protection. Under it a church congregation has been fined for importing a foreign pauper clergyman, a mode of keeping the foreign clergyman out of our rich vineyards which, though not so effective as that adopted by some protective countries where they confiscate his person and roast his carcass, has the merit of being less barbarous while having the same tendency. And now the American actor rebels because he is expressly exempted from this law which protects preachers. He should not be excepted. It is just as injurious to American industry to import actors as it is to import preachers or steel rails.

The traveler from a western city to the east by way of the Michigan Central railroad, is met at Detroit by a United States official who pastes certain labels on the traveler's baggage, and at Suspension Bridge another United States official inspects these labels. If at some point between Detroit and Suspension Bridge the traveler should buy something, he would be fined or his purchase confiscated on arriving at the latter point. The object of the labels and inspection, therefore, is to distinguish between goods that are subject to fine and those which are not. Now, why does the United States fine a man who brings goods to Suspension Bridge without having had them in his possession when he left Detroit? It is because they are Canadian goods and their importation into the United States is exceedingly injurious to the people of this country. But Mr. Congressman Butterworth, not having the fear of American workmen in his heart, proposes to allow the free importation of Canadian goods into this country; and what is worse, he proposes to do it in an underhand way. He has offered a resolution in congress empowering the president to invite negotiations looking to the admission of the several provinces of Canada into the union upon the same terms with the states now composing the union. As free trade exists between the states already in the union, the proposed annexation of Canada is nothing more than a cover under which to establish free trade with Canada. Once accomplished, the products of the Dominion, now kept back by custom houses, fines and forfeitures, would come down upon us like an avalanche. How can the organs of protection remain silent in the face of a threatened disaster like this?

Now that so many former occupants of West Washington market are complaining of favoritism in the distribution of stands in the new market, a good opportunity occurs for investigating the manner in which market stands are held. Is it true that stand owners are acquiring a kind of title which they lease and sell? Is it true that people who really do business in the markets are lesses of outsiders who receive a great deal higher rent from their tenants than they pay to the city?

Whatever may be said of the effect on public morals of publishing accounts of capital executions, but one thing can be said of the law prohibiting such publications. It is unconstitutional. The constitution of this state is explicit that "no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press;" and the liberty of the press is restrained when newspapers are forbidden, as by our new law of capital punishment they are, to publish any account of the details of an execution "beyond the statement of the fact that such convict was on the day in question duly executed according to law at the prison." Whether the constitution should be thus modified is another question, in reference to which it is enough to say that it is dangerous to trifle with the constitutional guarantee of free speech and press.

Canon Knox-Little, of the Church of England, who is visiting friends on this side, has been interviewed by the Evening Post. Touching the question of disestablishment, the canon said it really means disendowment; and disendowment, he explains, would be a violation of the eighth commandment, because the property of the English Church came through bequests and endowments from individuals. And to clinch the matter he asks, "Why single out the Church of Christ for looting? Why not descend upon the Baptists, Methodists and others, who have rich holdings?" It will interest "Baptists, Methodists and others" to know that, in the opinion of Canon Knox-Little, they are not of the Church of Christ.

Not a Prophet, but He Sees a Thing or Two. Charles Francis Adams in a speech before the Commercial club, in Boston, December 15, said: "I may, perhaps, be asked what my view of the future is, and what should now be done. While I do not care to set up as a prophet, the trend of events seems to me plain enough; nor do I believe that any act of congress or of state legislature can thwart or greatly change it. The railroads of this country are moving rapidly toward some great system of consolidation. I do not know when or how it will come about."

For Amateur Architects. Rochester Post-Express. "Whenever a man builds, no matter what manner of house he erects, he needs a site of land."

THE SINGLE TAX IDEA.

New York Times, December 19.

The central idea of Henry George's economic philosophy was originally public ownership of all land. His method of reaching that result was to put all taxes upon land and to increase them until it would be worth nobody's while to retain the title in it. Occupiers of land would simply pay its full rental value to the state in the form of taxes for the general benefit. This, it was argued, would make it easier to obtain possession of land for occupation and use and increase the number of holders, while it would relieve improvements due to labor and all the agencies of production from the burden of taxation. This idea of state ownership has become modified to the idea simply of a single tax to be laid on the "site value" of land, leaving the question of title and ownership undisturbed. In this form it has become the subject of much discussion of late, and in Boston last Saturday night it was taken up and opposed by Mr. Edward Atkinson in a speech before the single tax league of the city.

As a matter of discussion this question has the great merit of presenting two sides upon which much can be logically urged. As one of the speakers who replied to Mr. Atkinson said, "the great burden of the workingman is the indirect taxes that he knows nothing of." Not only those who are generally meant by "workingmen," but a large proportion of the producers of the country, of every grade and class, bear the burden of indirect taxation without practically knowing anything about it. Taxes upon the products of industry and upon the processes of production and exchange are the most burdensome of all, for the reason that they are the most unequal and the most costly to collect, and interfere most with production. But they are paid in the prices for which products are sold for consumption, and are not recognized as taxes by those who finally pay them. They appear in the "cost of living," and just as certainly diminish the value of an income as if they were assessed directly upon it. Any agitation which will make workmen and others fully understand and appreciate this will be useful. A single land tax would not have the faults and disadvantages of indirect taxation.

Taxes on personal property—that is, upon values produced by labor and held in individual ownership—are open to serious objections. Experience has proved that it is impossible to assess and collect them with any approach to equity. These values take so many intangible and evasive forms and are so easily transferred and concealed that the bulk of them escape taxation. Those that are held in trust for widows and orphans, or are involved in estates in process of legal settlement, are subject to their full share, and a few scrupulous men put themselves at a disadvantage with others by revealing their ownership, but by far the larger part of accrued wealth, escapes the burden. A tax that is inevitably unequal, and that bears most heavily on those least able to sustain it, is certainly objectionable. The single land tax would not be open to this objection. The land cannot escape, its ownership cannot be concealed, its assessment can easily be made equitable, and the collection of a tax upon it is the easiest and cheapest conceivable. Neither is the argument of the advocates of this tax against putting burdens upon improvements without force. Taxes can be readily laid upon buildings and machinery and the appliances of industry and trade, and made reasonably equal and just, but to a certain extent they operate to check improvements and production, to diminish the results of labor and enhance the cost of living.

In dealing with the "incidence" of taxation one fundamental fact must always be kept in mind. Taxes, whatever their form and however levied and collected, must come out of the product of labor. There is no other possible source for them. Whatever is taken from this product for public purposes remains just so much the less for the use and enjoyment of the producers in their capacity as consumers of what they have produced. The system that makes the smallest difference between what is needed for public uses and what is actually taken from the producers, that involves the least waste, is to that extent most meritorious. That which adjusts the exaction most accurately in accordance with ability to contribute is the most equitable. The single land tax is certainly a simple, a direct, and an economical means of obtaining the needed revenue. Would it be equitable?

Who would pay the tax, first and last, and in what proportion? If a man held unimproved land without putting it to any use he would pay the tax upon whatever its assessed value might be without any present means of recovery. If his land was occupied by dwellings the tenants would pay their share in rent, and the amount would be graduated according to the costliness of their habitations, which would in some sort correspond with their means. If it was occupied for business purposes by the owner or by some one renting from him, the taxes would be paid from the profits of the business, and would more or less affect the wages paid therein and the prices of the products manufactured or handled on the premises. Each man's contribution would be closely apportioned to his ability as an earner or a purchaser. In other words, the tax would be "diffused," as all real estate taxes are, and the adjustment would be much more nearly equitable than any artificial devices could make it. Considered simply as a scheme for raising the needed public revenue the single tax idea has much to commend it. It is our sole purpose now to present it under that aspect without considering incidental effects upon land ownership or industrial conditions. Its opponents address themselves to these effects almost exclusively.

Free Board and Lodging.

City Argus.

Judge, to Trump—Ten days.
Trump—Thanks, sweetest.
Judge—Two weeks; contempt of court.
Trump—Mercy, darling.
Judge, mad—Thirty days.
Trump—God bless you, old gall!
Judge, furious—Sixty days.
Trump—Oh, how I'd love to smother you with kisses!
Judge, livid—Ninety days!
Trump, as he goes out, aside—Thank God, I've got a shelter for the winter!

Indigestion's Worst Form.

Harper's Bazar.

"Hello, Moses, wot's de matter wid yeh?"
"Indigestion,"
"How's dat?"
"Hain't had nuthin' to digest lately."

LITTLE HOMES AND LITTLE FARMS.

Mr. Cushman, of Oxford, Presents Some Facts and Figures About Them For the Springfield "Republican" to Digest.

Oxford, Mass., Dec. 10.—The Springfield Republican has attempted a reply to my article in THE STANDARD of September 29, on "Little Homes and Little Farms." Although not expressly mentioning THE STANDARD article, I have reason to know that the editorial author had a copy of the same before him as he wrote. It is therefore noteworthy that the Republican entirely abandons the claim it carelessly put forth, that homesteads would be confiscated by the imposition of the single tax. When its eyes were opened it could doubtless look about in Springfield and behold manifold proofs to the contrary.

