

children's voices could be heard the music, and remembering the fire drill which they had so often practiced for such an emergency the pupils fell into line and marched out of the building. Then Raymond Schaeffer, the nine-year-old son of Sergeant Schaeffer of the Evanston police, ran hatless and coatless to the firebox a block away and standing on his tiptoes turned in the alarm.

The fire department soon arrived and extinguished the flames. The fire was caused by an overheated furnace and the damage to property did not exceed \$200.—Chicago Chronicle of December 17.

A CHRISTIAN CHINAMAN.

"Me no plosecute. Me gotte Chlistian lelligion. Me do by burgial men like me be done by."

His pigtail bobbing as he laughed in glee, Ching Wong, Chinese laundryman, 667 West Forty-seventh street, today refused to prosecute the man alleged to have held him up and robbed him of \$30.

Although Justice Jandus and police from the Stockyards police station insisted that the Chinaman prosecute the man they had taken so much trouble to arrest, Ching Wong smiled, blinked his biased little eyes and insisted that it wouldn't be the duty of a "Chlistian."

When his place was held up October 18 he had been insistent in his demands on the police to ferret out the case. When Patrick Bligh was arrested December 7, Ching Wong was positive in his identification and wanted to prosecute the man to the fullest extent of the law. Now he only smiles and says he doesn't care to get his money back or punish the man.

"Not Chlistian," is his only excuse.—Chicago Evening Post of December 19.

WHAT THE PHILIPPINE CENSUS HAS ESTABLISHED.

From the Report of the Secretary, Erving Winslow, to the New England Anti-Imperialist League at its meeting in Boston, November 30.

The recent census in the Philippines has established two points—the comparatively insignificant number of those wild tribes, the Apaches of President Roosevelt, who would have produced in the islands a welter of blood on the withdrawal of the American forces, and the fact that the Filipinos were practically a Christian nation, there being 7,000,000 civilized Filipinos, meaning those who have been baptized in the Catholic church,

and but 650,000 wild or barbarous Filipinos scattered through the various islands. Our census takers found no better means of prosecuting their work than to employ the very careful and trustworthy enumeration of the Roman church. To get the entire population it would be necessary to add the number of foreigners, Japanese and Chinese. The million and a half Filipinos who have died by act of war or in consequence of war brings up the number close to that of the original estimate.

ARE WE AS PROSPEROUS AS MR. HEPBURN CLAIMS?

Portions of the speech of Hon. Allan Benney, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, on Friday, December 11, in answer to the Hon. Wm. P. Hepburn, of Iowa, as reported in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman: As a new Member of this House, I have been much interested in its proceedings, and somewhat amused to find that the House of Representatives has resolved itself into a sort of a close corporation, with the Speaker of the House (owning 51 per cent. of the stock) as president, secretary and treasurer, and a board of directors, consisting of the gentleman from New York, the same from Iowa, and ditto from Ohio, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania acting as sergeant-at-arms [laughter]; the stockholders of this corporation being Republican Members and the lambs represented by the Democratic on-lookers, who hang around waiting for the only chance they ever get in this Congress—the chance to talk. [Laughter.] . . .

But you might have done worse. There is the gentleman from Pennsylvania, always affable, always polite, in fact, always a gentleman; the gentleman from New York, so courteous that it hurts, and so big that he has been permitted to carry your banner with the word "Leader" emblazoned thereon; and the gentleman from Ohio, good-natured and as full of fun—and stickers, too—as a Republican platform is of promises or the Post-Office Department of room for improvement. [Laughter.]

And your Speaker, though rather top-heavy with offices and stock in your corporation, is compelling us to grow fonder of him every day. And then last, but not least, the gentleman from Iowa, the power behind the throne, the real big gun, the "Long Tom" of this political warfare, to be brought forth only on special occasions, when annihilation is all that is proposed to be done to the minority;

the gentleman who, when he addresses himself to the Democratic side of the House, takes on that awful voice and fierce frown and to interrupt whom, even to ask a question or to set him straight, is an unpardonable offense, punishable by bluff repulse, sometimes amounting almost to insult.