Let us begin on the main road in the town of Oxford, which is now in the hands of the old common in the Center, and proceed south as far as the Congregational church. It is a distance of about a mile, and along here are thirty-eight places with dwelling houses. Take into account, not only the homesteads, but also all the land assessed to their owners in this town, even in several instances to constitute a large farm, and we shall find that a tax on land values of five per cent would lower the tax on thirty of these places by more than one-half. Of these other four homesteads the taxes raised only a small amount, from \$1 to \$6 each, and only two above \$25. In his late article in Scribner's, ex-Secretary of the Treasury McCullough says: "Of all property the homestead should be subject to the lightest taxation. . . . Humble homes ought everywhere to be protected against the tax collector." The ex-Secretary is looking for the single tax. That is the way it would work. To secure this result, upon which he declares the permanent benefit of our free institutions depends more than anything else, he ought to spend his remaining years in working for our reform with head and heart and both hands.

But let us return to the Republican. It takes advantage of my figures showing that the taxes on many large farms would be increased to say this: "One man's gain in this case means another's loss. Who are the losers? Manifestly the farmers whose buildings and other property have less value proportionately than their land." But I also said that if the owners of large farms were paying their land to its best use, the single tax would benefit them. I am ready to prove this, even when the direct taxation is alone considered. Let us take up again the case of the first large farm mentioned in my previous article, whose circumstances are singularly unfavorable. It is described and appraised in our valuation book as follows: "House \$275, barn \$600, farm, 150 acres, \$2,700." Now, instead of a \$375 house, such a one as our assessors would put at \$1,800 is as poor as the prosperous and enterprising farmer of 150 acres of land ought to live in. Instead of a \$600 barn he would have to have a much larger one or else separate shelters for his stock, whose aggregate value would be at the very least \$1,000. His stock and personal property would be at the lowest limit probably \$500. Then the improvements on the land when ready to be worked for all it is worth, would make its value mount up to \$50 an acre or \$3,000 for the whole farm. The Republican might perhaps like to object that this last item is too high, and so forth. This I can show that a 08 acre farm on the same road only a half mile distant from this one, with land originally of the same general character but which is better improved, is valued by our assessors at over \$7 an acre without the buildings. Accordingly with a house at \$1,800, barns at \$1,000, stock and personal property at \$500, and land at \$5,400, the farmer would be worth \$9,000, and like others in this town would doubtless be assessed for what he is worth. At the rate of \$14.50 per thousand, which was paid without objection, the tax on this improved place would have been under our present system over \$130. It could not have been so much under the George system, for our assessors now value the land at only \$2,700, and if we allow only \$200—and we would better allow \$500—for the present improvements on the land, consisting of some fruit trees, some smooth and clear grass land, and several miles of somewhat defective fencing, it will bring the original land value down to \$2,500, on which the George tax at five per cent would be but \$125. What the gain would be to the farmer if he lived in a \$2,500 house, or put up a couple of additional houses for his help, since the place is two miles from the village, let our opponents conjecture.

I have endeavored to estimate what amount a tax on land values of five per cent would produce in this town, and my figures indicate that it would be just about sufficient to pay our school and county tax and all town charges as they are at present. It might be that in some towns less developed than Oxford the amount realized would be so small as to impose strict economy upon them. I am ready to follow Professor Harris, the "Concord philosopher," long ago quoted approvingly by the Republican as showing that the whole annual revenue of the land of the country would not equal present taxation, and especially that Mr. George's proposition to "abolish all taxation save that upon land values" might amount to 150 per cent on the total value in this way:

If the present national and local taxes were all assessed upon land, land could not avoid the taxes by becoming cheap. If the value of land sank to five per cent of its present value the government would simply be obliged, on Mr. George's plan, to raise the rate of taxation twenty times the rate before assessed, and thus make it pay every year 150 per cent of its total value in order to get the requisite amount of revenue that it collects at present. The Republican once said that Henry George was followed by many "kind hearted snobs" with more sentiment than common sense. And opposed, I would say, by some philosophers with more prejudice than common sense. Neither Henry George nor any of his followers, I am sure, ever thought of taxing land values beyond what they would bear, but would even make the rate a little less than they would bear to avoid dispossessing present holders not keen for their land out of the way. And if necessary to supplement the single tax, Mr. George, in a note to chapter 29 of "Protection or Free Trade?" mentions several taxes capable of producing large amounts, which, though not economically perfect, are yet vastly less objectionable than any we have at present, and would injuriously affect production and trade very little if at all.

The Republican's claim in its late article, after supposing a "humble home of a workingman on a lot beside a costly mansion," that the George scheme would lift the burden from the wealthy owner and add to that of the poor man is refuted by Mr. Post in THE STANDARD of December 8. I do not wish to enter into any discussion of general principles—that I will leave to THE STANDARD's editors. I only wish to testify as an eye witness to facts visible everywhere here to everyone with eyes.

I assert that these conclusions are irresistible.

1. That the adoption of the single tax would bring a considerable abatement of the present taxes upon almost all "little homes."
2. That the amount abated from homesteads would fall upon the owners of our run down large farms; but when we take into accountthe relief granted them from indirect taxation through the tariff, they would as a class be at least as well off as they are now.
3. That the owners of large farms reasonably well equipped and in shape to be run for something like what they are worth, pay more direct taxes under our system to-day than they would have to pay under the George system.4. That our savings banks and insurance companies ought to be as solid after the adoption of the single tax as they are now, for the mortgagee would be better able to pay back the money loaned on his homestead. As a long time reader, friendly to the Republican and an admirer of its general course, I ask that paper to remember these things when it writes of Henry George again. It would be too much to expect it to expressly advocate our principles for some time yet, but when the real day of conflict comes, and the fight grows hot I feel sure from what I know of it that we shall have the Republican with us.
ALBERT S. CUSHMAN.

BALLOT REFORM.

The democracy of Indiana is solid for ballot reform.—(Indianapolis Sentinel (dem.)

No fault has been found with the workings of the Australian system thus far except by those who were in the habit of buying voters and who liked to know that they got the goods they purchased.—(Pensacola Commercial (dem.)

A good many people are asking the question: "What is the Australian system of voting?" It is a system by which every voter votes upon his own intelligence, and in which money, influence, intimidation, bribery or coaxing will have no part.—(St. Joseph, Mo., Leader.

The man who would stuff a ballot box or rob one is the worst of criminals, and could not be punished too severely. The appeal sees no way of foisting such villains except by the Australian plan, which is now in vogue in England, in Massachusetts and in Kentucky, applying only to municipal elections, however, in the latter state.—(Memphis Appeal (dem.)

When it is recalled that the use of money is becoming so notorious that bribery in politics of the states is as open as the sale of calico, and carried on as unobscuredly, it will be seen that unless some plan akin to the Australian system shall be adopted, the foundation of American democracy is most seriously threatened by the power of money. Unless the debauchery of politics shall be stopped we can read the decline of the American republic in the history of Rome.—(Broadwayville, Pa., Record (dem.)

There is a disposition, now that a political calm is inaugurated, to investigate the matter of bribery at elections. It is conceded that it has become a feature that may lead to the most dangerous results if continued. The matter can hardly draw too much a picture of the possibilities in that line. The discussion and investigation should be divested of partisan features and a public sentiment developed that will demand the most rigid enactments against bribery of voters, the use of vast sums of money in elections.—(St. Paul Globe.

THE NEW DEMOCRACY.

Trade restriction is so absurd a policy that it cannot stand free discussion.—(Eagle Pass, Tex., Guide.

There will be a free trade party in the next campaign, at least, so we prophesy.—(Providence, R. I., Independent Cleveland.

If Texas sheepmen cannot compete with Mexican sheepmen without an import tax—why not? Because Texas lands are costlier, are more valuable for some other purpose? Then why should they not be put to the more valuable use?—(Eagle Pass, Tex., Guide.

If the democratic party is to go into the next presidential canvass upon the question of the public revenue in any of its phases, they should begin the work of formulation, agitation and education now, and keep it up until the day of election, 1892.—(Rochester Union.

President Cleveland received 100,000 more votes than Harrison. Our Grover didn't win the election, because the laws are not built that way; but he did win a handsome endorsement from the people, a large majority of whom voted against candidate Harrison.—(Boston Globe.

The popularity of the schemes for blowing in the public money shows the evil of indirect taxation. Imagine a board of county commissioners passing acts to raise taxes and increase expenses—and then imagine the vigor with which the said board would be kicked out of office.—(Rockville, Ind., Tribune.

Capital can have no secure foundation under universal suffrage, except on the equality of rights and privileges. The laws must not only secure such equality, but they must see to it that the door must be closed to dispute upon that point, and it never can be closed so long as any portion of the community is taxed for the benefit of another.—(The Nation.

Trade needs freer movement, industry needs lighter burdens and wider fields. Both of these needs are denied by a fiscal system which abstracts and piles up currency and treasure at the rate of over \$100,000,000 a year, which impedes and more or less paralyzes industry in every natural channel of commerce, and which makes scarce and dearer the necessities of both production and consumption.—(Galveston, Tex., News.

Higgins & Co., run a big carpet factory in New York. During the campaign Higgins illustrated the dire results of "free trade" declared that the wages of all his operators would be reduced in case Cleveland were elected. Cleveland wasn't elected, but the wages came down all the same. After December 17 all of Higgins's operators who have been paid by the week will be reduced ten per cent, and the wages of those paid by the piece fifteen per cent. This is a practical lesson as to how and upon protection protects.—(Indianapolis News.

On the lines that he (Cleveland) has laid down, the battle for reform will be continued by the democratic party. It is one in which ultimate success is inevitable. All of the forces of modern life, all of the educational influences of our schools and colleges; all of the power gained by man's inventive ingenuity, by the extension of our railway lines, by the improvements in our business methods, by the destruction of natural barriers to the exchange of commodities, are working together for the overthrow of a system of restriction and protection handed down to the nineteenth century from the middle ages, and maintained now as then, at the expense of the nation and the benefit of the few.—(Louisville Courier-Journal.

Important Society Events.

Evening Sun.

Among the prominent persons at the Vanderburgh reception the other day was Hon. Barney McCullough of Pinkerton's detective agency, under whose especial care the host's big-a-brace and furniture were placed.

The Prince of Wales, having repudiated his Sandringham palace, all the first families of New York and Newport will give their pipes a thorough overhauling in the spring. There is much regret expressed that the season is too far advanced to have it done now.

Wasn't Writ In the Bond.

Magistrate (to prisoner arrested for assault)—You admit, then, that you pulled your landlord's nose?

Prisoner—Yes.
"Didn't you know that you had no right to do that?"

"No, sir; if I had no right to pull his nose he would have had it put down in the lease."

A CHRISTMAS STORY.

Mr. John Smith was a law abiding, conservative sort of man. His circle of acquaintances was not large, but those who did know him regarded him as a good citizen.

John was honest, industrious and frugal.

He married early in life, when he had nothing but his great big, strong hands with which to win his way. John sometimes thought that he had a hard time in this world, and once when the baby was sick so long and his wife fell on the cellar steps and broke her arm, he had to neglect his work for many weeks, and got in debt, so that it took him more than a year to get out. But, upon the whole, John was contented and reasonably happy.

And, moreover, he owned a comfortable home.

Mr. Smith had never read any works on political economy, and took but little interest in politics. He voted the same ticket that his father before him did, and voted it straight, no matter what names were on it. John had never belonged to any labor organization and had been heard to say that he never intended to join anything.

Only at one season of the year was John liberal in his expenditures, and that was at the holy Christmas time. It delighted him to gladden the eyes and hearts of his wife and children with generous gifts on that day, and it had been his custom for many years to begin at the first of each January to lay aside small savings for the purpose of making these purchases when the next Christmas should come.

This year he had by the middle of summer a neat sum saved for this cherished purpose, when suddenly he lost his employment and could find none other. Times were dull and employment scarce. The weeks slipped by and his savings melted away. John groaned in anguish when he thought of the cloak which he had intended to buy for his good wife, and he dreaded the coming of Christmas, which was now only two months away.

One night, for the want of something else to do, he attended a political meeting. The great hall was full to the doors. The speaker was a man of national renown. Many laboring people were in the audience and the address of the evening was in the main directed to them. He spoke of the dignity of labor and the joys of the home circle, depicted the grinding poverty of the laboring people in Europe, and contrasted the conditions there with happy America where the protective tariff laws brought prosperity and contentment to the sons of toil.

The enthusiasm of the people was at white heat, and the hall rang again and again with loud applause. But John Smith did not join in it, and as he walked home from the meeting he thought with bitterness of the coming Christmas and of the fact that that day he had spent his last dollar.

The next day he did what he had been doing frequently of late, went to the office of the Compound Hydraulic Manufacturing Company, where he had been employed so many years, and asked when the works would start again. The clerk said: "I do not know. Our works now are controlled by the Consolidated Hydraulic Company, you know, and we must do as they say."

That day John received a card from Blackstone & Statute, local attorneys for the Consolidated Compound Hydraulic Company, requesting him to call, which he did promptly.

John was shown into the private consultation room, and felt quite abashed when he saw such an assemblage of greatness. He was introduced to each gentleman present, among whom he found General Walker, candidate for governor; General Babler, nominee for congress; Mr. Overlapp, president of the Consolidated Hydraulic Company, and others.

Mr. Overlapp, as he shook hands with Mr. Smith, said "I am quite glad to see you, sir, and form your acquaintance, sir," and after taking a pinch of snuff from a gold box he resumed, "This is a conference, sir, in which we are considering as to what can be done to save our laboring men, sir, from coming into competition with the pauper labor of England, sir. Much depends upon the election from this district of our friend, General Babler, a true friend to the laboring man and a bitter enemy to British free trade. We are told that under the peculiar condition of things, sir, that you can be of great help to us in this little city, sir. I do not understand it exactly but Mr. Statute does and he will explain it all."

Here he paused, out of breath, and took snuff again, then added with a chuckle "Sly dog, Statute is, I must say."

Smith's eyes opened wide with wonder, but he said nothing. Statute looked the door, passed the cigars around, resumed his seat and said to Smith, "As you are aware (he was not aware of it, however) I am the chairman of our county committee and I have been neglecting no detail work necessary to win this fight. The race in this district is close and the majority may not be one hundred either way. We are losing strength in an unexpected direction in this city and to counteract it I have sent for you. You are an old resident here are you not?"

"Yes, sir," exclaimed John Smith, "but hold on; I am certainly not the man you want. There is some mistake. I know nothing about politics or electing people."

Overlapp took snuff. Babler winked at Walker and Statute continued: "You work for the Hydraulic company and own real estate do you not?"

John nodded.

"Earned your home by your labor—that is, paid for it out of your wages?"

"Yes—or no, not exactly," answered John. "My wife inherited some money from an uncle and that helped me to pay for it."

"Be need not mention that," exclaimed Overlapp.

"You will be well paid for what you are to do for us and I will explain exactly

what it is," continued Statute. "I have here a poster which is now being circulated." He held it up and it read like this:

PUBLIC MEETING.
The Ninth Ward Single Tax Club
will hold a public meeting at
Workingmen's Hall,
Thursday Evening, Nov. 1.

An able speaker will address the meeting favoring the proposition that our revenue should be raised by a single tax upon land values. Any workman present may ask questions or speak in reply to the address of the evening.

"Now these folks," said Statute, "teach free trade."

"D—d fools!" commented Overlapp. "We desire you, Mr. Smith," continued Statute, "to prepare yourself for the occasion, attend that meeting and at the close of the blatherskite speech that will be delivered, take the platform and reply to it. A speech from you to the workmen down in that ward will do much good."

John was thunderstruck. "W-h-a-t," he gasped, "me speak; why I never made a speech in my life."

"So much the better," said Statute. "I can instruct you what to say, or if you wish I will write it out for you. These fellows, you know, are drawing votes away from Babler by advocating free trade. They favor placing all taxes on real estate. You have in your speech but to tell how you have earned and have for twenty years owned a home of your own. Show them your tax receipt, which you must happen to have in your pocket, and explain how if taxes were all on real estate your property would have been swallowed up long ago. You can get right down to the meat of the question and show by your own case that this Henry George nonsense would ruin the small property holder."

"Henry George and all his followers are d—d anarchists, sir, and ought to be fired out," said Overlapp as he again resorted to his gold box.

Smith would give no answer that day but promised to keep the matter a profound secret and would give an answer the following day.

When half way down the stairs Smith returned and upon being again admitted to the august presence he had just left he stood with his hat under his arm and timidly asked Mr. Overlapp when work would be resumed at the Compound Hydraulic works.

"Just as soon, sir, as we win this election," replied the president. "While this tariff agitation continues we are forced to shut down. If the doctrine of protection to American labor wins in this fight I tell you sir things will hum and wages will be higher. Oh Lord! Statute, give me some water. I am almost choked."

Smith felt relieved now. He had been troubled as to the cause of the shut down at the mill, but now all his doubts had vanished. After the election would come good times.

Our hero slept little that night and thought much. He wanted to make the speech, yet he was an honest man and before he gave his promise he must satisfy himself as to a few points: Was it true that these Henry George men believed in placing all taxes upon land? Would it be right to accept pay for making a speech?

So the next day John donned his best clothes and called upon the editor of the leading paper in that city and politely asked him for information on two points: "Do political speakers receive pay for their work?" The wise newspaperman's answer to this question was "yes."

"Does Henry George believe in collecting all taxes from land?" The answer was "yes."

Smith's mind was made up. An hour afterward he had visited Statute and received \$50 in crisp new bills with the promise of fifty more after the speech was made, and he was further informed that he could be expected to work at the polls for Babler and the whole ticket.