From the Republican side of this House we learn that when the gentleman from Iowa speaks he gives forth simon-pure Republican belief, Republican doctrine, and Republican policy, and that no man dare contradict him or be in opposition to him, and I think the majority side of this House has shown its indorsement of that proposition. I was dumfounded a few days ago to see a large number of Members on that side laugh and applaud at the utterly unfair reference made by the Iowa thunderer to the gentleman on this side of the Chamber from New York [Mr. Baker], who, by the way, in the face of that unfairness conducted himself in such a gentlemanly manner as to win the approbation of every man in the room. It was an exhibition of servility on the other side not to be expected in this body. . . .

On November 19 last the oracle from Iowa said on this floor:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work. And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

And on December 1 he repeated that statement in these words:

To-day every man in the United States who wants to work finds employment in the great labor fields of the United States, and at a compensating wage.

Mr. Chairman, the brilliant gentleman made only two mistakes in his proposition—

First. There is not work in the United States for every man in the United States who wants to work.

Second. There is not a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

I bow to the gentleman's superior knowledge and information in some things, but this is not one of them. This particular time I ask him as a loyal Republican to bow to the statement of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, who says there are 1,000,000 men in the country out of work.

I live in the city of Bayonne, a city of 40,000 inhabitants. Every morning at the gates of our great manufacturing establishments—the Standard Oil company, the Babcock & Wilcox Boiler company, the Safety Insulated Wire and Cable company, and other large

concerns—hundreds of men congregate and beg for work. Across Newark Bay, at the works of the Singer Manufacturing company, other hundreds gather, also looking for work. Every large factory in Jersey City, New York, and in every other city that I know of, will furnish a similar sight each morning.

Every man in public life, if he lives in a city and is known to have a heart in him, can testify that he is overrun with applications of deserving men looking for work. And the men at these factory gates are the men who really want and deserve work. In addition to this evidence, do not the newspapers almost daily contain accounts of works shutting down, certain railroad companies laying off 150,000 men within the last three months, and so on? . . .

If the old Pharisee who used to stand on the street corner in Jerusalem and thank his Maker that he was not like other men should suddenly walk into this chamber and listen to three ordinary Republican speeches, he would hide his face in shame and admit that in comparison with the Latter-Day Republican Saints here he in the old days in Jerusalem knew absolutely nothing about his business. (Laughter.) . . .

If the gentleman from Iowa had looked before he leaped, or rather before he talked, he must have discovered that for more than one hundred years labor in this country has been battling, at first for its very life and later for a betterment of its condition; that while less than one hundred years ago the leaders of the shoemakers of Philadelphia and the tailors of New York were fined for combining to raise wages, to-day the leaders of the coal miners and of workers in other lines are welcome guests at the table of the President of the United States. Oh, things have changed.

The whole civilized world has progressed. The people of the earth have grown better and wiser year by year. An unfettered press in America—excepting, of course, in the State of Quay and Pennypacker—continually advising the people of their rights and educating them in every line, has assisted our people tremendously. Our schools have done their share. Of course labor has risen! Why shouldn't it rise? Let us examine that rise for a moment.

We read that at one time in this country our laws arbitrarily fixed 48 cents per day as the top wage that could be paid to the best workman. There was no bottom wage. The inferior workman had his wage fixed by the village constable, and it would take

a magnifying glass to find it. That beautiful city in which we are now assembled was built largely by men working for 50 cents per day, the hod-carriers received \$70 per year for a working day that commenced with sunrise and finished with sunset.

That in 1835 weavers were paid \$65 per year and worked twelve hours per day.

That in 1844 factory girls received \$1.25 to \$2 per week, working from 5 a. m. to 7 p. m., with fifteen minutes recess for breakfast and one-half hour for dinner.

That in 1800 workmen's average wages were \$65 per year, and in that year one clerk with a few pigeonholes for filing purposes conducted all the business of the Patent Office.

That in 1850 the average wages were \$247.

That in 1900 the average wages were \$446, and in this last year more than 27,000 patents were granted in the United States and the clerks in the Patent Office constituted an army.

That the wages of the bricklayers climbed up as follows: In 1776 the wages were 50 cents per day of fourteen hours; in 1850 the wages were \$1.75 for twelve hours; in 1901 the wages were over \$4.80 per day of eight hours.