Smith could hardly eat or sleep. His whole mind was on that speech. He wrote a dozen and burned them all up. The wife of his heart was almost crazed with anxiety for him, as she was in utter ignorance of the whole matter.

On Thursday morning an idea struck him. His speech would be a success. He hugged his wife with delight, and went at once to Cash & Trimmings, and bought the long-coveted cloak, for which he exchanged the \$50. To-morrow he would have more money, and be famous besides. The precious cloak was taken home and concealed in a safe place, not to be looked at again until Christmas morning.

Then Mr. Smith wrote a polite letter to the city tax collector, propounding certain interrogatories to that official. This he carried in person to the city building. The collector politely informed Mr. Smith that he would take pleasure in answering the letter, but that it was his busy season; the matter would require some examination and calculation, and that it would be late in the afternoon before he could possibly place the answer in Mr. Smith's hands. Where would he be in the evening? Mr. Smith would be at Workingmen's hall, seated near the front on the left hand aisle.

That night Workingmen's hall was well filled. The single tax club of the Ninth ward had reason to be proud of the meeting. It had been well advertised by posters, though the newspapers had not and would not mention it. A good band discoursed patriotic airs, the stage was neatly decorated, and all went merry as a marriage bell.

The chairman called the meeting to order, and stated that at the close of the address any persons in the audience might propound pertinent questions to the orator or speak in opposition to him.

The speaker was a laboring man from another city, and evidently had some experience in public speaking. His effort was a fairly good one. He in a general way advocated the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; depicted in graphic way the terrible tendencies of the times toward greater centralization and monopoly of natural opportunities.

He gave an intelligent exposition of the fallacy of protection, and at the close of his remarks declared that the remedy was to be found in the single tax.

Smith read the letter to its close and then faintly and was in bed three weeks with brain fever.

OFFICE OF BLACKSTONE & STATUTE,
Attorneys at Law.

Obadiah Overlapp, esq., Wall street, New York city.

Dear Sir: I am sorry to say that the majority in this city against Babler is 137, and in the district 95. We lost 300 votes in the Ninth ward.

I attribute it to that wretched Smith. He

and the only one which would afford relief to oppressed labor and make the struggle for existence less bitter in its intensity was the plan of collecting our public revenues by a single and direct tax upon land values. At the close the orator received liberal applause. The audience had been deeply interested and had paid close attention. Many were satisfied that protection was a fraud, and that unequal distribution rather than over production was the trouble, but the remedy had not been made clear. The dim outlines of the cat had not been brought to the eye.

When the speech was about half over a messenger boy came into the hall with a sealed letter addressed to John Smith, esq., and it was soon delivered to our hero.

John Smith sat during the speech like one paralyzed. He could neither speak nor move, and could hardly think. The idea of standing up before that great audience—horror! Why had he ever agreed to do such a thing? He sat there and held the tax collector's letter in his hand and wished that he could sink down through the floor into the very bowels of the earth too deep for the hand of resurrection to reach him. But the sound of the final applause aroused him, and with a tremor in his voice and with a firm step he placed himself in the aisle, and addressing the chairman, stated that he desired to be heard.

He was invited to the platform, and as he gazed into the sea of faces he saw in the corner near the door his friend Statute standing up and wearing a slouch hat.

He remembered now the fact that he had not examined the letter which he held in his hand and which was intended to be the principal part of his speech, but he could not stop; like Mazeppa, his mad steed would dash on and he must ride. He said:

"Mr. Chairman: I saw a poster advertising this meeting and I determined to attend it. The questions here discussed are of import to me. I labor for my own living and that of my well loved wife and children. The policy of the government or a change in it may not make much difference to the rich and the strong, but to you and me it may mean bread or starvation. But to come directly to the point. I have labored for a living all my life. I own and occupy a humble though comfortable home; a house and lot in this city. The speaker to-night advocates the raising of all revenues by a single and direct tax upon real estate, not including its improvements. We will all agree that if this new system of taxation would swallow up the homes and small holdings of real estate that it is vicious and ought to be frowned upon. If it would promote homes and small holdings it is a good thing and we ought to embrace it. The speaker to-night argued that we ought to relieve from taxation that which he calls the fruits of labor, to wit: personal property and improvements on land. To settle this question once for all in my own mind, and to determine whether I ought to vote for General Babler or his free trade opponent I this morning addressed a letter of inquiry to the tax collector, and I hold in my hand his reply, which I will now read to you:

John here paused and took a drink of water, and the audience cheered. All shades of opinion were pleased thus far and Statute was almost crazed with joy. John himself felt fully at ease; he felt that victory was his. His name would be in every newspaper. What a happy idea it was to go to the record for proof. Order was soon restored and John proceeded to read:

OFFICE OF CITY TAX COLLECTOR,
November 1.

John Smith, esq., city:
Dear Sir: Yours of to-day noted. In reply to your questions will say that from an examination of the records I find that you are assessed for taxation in this city as follows:

Lot No. 16, Overlapp's addition, \$200 00
Improvements on your lot, 1,000 00
Personal property, 500 00
Total valuation, \$1,700 00
Rate of taxation, 2 per cent.
Amount of your tax for year, \$34 00

The rate for twenty years has averaged 2 per cent, hence in twenty years you have paid, \$680 00

This city for taxation has the following valuation:
Real estate, \$5,000,000 00
Improvements, 1,300,000 00
Personal property, 700,000 00
Total, \$7,000,000 00
Our rate, 2 per cent.
Realizes per year, \$140,000 00

If we did not tax improvements and personal property our total valuation would be: Real estate values, \$5,000,000 00
And we would be compelled to increase our rate to 4 per cent.

Which would realize, \$200,000 00
Under such a system you would be taxed Upon real estate, 107 1/2 O. A. \$200 00
Rate per year, 4 per cent.

Total tax per year, \$80 00
For twenty years, \$1600 00
Take what you have paid, 680 00
And deduct, 100 00

And it shows your saving would have been, \$820 00
Under the single tax plan.

Of course such a system will never be adopted because it would be too hard upon those who hold idle land. Such a system in this city would double the taxes of Mr. Overlapp and other nonresidents, who invested in vacant lands here before the city was built.

Respectfully,
FEN POINT, City Collector.

Smith read the letter to its close and then faintly and was in bed three weeks with brain fever.

OFFICE OF BLACKSTONE & STATUTE,
Attorneys at Law.

Obadiah Overlapp, esq., Wall street, New York city.

Dear Sir: I am sorry to say that the majority in this city against Babler is 137, and in the district 95. We lost 300 votes in the Ninth ward.

I attribute it to that wretched Smith. He

sold out to the other side and made a free trade speech. I think he is a socialist. It looks like the country was safe, and that we have president, senate and house. Yours,
U. S. STATUTE.

S. W. W.

THE SINGLE TAX CLUB HOUSE.

Over Two Hundred More Shares Taken—
The Outlook for the Plan Very Encouraging.

Subscriptions for the purchase of a single tax house are still coming slowly in. The following subscriptions are acknowledged by the secretary:

J. H. Abrahams, 140 Nassau street, city, \$10
Wm. H. Hillier, 31 West Forty-eighth street, city, 10
George Marsh, 91 Fulton street, city (second sub-
scription), 5
Fritz Meyer, 26 West Forty-seventh street, city, 5
J. H. Sealy, 59 East Eighty-fourth street, city, 5
J. Silverman, 69 Broadway street, city, 5
W. J. Terwilliger, Columbia college, city, 5
H. F. Wood, 24 East Twenty-first street, city, 2
J. P. Crawford, 16 Court street, Brooklyn, 5
Joshua L. Atwood, 131 Baitelle street, Brooklyn, 5
E. D. 5
George H. Harwell, Whitestone, L. I., 5
Samuel E. Clarkson, Blue Bell, Pa., 2
C. S. Walker, 14 East street, Cincinnati, O., 2
J. A. Horgan, 26 Madison street, Chicago, Ill., 5
H. S. Deane, 100 Broadway street, New York, 5
J. B. Wallace, Maraton, Texas, 5

Previously acknowledged, \$152
Total to date, \$320

The secretary has been notified that subscriptions for about 100 shares besides are in the hands of friends, who will turn them in during the latter part of this week.

The following circular is issued by the sub-committee having in charge the receiving of subscriptions for the single tax club house:

THE SINGLE TAX HOME.

Those who have simply made a solitary subscription in this matter have not accomplished everything needed. To raise \$10,000 steadily, continued and persistent work is wanted by each man, woman and child. We subscribed will consider himself a committee of one to gather in subscriptions in his special vicinity, and to send them in at once to the secretary, William McCabe, 236 East Fourteenth street, New York city. The present temporary committee would therefore be applied to all who believe that the "Home" is a need and would aid in its procurement to send in their own and obtain as many outside subscriptions as possible, to do so, please forward them as above.

WILLIAM J. GONSTON,
A. J. STEERS,
Wm. MCCABE,
JEROME O'NEILL,
W. H. FAULKNER,
Committee.

Most of the friends subscribing merely send in their names, addresses and the amounts they will subscribe; but some accompany their subscriptions with a few words of encouragement.

George H. Harwell, Whitestone, Long Island, hopes that the requisite number of shares will soon be got, and says:

"If things go all right (my work, I mean) I will try to get another 'V' in it, but this is all I can do at present. I wish you success."

Samuel E. Clarkson, Blue Bell, Pa., enthusiastically indorses Mr. Steers' plan for the clubhouse, and then goes on to say:

Words cannot express the feeling that links me with you all, though entire strangers in the ordinary sense of the term. My field of propaganda is a small one and most trying. In an obscure section given over to the use of small farms and truck patches, they are wearily ignorant of the ills that beset the industrial masses in densely populated sections. But through the agency of a democratic society which I have been instrumental in founding, I hope to bring them to a clear conception of the beauties of the freedom of exchange in the hope that then they will be able to see the same truths in the freedom of production.

Those who desire to subscribe to the stock for the purchase of the single tax club house will find the blank on the eighth page of THE STANDARD, which they can fill in and forward as directed.

THEY HELD AN EXPERIENCE MEETING.

And One Member After Another Got Up and Recited Off Interesting Yarns.

The third lecture of the Manhattan single tax club in the Ninth congressional district was held last Sunday evening at 105 Second avenue. The attendance was even larger than on the previous Sunday. The speaker billed for the evening failed to appear, but one of the members took up a copy of "Protection or Free Trade?" and read the fourteenth chapter—"Do High Wages Necessitate Protection?" One member after another took the floor and told interesting stories. One speaker, who had been brought up in a ship yard, related how thirty years ago the east side was lined with ship yards where thousands of men were employed at good wages. The ships built there had the reputation of being the best built in the world; but a tariff was laid on necessary materials entering into ship building with the result that that industry was destroyed.

Another member, who had sailed the salt seas on Yankee ships with Yankee crews, said that while the Yankee sailor thirty years ago got the best wages of any sailor, still our ships were sailed the cheapest, sailed the fastest and sailed the best of any ships on the eastern or western oceans. Even in British ports the American ships were preferred. The protective tariff came, and the Yankee ships with Yankee crews were all but swept from the face of the salt water. Where twenty-five or thirty years the stars and stripes floated in every port of the world, now such a thing in a foreign port is a curiosity.

Another member, who had spent some years in Australia in the office of protection and free trade in the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria, which has heretofore been alluded to in the columns of THE STANDARD.

A man who lived in England during the emergence of that country from protection to such free trade as exists there to-day, spoke of the effect the change had made on the working people. The change, he said, had been a benefit, not only to labor but to capital productively used. The condition of the English workman was at least 100 per cent better than forty years ago; and the nearer the English people approached to absolute free trade the more improved would be the laborer's condition.

"If," said the speaker, "the average workman here or in England would examine the question for himself, in his own interests, the protection doctrine would then and there be doomed."

Mr. Steers came into the club room during the last speaker's remarks. He was called on for a speech, but instead of making one, he stated that he had just left Henry George's house, where a large party of friends were gathered to welcome him home. A member of the club thereupon arose and said that here were over a hundred of Mr. George's friends assembled, and though the hour was late (10:15) he moved that the club go up in a body to congratulate Mr. George on his safe return to us. The motion was carried unanimously.

inously, and the members marched up the wet pavements of Second avenue to Nineteenth street and to Mr. George's house, where they were cordially greeted.

NOW'S THE TIME TO STRIKE.

Everything is Ripe for a Brilliant Dash for Electoral Reform in Ohio—A Draft of a Petition to the Legislature.

The sketch of the Australian system given by Louis F. Post in THE STANDARD for December 1 is full of stirring suggestions. What he says, however, in the closing paragraph as to the policy of delaying this reform until the fullness of time, rather than endanger its complete success by premature action, seems to leave out of sight another view of the matter which, to my mind, shows delay to be dangerous. In Ohio politics the charge of bribery and the practice, too, has become so common already that a very large number of respectable citizens have come to look on the matter with despair, or, worse yet, with indifference, as an evil that cannot be cured but can be endured. True, there has not yet come to light in this state any widely organized plot, like that in Indiana, to "divide the flocks into blocks of five and put a trusted man with the necessary funds in charge of these five," etc., but there has certainly been as shameful buying and selling of votes here in times past as any we have heard of this year in Indiana. And this shamelessness is unquestionably due in a great degree to the prevalent belief that nobody cares much about it.

The newspaper history of election frauds in Cincinnati and Columbus is too fresh in the minds of the public to need more than mention here. But let me illustrate the spirit of the times by experiences taken from the under current of private life. In the largest government office in the northern part of this state was an employee eight years ago whom I knew personally. This man had a notoriety among the politicians of the city as a "worker." His boasting of having bribed so many Bohemians in the lumber yards at so much a head was so open that it was generally talked of among the sixty or seventy men in the office, and for a while it was a standing joke against him that he had himself admitted that he had "saved" money enough out of what had been "placed" with him to buy himself a suit of clothes. No one seemed to think very poorly of him for this bribery work. On the contrary, in election times he was treated by his chief in office with marked consideration.

Another example from this end of the state. A wealthy gentleman born in Cincinnati assured me a few days after the recent election that beyond a doubt there was really no help for this bribery; it was a common practice everywhere, and well known to be so. To corroborate this statement he cited the case of a young friend of his whom he named, a prominent politician in Cincinnati, who held a high office in Columbus. This young man had confessed, laughingly, to him that he had spent all the money he could raise and scrape to buy votes for his father. "Of course," he added, "it is a shame, but everybody does it—you've got to do it." And the manner in which this was told to me showed clearly enough that it was really considered no shame at all.

This indifference is not surprising when one considers the general tone of the press on this point. The Cincinnati Commercial Gazette repeatedly and urgently solicited contributions of money in the last campaign to be sent into Indiana. In one of its editorials in the last days of the campaign this paper warned its readers that the democrats were pouring a flood of money into Indiana, especially from Kentucky, and were devoting it to unscrupulous debauchery of Indiana politicians. It put the matter in this way: "The democrats must contribute promptly and liberally; and then, with cool effrontery, added that no republican need entertain the slightest fear that this money would be put to bad use."

Indeed, the foul history of Ohio elections for the last twelve years would satisfy any one, I think, that if it was only fulness of time we had to wait for this carbuncle of bribery was ready to prick long ago. I do not think, therefore, it is too early to suggest to the single tax men of Ohio that as soon as possible they start a petition for this purpose. The petition below is framed after the suggestions of Mr. Post's article. If single tax men throughout the state will publish in their local papers some petition like this and invite all citizens, irrespective of party, to assist in circulating it they will be fully as likely to secure a large list of names now they would, if they waited for a stronger feeling on the subject. Interest in these outrages fades with the remembrance of them. And the bribers themselves have not yet anticipated the movement and plotted to defeat it.

For my own use I have drawn up the following (thanks to Mr. Post).

To the Honorable the Legislature of the State of Ohio.

The undersigned, citizens of the state of Ohio, believing that without freedom and honesty in elections are carefully preserved, government of the people, by the people, for the people is impossible, and believing therefore that intimidation and bribery in elections are not only disgraceful but calamitous, degrading those who can be frightened, corrupting those who can be bought, humiliating every citizen who takes pride in his country, tending swiftly to the overthrow of all faith in representative government and of these disasters constituting every briber and intimidator an assassin of American liberty, therefore, we desire and petition your honorable body that the election laws now in force in this state be so amended as to provide safeguards for the freedom and purity of our elections, similar to those provided by what is known as the Australian system, and that this amendment shall provide especially as follows:

1. That ballots for any office shall contain the names of all candidates for that office.
2. That all ballots be printed at public expense.
3. That these ballots be so marked on the back, or stamped, that when folded the endorsement will show the ballot to be official.
4. That only one of these ballots, or set of ballots, be delivered by sworn officers to each voter as he presents himself to vote.
5. That the voter deliver his ballot to the inspectors so folded as to conceal its face and expose the official endorsement.
6. That there be no communication with him, except by election officers for official purposes, from the time he receives his ballot until he votes.
7. That no voter be allowed to cast any ballot but such as he receives from the election officers.
8. That immediately after voting he withdraw from the secluded part of the polling place.

If the single tax men of Ohio will circulate and gather in these petitions it will be an easy matter to secure the presentation of them to the state legislature. And if this reform is carried out it is scarcely necessary to add that when the question of a single tax is put to popular vote, as before long it may be, the selfish interests and timid prejudices arrayed against us cannot employ bribery for their ally. The battle we fight then can be more certainly fought on the merits of the issue.

WALTER H. BRECHER.
Cincinnati, Ohio.

STRAWNS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

The single tax clubs and societies are going right along with their discussions on this important question. Every one has a natural right to a dwelling place somewhere on earth or else has no business or, no right on the planet.—[The Craftsman.]

In the future THE TEXAS TRIBUNE, published at San Antonio, will contain several columns devoted to the dissemination of the truths of the single tax doctrine. This doctrine is now claiming the attention of our ablest and best men. Everyone who desires the prosperity and happiness of all men ought to understand and accept it.—[Pearshall, Texas, Sun.]