The tariff didn't do that! The condition is the fruit of labor's one hundred years' fight for its own. The fight isn't over yet, but when John Mitchell forced the strongest combination of moneyed interests in this world to treat as humans and not as beasts the 147,000 coal miners in the anthracite fields labor saw the dawn break and the sun rise.

In the words of John Hay, every sympathizer with the downtrodden should continue to pray:

Wherever man oppresses man
Beneath Thy liberal sun,
O God! be there Thine arm made bare,
Thy righteous will be done.

If, as the gentleman maintains, "there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor," how is it that in many parts of the country workingmen are striking for a wage that will be a suitable return for their day's labor?

Unless the gentleman's statement is utter nonsense, it can mean only one thing, viz., that the coal miner, the trolley conductor and motorman, the track repairer, the railroad employe in every station, the carpenter, mason and craftsman of every kind, the ditch digger, and, in fact, every workingman "who will perform a day's labor" is now receiving a "compensating wage," or, in other

words, all the wage he is entitled to, a suitable return for his labor.

What an insult to the laboring men of our land! Does the gentleman presume now to say that when the labor organizations of this country look for better wages they ask for something they are not entitled to? Doesn't he know that no man is more willing to do a full day's work for a full day's pay than the laboring man? Yes, sir; the laborer is, as a rule, more willing to do a day's work for his wage than are the members of this House, and in order to have them do it they need not be watched any closer than our own Members. If anybody disagrees with me, look around at the empty desks. [Laughter and applause.]

The gentleman from Iowa fairly thundered forth, on December 1, these words:

When has there been a time when the distribution of wealth was as great as it is now, and when the humblest and the poorest had so large a share of the accumulations of each year as now?

There never has been a time.

Has the gentleman not read the figures in the United States census of 1900 which show that 8.99 per cent. of the people own 72.67 per cent. of the wealth of this country? Has he never seen the estimates of Mr. Charles B. Spahr, whereby it appears that one per cent. of the people own 54.8 per cent. of the wealth; another 10.9 per cent. of the people own 32.2 per cent. additional, which added together shows that 11.9 per cent. of the people own 87 per cent. of our wealth, the other 13 per cent. of the wealth then remaining being owned by 38.1 per cent. of the people? Add all these items up and you will see by these figures all of our wealth is owned by just 50 per cent. of the people, the other 50 per cent. of our people, or in round numbers 40,000,000 souls, owning absolutely no part of the country's great wealth.

Has it not been stated over and over again without contradiction that when the board of directors of the steel trust meets, the 22 men who there sit down own one-twelfth part of the entire wealth of the United States?

Does that show the present to be a time when the distribution of wealth is greater than ever before, and that the humblest and the poorest have a larger share of the accumulations of the year than ever before?

Shame on the suggestion!

On the 1st of this month the gentleman from Iowa said:

I live in a county of 24,000 people—a farming community. There is not a protected industry in that county. On the 1st day of last October there were \$2,580,000 on deposit in the little banks of that county. Ninety-five per cent. of those deposits belonged to farmers, and they amounted to more than

\$100 for every man, woman and child in the county.

Where can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?

Mr. Chairman, the success of the land we love, as pictured by the gentleman's description of conditions in his home county to-day, cannot be duplicated, so far as I know, in any other country in the world. I congratulate him upon the prosperity of the community in which he lives, and for that prosperity, due almost solely to the fact that Providence assisted that county to raise a very large crop of wheat and other cereals during late years, he and every other man who shared in that prosperity ought to spend less of their time in praising Dingley schedules and more of their time in thanking Almighty God. (Applause on the Democratic side.)

I despise his suggestion that these conditions exist there because of our protective tariff. It is a small reason for a big man to advance for the grand position to-day of the greatest land on earth. We have the conditions suggested by the gentleman, not because of the tariff, but rather in spite of it, or at least a part of it; not because the people at present favor his party or mine; not because of this law or that law, but because this is the United States of America, a country without parallel since time began. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Has the gentleman ever stopped to consider the land we live in and compare it with other lands less favored? Does he recall that our country from the time of its first settlement until now has been the one place on earth to which was attracted the best blood and sinew of all the countries of the world? Does he not know that such blood and sinew, intermingling here and fostered under the freedom of our Stars and Stripes, has produced a race of men whose equal never lived before, and will he not now, in due humility, admit that this superior race of men in this beloved land has been signally favored by an all-wise Providence?