Dakota farmers are after the non-resident land owner with a proposition to throw all the taxes on land values. Unlike our Ontario farmers, who persist in the futile attempt to tax personality, the Dakota men see that by taxing land values solely they will not increase their own burdens but will make it impossible for the land speculator to exist.—[Toronto Globe.]

There are certain general reforms which have to do with the well-being of farmers everywhere, for there can be no diversity of interest among agriculturists when it comes to checking the ravages of these devouring "trusts," and in limiting the greedy rapacity of the railway gang who, unless they are forcibly withheld, will rob every farmer of the land of his just profit, would the consequences freight rates. Let the farmers' rallying cry for 1892 be "Government ownership of all railways."—[The Farmers' Voice.]

The proposition to tax land values only would meet the opposition, not only of all the large land speculators, who are holding vacant and unimproved land to be made valuable by other parties, but also of all the small land owners, who do not yet see the benefit it might be to them. There is one plainly apparent reason, however, that ought to appeal powerfully to all thinking men in favor of such a reform. It is the absurdity of taxing in proportion as they are industrious, honest, saving and patriotic.—[East Oregonian.]

The single tax men are reformers of the kind who don't have any such word as defeat in their dictionary. Every campaign is a palpable gain for them because it gives them an opportunity to spread the light on the great truth which they believe is the only needful for men to see and understand in order to become converted to. No sooner is the election over than the single tax men organize for a move to amend the state constitution so as to allow the legislature to take the laws in accord with the single tax principle that it is unjust to tax men more for making land useful than for holding land idle.—[Northwestern Labor Union.]

The single tax movement is again springing forward throughout the country. The Texas and Minnesota legislatures will be forced to meet and wrestle with the question this winter, as in both states petitions have been circulated and thousands of signatures obtained to exempt all improvements on land and all personal property from state taxation. They have been secured by the farmers, merchants and, in fact, the very best elements in the states. The land speculators are in a flurry over the matter, as they see the coming of that time when they cannot afford to hold the natural opportunities of labor out of the market.—[Clinton, Ind., Argus.]

Before the late election many sensible farmers and other good citizens in Waller county, imagined that the single tax doctrine meant injustice to those who own land, and contemplated taking away their farms, and giving them to people who had none. This interest in the single tax movement was kindled by designing men who do not wish the single tax to succeed. The agitation of the question during the canvass has brought out the truth to these farmers and good citizens who had not taken the trouble to look into the matter. They now see clearly that what is proposed by single tax men, will unquestionably reduce the taxation on farmers' property.—[Hempstead, Tex., Advance Guard.]

The advocates of the single tax in Minneapolis are starting an agitation of the masses by petitions to the legislature. The real estate dealers promptly take alarm and hold intimidation meetings, declaring that

MOTHER ANTOINE'S LAD.

Jean Richman.

How did I learn the story that I am going to tell you? What concern is it of yours, provided I tell it well. Now, I am sure of telling it well. I declare this before hand and without any of an author's conceit; for I have nothing to do with it as an author, and shall confine myself to simply noting the facts just as I have gathered them.

Once on a time there was a poor grandmother and her poor grandson, who possessed nothing in the world but their affection for each other; and the grandmother was seventy-seven years of age and the grandson was eight.

They lived on the sixth story in a tenement house in an alley between Belleville and Menhantment, a quarter where there are few rich people. Now, even among this wretched population, the wretchedness of these two was marked. That tells how great it was.

Look at it. The child was sick, crippled, confined to bed during the past twelve months, and the old woman was very old, very feeble, so that with the best good will in the world she could not really work much.

Fortunately, beggars are good to their fellows. The poor folk of the quarter bestowed alms on this poverty, more pitiable still than their own, and their charity, joined to some allowance from the board of relief, supported the life of grandmother and grandchild.

The old woman was called Mother Antoine, and the child was called Mother Antoine's Lad (mome). He was not known by any other name, for he had never been seen running and playing in the street with the gamins of his age; no comrade had ever been heard calling to him across the street; all you heard was from time to time, among the neighbor women—

"Well, Mother Antoine's lad, how is he?"

Alas! he was going from bad to worse, was Mother Antoine's lad. The poor boy was consumptive and sickly, and when he was not crying from the dull pain of his hip disease, he was coughing a dry and bloody cough, which brought two bunches of dull violets to his cheeks.

During his childhood, although he limped and was often on his back, he had had, nevertheless, some fairly good turns. Then the grandfather, who was still working (although he was eighty years old, took him nice walks in the fresh air and the sunlight, and gained means to buy, here or there, the remedies which set him up for a few weeks. But since then he had lived in this wretched garret, on the sixth story, over a court yard, from which arose the stale odor of the sinks, since the old woman could not scrape together more than was just needed to keep them from dying of hunger—since December of last year Mother Antoine's lad had never got up, and in all probability would never get up again.

The last time he had been out was Christmas day.

On that day Mother Antoine had wrapped him up as best she could in a big muffler which she had made of her old shawl; she had put on him her two only pairs of stockings to keep his feet warm in his new rubbers, and she had taken him to the boulevard, along the little stalls full of toys, figures and dolls that made a splendid array of colored fairy land.

This fairy land had remained in the eyes and in the imagination of the sick boy, and ever since he had spoken of it with thrills of regret and desire, opening his mouth wide in ecstasy and stretching out his thin little arms to the mirage of all these forgettable marvels of which he had caught a glimpse.

There was, first and foremost, away down near the Place du Grand Opera, a superb punchinello—striped and gilded, almost as tall as the little stunted being himself—which, when one pulled the string, shook gayly its bells and rattles, raised its arms, flung out its legs and looked at you at the same time with its illumined face and almost living grin.

"Oh, how pretty it was, how pretty it was!" Mother Antoine's lad had often cried; "It is very dear, mammy, is it not, a punchinello like that?"

"Come now, I will buy you one of them, when we are richer."

"And when shall we be richer?"

"Soon, my pet, soon."

"Then I shall have it, eh? the punchinello?"

"Yes, yes, you shall have it."

"For you see, mammy, I am sure that if I had it I should be cured at once."

This same idea recurred incessantly as though he were possessed by it. And when he was worse than usual, the poor little thing, when his pains racked him fiercest, when his terrible cough shook him as if it would tear the breath out of him, oh, then, the desire became more active—almost poignant. Anybody could see that it added to his sufferings, and that in reality the possession of the toy would ease his pain like a charm.

And she knew this, old Mother Antoine. By dint of promising the punchinello she came to feel that she must keep her promise, and that she had no other way but this to keep her cherub alive a little longer. Yes, he should have it, the punchinello. And he would be cured! She, too—she herself had ended by believing in this mad hope.

Yes, he should have it. But how? As he said himself with tears of impotent longing, it must cost a deal, a punchinello like that! It was a toy for the rich. At least twenty francs. Perhaps more.

Where could she find this gold, she who no longer knew the color even of silver, and who only saw at long, long intervals, a few big copper sous among the alms she received. Twenty francs! Why, a fortune!

She traded off the rags that were given her at the beginning of winter. She even sold the occasional tickets for bread and of which she had such trouble to get.

She herself fasted. And when he appeared by himself he said to her, "What are not hungry, mammy?"

"No," she answered, "they made me swallow a plate of soup in the cabinet-maker's shop."

Thus she passed two days together, sometimes without tasting anything. What matter! He should have his punchinello.

She had economized in this fashion for three months, and on the day before yesterday she had altogether nine francs three sous.

"At least ten francs," she thought; "I must have at least ten francs! Still seven sous to find between now and tomorrow!"

That day, Mother Antoine's lad was terribly sick. With the fortnight's cold spell just passed you see in what a state the dear little angel must have been. And her poor neighbors cannot bestow much charity on the old woman, they themselves dying of cold and hunger. No more rags to sell; three tickets for bread and wood; that was all that remained in the garret.

But the little one is so low—so low that he can swallow nothing. What use, then, for bread to-day? For her? Not a word of that. And to-morrow? Ah, to-morrow she will find some. What is wanted at the moment, the necessary, the indispensable thing is not food, but the punchinello. If he had it there, now, in his trembling little fingers, surely he would be better.

"How pretty it was!" he said with a stifled rattle in his throat.

And his eyes grew larger; his nostrils, pinched by disease, suddenly quiver, a warm glow comes on his skin, life returns to his pale lips. Life, yes, life. He will live if his dream is realized.

"How pretty it was!"

"I am going to get it for you, yes, I am going right away."

"What, the punchinello?"

"Yes, the punchinello."

"So, we are rich, mammy?"

"Yes, my pet. Look here!"

She shows him her nine francs three sous. It is all in sous, there is a big heap of them.

The child claps his hands.

"Go quick, mammy; go quick, now. Do not be long."

She has gone. No, she will not be long. With her old feeble limbs she first runs about to her neighbors to sell the three tickets, the last ones.