Does it count for nothing in the world's competition of nations that the American people have a land so large, so fertile, so favored by God's sun and rain in just the proper proportion, so abundantly provided with inventive geniuses, so situated as to climate and temperature, so rich in minerals and in everything else that goes to make a country so great, so well equipped with seacoast and natural inland waterways as to facilitate commercial intercourse among ourselves and with foreign countries, and

so placed with reference to other countries as to make us practically secure forever against any method of foreign attack, thus permitting our people to devote more of their energies to peaceful pursuits; so placed and so favored, in fact, as to constitute a marvel to every foreigner who visits our shores?

Why, sir, a people placed in these surroundings and with these advantages, who are not one whit better equipped personally than the people of other countries, ought still, by reason of the surroundings and advantages mentioned, lead all other people in every line of endeavor, but when we find this favored land and this superior people in combination, what is there on the earth to-day that can stand in opposition to it?

"Where," says the gentleman from Iowa, pointing to one of the evidences of our splendid success, "can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?" etc.

If the protective tariff is responsible for the prosperity pictured by the gentleman, then our people and our country are not. If it is a question of tariff and not people and country, then it is quite evident that all countries should prosper in proportion to the height of their tariff schedules. Why, then, I wonder, does not the Republican party double the tariff rates, and thus increase twofold the wages and the general prosperity?

WHY "COMPENSATING" WAGES ARE NOT PAID.

Portions of the speech of Hon. Robert Baker, of New York, in the House of Representatives, on Monday, December 14, in reply to the Hon. Wm. P. Hepburn, of Iowa, as reported in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman: I had not expected to take up the time of the House so early in the session. I had thought of exercising that modesty which is becoming in a new Member; but there have been two statements made upon the floor recently, by men conspicuous in leadership on the other side—one economic and the other political—which, it seems to me, demand a reply, even if it be by a new Member.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Hepburn), in his speech on the 19th of November, said:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work.

And that sentiment found, as it necessarily and properly would, applause upon the Republican side. There was no reason why there should not be applause

upon the Democratic side, if it were true! And then the gentleman from Iowa proceeded:

And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

It is because my views are so entirely at variance with what the gentleman evidently regards as a "compensating" wage that I have asked for the privilege here now of making some comments upon what in my estimation is a most extraordinary statement.

What constitutes a compensating wage? In my humble judgment, a compensating wage means the entire product which any laborer gives to an article by his toil, and if any part of the value of that labor which he has implanted upon that article is subtracted or taken away by some other power, then to that extent that labor does not obtain a compensating wage.

Is there any man, even upon the Republican side, who will claim to-day that, as we see growing up on the one hand gigantic fortunes almost beyond calculation, and as we see in our great cities especially hundreds of thousands of individuals who scarcely know where their breakfast is coming from in the morning, who will pretend that these men, these hundreds of thousands of individuals, having none of the wealth of the world, have received compensating wages for their past toil? . . .

[Mr. Baker then cited at length facts showing the lack of a "compensating" wage to the laborers of this country. Upon being asked during this portion of his speech, by Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania (Rep.), if he would yield the floor for an interruption, Mr. Baker replied: "I want to say, this being the first time I have spoken upon this floor, that I shall maintain the invariable rule I have followed outside this House, to answer every question that may be addressed to me, no matter who the gentleman may be." This statement was received with applause.]

WHY A "COMPENSATING" WAGE IS NOT PAID.

Why is it that a "compensating" wage is not paid to the coal miner; to the worker in the clothing sweat shop; to the farm laborer; to the factory operative, whether in cotton, worsted, woolen, and paper goods, boots and shoes, or other industries; to the sales girl of our city department stores; even to the clerks and bookkeepers—most of whom regard themselves as superior to factory operatives—thousands of whom, even in New York, with its high cost of living, receive less than \$12 a week? Why is it that despite the manifold inventions which more than anything else mark the latter