"It is to buy a remedy for the lad," she says, and she speaks the truth. It is, indeed, a remedy that she is going in search of.

Ten francs, she has them at last! She had to waste half an hour on it, but at last she has them. How she hurries on, tottering and stumbling, in spite of the slippery pavement, in spite of the numbing cold that freezes her bones; for she has eaten nothing yesterday, nothing to-day, and she has put her crusts on the sick child's bed. She has only a wretched petticoat and a thin jacket over her shift. Br-r-r! She will go spite of all. It is a long way, too. She will not go to the first store she comes to. She must go away—away, near the Grand Opera. The punchinello, perhaps, is still there this year, and who knows? perhaps it does not cost more than ten francs.

Yes, it was indeed the same, and for ten francs she got it, by bargaining. It was indeed the same. She recognized it. She returns, pressing it close to her heart with all a mother's care, as though afraid of hurting it. She, too—she said:

"How pretty it is!"

Let us cut short. Fate is the most terrible of dramatic creators. No one invents such striking effects as Reality. When you attempt to set forth one of the supreme situations in life, all that is left is to do so in two words.

The old woman had been away two full hours. On her return she found the child dead.

Yesterday Mother Antoine's lad was buried.

Mother Antoine placed in the little coffin, on the shroud made out of a patched gown, the pretty punchinello, covered with dazling colors, tinkling bells, wonderful gilding. And thus the little corpse had its Christmas box.

May Mother Antoine soon have her New Year's gift—Death!

The Iron Duke at Waterloo.

The following selection is taken from an English publication by Mr. Murray, containing an account of conversations between the duke of Wellington and Earl Stanhope from 1831 to 1851:

Nobody, said the duke, could ever say exactly when the battle of Waterloo commenced. Lord Stanhope asked him what was the total number of killed at Waterloo. The duke replied:

"On both sides there must have been between thirty and forty thousand. It is impossible ever to say exactly what the French lost. I remember seeing a large French column entering the wood behind Hougomont, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

At dinner I asked him whether he could make out Napoleon at Waterloo on the opposite heights. "No, I could not—the day was dark—there was a great deal of rain in the air. I made out Soult most plainly. I had an excellent telescope. I saw him come up—all the officers took off their hats as he turned toward them. I saw him spying at us—write and send off a letter. I knew he was writing, and another about as large going out on the other side. I said, 'This is the eddied maneuver I never saw!' but on looking more closely I found that the last column consisted only of wounded. There were thousands limping off from the field."

CONCERNING THE FORTUNES OF T. THOMPSON, GAMBLER.

Blackly Hall in New York Sun.

Shortly after noon yesterday the sunlight climbed over a ridge of the big Metropolitan Opera House, glanced into a room on the third floor of an unpretentious looking house, and threw a mellow autumnal haze over the gaunt figure of a gentleman who was painting his hat with benzine. He wore a night shirt, a pair of easy slippers and an air of languor.

"This is dead low ebb," he muttered to himself despondently. "I haven't hit the benzine bottle before for six years. But it's a good old bottle all the same," he added, with a fond air, as he continued to touch up the rusty places of his dark beaver with the strong smelling fluid.

Slowly rising to his feet he held the hat off at arm's length and turned it around admiringly.

"Fit for a winner," he said shortly. He threw the shades open widely and dragged himself listlessly around the room in search of his boots. One hung in the paper rack on the wall and the other lay on the floor under the dressing table. After examining them critically by the light of the sun he went over to the washstand, took a small sponge and carefully washed the blacking from the boots. Then he dried them with a towel with paternal care, opened another of the many bottles on the mantelpiece and began to varnish the boots carefully.

"There's only one satisfaction," he remarked with his next breath, "about this whole business, and that is that I can do it a devilish sight better than that infernal nigger could."

While the shoes were drying, a full hour was put in by the gambler in shaving himself with extraordinary care, arranging his hair, and brushing his clothes. The benzine bottle came in again for one or two rusty spots on the seams, but when he was fully attired, had thrust a little cambric handkerchief into his pocket, pulled on a new pair of gloves, and had shaken himself together, he presented an appearance of wealth and affluence.

"A man in my position," he said, addressing himself in the mirror, "has to sail too close to the wind to take any chances. Anybody looking at me would think I am a duke; but I ain't. I've got to keep up the bluff. If New York gets on to the fact that I am busted I'll have to get out of town before night."

At the corner a flower girl smiled gently upon the sorrow-faced but correct looking gentleman who approached her. She stood on her toes to pin a big white rose on the lapel of his coat.

"How many do I owe you for now, Katie?" asked Mr. Thompson thoughtfully.

"Not a single one," said the girl promptly. "You paid enough in one day last month to buy flowers for five years."

"Better keep the score," said the gambler sturdily. "I'm going to hit 'em hard, to-night, and to-morrow I'll make good."

"Well, then, it's sixteen," said the girl quietly.

"Good Gawd!" muttered the gambler. "Broke for sixteen days. No wonder I feel queer."

He stood in a brown study for a long while, and then casually wandered down Broadway until he came to another group of gamblers who had come out to enjoy the sunlight, and who were attired with remarkable care. There were seven or eight in the group, and they were more correctly dressed than any similar number of millionaires that could be picked out in the country. They all had their clothes made by a crack tailor, their boots and the other details of their attire were beyond criticism, and they were clean shaven and redolent of roses.

A broad grin went round the group as Mr. Thompson sauntered up and accepted a cigar. He looked at it nervously a moment before striking a match, and then slowly bit off the end. It was a big, black, expensive sort of a weed, and it reeked of heartburn and indigestion in every fiber. The pallid and fagged gambler stared at the weed a moment longer, and then, dropping the match that one of his cronies had given him, carefully put the cigar in his pocket and shook his head.

"That's a pretty strong breakfast, Tommy," said an ex-pugilist and gambler who was in the group, eyeing his friend shrewdly.

"Oh, I've had my breakfast," remarked the hero of the benzine bottle carelessly. "Never."

"You're a liar," said the pugilist calmly, but with a benevolent twinkle in his shrewd gray eye.

"Well," said Mr. Thompson, weakly and candidly, "perhaps I am."

"In which case," said the pugilist, "you comes up with me and breakfasts at my flat."

Mr. Thompson straightened himself up a bit and acquiesced with a nod of his head. Then he went through the superfluous form of drinking a cocktail to give him an appetite, and he and the ex-pugilist walked slowly up Broadway, after nodding an adieu to the others. They turned westward into Twenty-eighth street, climbed to the second story of an apartment house, and entered a flat.

There were \$4,000 or \$5,000 worth of pictures on the walls. The carpets were Axminster and velvet, with hangings superbly embroidered. The furniture was of the most costly and unique pattern. Everything was in admirable taste, and all the fittings had evidently been designed for the rooms. On the portieres was woven in several places the initial "T." All of the expensive cut glass was adorned by the same letter, and so in turn was the silver. The magnificent sideboard in the dining room was built up in scrolls and elaborate workmanship until the apex was reached, and on this apex was a bronze Bacchante holding aloft a silver horn of plenty, which was also in the shape of the script "T."

The eyes of the ruined sport wandered over this cabalistic letter half carelessly as he sank into a chair in the dining room, and conversed amiably about the weather, the races, and the big winnings of a mutual friend about whom the whole town had been talking for a day. There

was nothing about Mr. Thompson's manner that indicated more than a passing interest in the surroundings.

A woman of remarkable beauty strolled into the apartment, clad in a long pink dressing gown, with lace around her throat and sleeves. Her blond hair was piled upon her head carelessly, and her brown eyes had the lazy look of an untidy housewife. Her face would have been familiar to half the cigarette-smoking boys in the country, for it is the one most often seen plastered about in the tobacco shops. She married Mr. Thompson's host three weeks ago and forsook the foot-lights forever. Her air was amiable and easy going.

"Tommy," she said shortly, "I hear you are in hard luck."

"Well, yes," said Mr. Thompson carelessly. "they've been ruinin' against me a little lately, but that's the way things go once in a while, you know. I lose about eighteen thou in a month."

"It must make you kinder sad," the lady of the house said, glancing around, "to come into this place, don't it?"

Mr. Thompson affected to be unconscious of the meaning of the remark for a moment, and then said, as though a light had just burst over him:

"Oh, yes, I understand. Hadn't thought of it before. Mightily glad I got it off my hands, though, and it's lucky Tieman had the money to buy me out, for the 'T' answers just as well for him as it does for me."

"Where are you living now?" asked Mrs. Tieman commiseratingly.

"I make my headquarters at the Hoffman place," said Mr. Thompson lightly; "but I have a quiet suite of apartments up town, where I sneak off at times and get a good night's rest."

At the mention of Mr. Thompson's "quiet suite of apartments," a close observer might have seen a broad grin on the face of the ex-pugilist, who was changing his collar before the bevelled mirror in one of the inner rooms.

They went out to breakfast and ate from the china which Mr. Thompson had made for his own use when he was in affluence less than a month before. The breakfast was ample. When Mr. Thompson lit his cigar, threw out his chest, and strolled out of the house again, he made a direct cut for Fifth avenue, and walked up as far as the park and back again with the languid and exclusive air of a club man taking his constitutional.

It was well on toward 4 o'clock when he returned, and from that time on he went from one group to another on Broadway, and managed to drift to the bar at frequent intervals, but at 8 o'clock all of the gamblers had disappeared, and Mr. Thompson sat alone in the corridor of the Gilsey House, making a pretense of reading an evening paper. Once or twice he put his hand in his upper waistcoat pocket, took out a ten-dollar bill and looked at it longingly. He was hungry, but he had a scheme in view for that ten-dollar bill, and each time he replaced it carefully in his pocket.

Shortly after 8 an acquaintance came along with two seats for the theatre, and from that time till 11 o'clock Mr. Thompson was a quiet spectator of Mary Anderson's performance at Palmer's theatre. He only went out once between the acts, and that was because his friend remarked that he was looking very seedy, and suggested a drink.

"I'll go you," said the gambler emphatically, as they started out. "Miss Anderson drives me to drink. She's too pure and good for this earth altogether, but she's the queen of them all. I used to kick because people talked so much about her purity, but now I've come to the conclusion that they don't talk enough."

"When I compare myself," continued Mr. Thompson dramatically, "to that pure and beautiful young woman, I feel like what I am—a dead sea looser."

It was probably melancholy arising from these impressions, along with the lack of dinner, which drove Mr. Thompson into a fit more or less tinged with desperation when he walked in to a gambling house on Twenty-ninth street just after the theater was out. He had left his friend at the corner. Another large cigar, a memento from an acquaintance, reposed between the clenched teeth of Tommy Thompson, Esq., as he sauntered into the double parlors of the house and went directly to the faro table. Everybody was looking at a little Hebrew salesman who had won fourteen times handrunning, and a crowd of other players were following the salesman's lead. There were three or four quick nods to the well known arrival, and then the gambler went over to the little cage in the corner of the room, passed in his \$10 to the cashier within, took his two blue chips, and strolled back to the table. He was a picture of lazy composure and insolent complacency. No man who looked at the long, handsome keen face with the heavy eyes, drooping moustache and blasé expression would have supposed that the gambler was staking the last cent that he could beg or borrow on his bet as he laid down his chips on the table. He had observed that the pile of chips of the Hebrew salesman had assumed the rough semblance of the letter "A," and the apex of the letter was toward the queen on the table.

"A for Anderson," said the gambler quietly. "She's a queen, and the queen's my play."

He won. Luck ran toward him like a shot, and a few moments later as the cards ran low he called the turn. Twenty minutes later a terrific row suddenly broke out between the Hebrew salesman and the dealer. The negro waiters hurriedly closed the doors and whisked off their aprons, and there was a quick, determined effort on the part of everybody to suppress the disturbance. A crowd of seventy or eighty men was present, many of them of unquestioned standing in the business world, and the altercation grew higher and higher until the proprietor of the bank hurried in from the upper rooms, where a quiet game of poker was going on. Just as he entered there was a collision between the salesman and Thompson, who was acting the part of peace-maker. A short scuffle ensued, in which the hero of the benzine bottle was cut across the forehead by a falling gas globe. The proprietor closed the game, the checks were cashed in, and the players pushed out into the street. A white rag was bound across Mr. Thompson's forehead, but he smiled serenely amid it all, and slowly emptied his box of blue and yellow chips as they called a coupe for him. The chips were cashed in. He thrust \$1,100 into his pocket, drove home to his lodgings, waked up the aged landlady, and an hour later he might have been seen amid champagne and cold chicken salad, as happy a gambler as New York could show. Just before he went to bed there was a rattle on the pavement opposite the Metropolitan opera house as the gambler fired a fusillade of bottles out of his window before turning in for the night. The benzine bottle went last and with a parting benediction from the knight of the green cloth.

WHAT DO THE ANIMALS SEE?

And What Music Do They Hear That We Cannot Conceive?

"It has been shown that animals hear sounds which are beyond the range of our hearing," says John Lubbock, "and that they can perceive the ultra violet rays, which are invisible to our eyes."

"Now, as every ray of light which we can perceive at all appears to us as a distinct color, it becomes probable that these ultra violet rays make themselves apparent to the ants as a distinct and separate color (of which we can form no idea), but as different from the rest as red is from yellow or green or violet. The question also arises whether white light to these insects would differ from our white light, in containing this additional color. As at any rate, as few of the colors in nature are pure, but almost all arise from the combination of rays of different wave lengths, and as in such cases the resultant would be composed not only of the rays we see, but of these and the ultra violet, it would appear that the color of objects and the general aspect of nature must present to animals a very different appearance from what it does to us."

"These considerations cannot but raise the reflection how different the world may be to us from what it does to us. So long as we are conscious of the vibrations of the air strike on the drum of our ear. When they are few the sound is deep; as they increase in number it becomes shriller and shriller; but when they reach the number of the sound of a whistle, and they cease to be audible. Light is the effect produced on us when waves of light strike on the eye. When four hundred millions of vibrations strike the retina in a second, they produce red, and as the number increases, the color passes into orange, then yellow, green, blue and violet. But between 400,000 vibrations in a second and four hundred millions of vibrations we have no organ of sense capable of receiving the impression. Yet between these limits any number of sensations may exist. We have five senses, and sometimes fancy that we cannot measure the infinite by our own narrow limitations."

"Moreover, looking at the question from the other side, we find in animals complex organs of sense richly supplied with nerves, but the functions of which we are yet unable to explain. There may be fifty other senses as different from ours as sound is from sight; and even within the boundaries of our own senses there may be endless sounds which we cannot hear, and colors as different as red from green, of which we have no conception. These and a thousand other questions remain for solution. The familiar world which surrounds us may be a totally different place to other animals. To them it may be full of music which we cannot hear, of color which we cannot see, of sensations which we cannot conceive."

The Ashanti in Battle.

In an article discussing the military qualities of the negro, published in the December number of the *Fortnightly*, Lord Alva deley speaks of the Ashantis as "a fine, brave fighting people," whose courage is based almost entirely on fear.

If in battle the Ashanti turns to fly, there are men on the lookout close behind him who have positive orders to kill him without any question. If these men in the second line fall back, the first line will shoot them down again in the third line, when I may cut the subaltern officers, will kill both them and the runaway coward. There are several lines of several grades behind the front fighting line, each line being a reserve, and the first line is imposed upon it, until the general command is reached. If he falls if he is defeated, he answers for his failure with his head when he returns to his king at Comassie. In the organization of all civilized armies much stress is laid upon the chain of responsibility, the soldier through all ranks, from the commander in chief to the private soldier. In the Ashanti army, or nation, for they are one, the emblem of responsibility is the executioner's knife. The man in front feels that under every circumstance he incurs less risk by going forward than by running away, for the latter at least is certain death. The refrain of the Ashanti war song, which they sing together in a shouting voice when going into action, was:

If I go forward I die,
If I go backward I die;
Better go forward and die.

Yet this fear-begotten courage is capable of great things, as the following story will show:

After the Ashantis had fallen in their attack on Fort Abracobra, I sent a party of thirty men to guard the fort. The Ashantis had fallen back to gather food, leaving only a few isolated men to watch over their camp. One of these men, quite alone, who might easily have escaped, remained within five feet of the fort, and when he saw a party of Ashantis advancing with much noise. He coolly fired into the party, and unwatched by any of his people, faced alone the pursuers.

Preparing for the Approaching Storm but This Won't Save Them.

A "Landlord" writes to the *Pitt Mail Gazette* as follows:

I saw to-day, in a draft loose for a west end shop, the following new covenants, which may interest some of your friends who are agitating for a reform of the land laws: "And the lessee covenant that they will pay all rates and taxes, etc., and the land tax, and when now or shall or may at any time during the continuance of the said term be rated, charged, assessed or imposed on or in respect of the said demised premises, or any part thereof, or on the landlord or tenant, or any person claiming in respect thereof, by authority of parliament or otherwise." It will be for those who draft any bills dealing with taxation of ground rents, or values, to see that the intentions of the legislature are not defeated by contracts of this nature.

The Very Sad Story of a Flutist.

Mole picked up his cherished \$9.20 flute last night, and lied him forth to serenade his best girl. It was a lovely evening; the pale moon shed a soft silvery sheen over her pale puerile face, and the wind was in respect, there was a dreamy, tender little selection, and soon the window above was gently opened, and his fair young innamorata listened enraptured to the mellow tones of the flute. The slight vision at the window stimulated Mole to renewed efforts; he wiped his mouth, he took a firm grip on the flute, puckered his lips, and prepared to throw large slabs of sentiment into his new piece, entitled "I am a Flutist," but at this juncture a shadowy figure appeared on the scene, and Mole, without leaving his card. He put in his best looks, and managed to keep ahead the first

hundred yards; then the dog began to gain rapidly on the unfortunate flutist; the frightened girl at the window called wildly to the bloodthirsty canine,

