

brute in the latter instance to hoist it, but it takes a moral hero to lower it.

In what splendid contrast is that sentiment with the bunting-worshipping sentiment which it is intended to rebuke.

As Mr. Bryan has made his views regarding wealth perfectly clear, by declaring that he would conserve earned wealth and put an end to unearned wealth, Don M. Dickinson puts himself in an anomalous position by objecting to Bryan on account of his views regarding wealth. It is easy to understand why men like Dickinson wish to conserve unearned wealth, but why they expose their love for that particular kind, as Dickinson has done, is not so obvious.

It is instructive to observe, also, that in justifying his decision to vote for McKinley, Mr. Dickinson declares himself to be "a democrat on all the fundamental issues on which" the party has "joined battle in the past with the republicans." He thereby proves beyond question that he belongs with McKinley; for the great fundamental issue on which the democratic party originally joined battle with the republicans was the issue of the principles of the declaration of independence. The democratic party was opposed to those principles then; the republican party is opposed to them now. It is exquisitely appropriate, therefore, that Mr. Dickinson, since he is proud to have been a democrat in the middle of the century, should be a McKinley republican at its close.

This is the time of year when the Illinois secretary of state goes a-gunning for corporations and partnerships, and the song he sings them has this argentiferous chorus:

A dollar from you! and you! and you!
One dollar apiece I claim.
A dollar from you! and you! and you!
Next year I'll call again.

This dollar is the secretary's fee for filing affidavits in which corporation officers and business men swear that their concerns are not trusts. To forget to file an affidavit and pay the dol-

lar is to incur a penalty of \$50 a day for every day's neglect. That is the law. It is an anti-trust law. But it has no more effect upon trusts, and cannot have, than the pope's bull had upon the comet. All it accomplishes is to fatten the fees of the secretary of state at the expense of corporations and partnerships that are not in trusts. A trust can easily evade the law, but a partnership or corporation not in the trust cannot evade payment of the dollar.

THE TREND OF WAGES.

Under the title "Trend of Wages from 1891 to 1900," the September Bulletin of the department of labor, which is over a month late in its appearance, presents a table of relative wage statistics which is an analysis or summary of data given in the July Bulletin (pages 766 to 812) as "Table I—Rates of Wages in Various Occupations." It is intended to show that wages have increased since 1891.

Thus in the heat of the presidential campaign, and when too late to expose him adequately, Col. Wright springs upon the public another batch of misleading wage statistics. His summary follows:

"Relative wages from 1891 to 1900 inclusive."	
Year.	Relative Wages.
1891	100.00
1892	100.30
1893	99.30
1894	98.06
1895	97.88
1896	97.93
1897	98.96
1898	98.79
1899	101.54
1900	103.45

It is remarked in the article in the September Bulletin that "all the data included, except those for mining, relate to the manufacturing industries, the data relative to steam railroads and street railways having been excluded from the summary." There is also this further observation:

While the data from which the table is drawn do not afford the basis for a strictly scientific calculation of relative wages, a careful examination of the figures given in table I leads to the belief that they are fairly representative, and that the results here given, showing the trend of wages from 1891 to 1900, are entirely fair and undoubtedly approximate very

closely the actual conditions for the whole country.

That the data presented by Col. Wright in table I of the July Bulletin, of which the foregoing table of relative wages is a summary, are not "fairly representative" may be discovered by a comparison of the data of that table relating to steam railroads (pages 803-809) with the figures of the Interstate Commerce commission, showing the "average daily compensation of all railway employes in the United States, 1892 to 1899 inclusive," which may be found on page 692 of the July Bulletin. An extended comparison would exceed my space, but any one can discover the facts by comparing these differing statistics, to be found in the same number of the Bulletin.

We may note, for instance, that carpenters' wages in railroad establishment 1 (page 803) increased from \$1.71 in 1892 to \$1.98 in 1899, and that in establishment 2 they increased from \$1.80 in 1892 to \$1.96 in 1899. Yet, according to the interstate commerce table, carpenters' wages paid by railroads fell from \$2.08 in 1892 to \$2.03 in 1899.

Machinists' wages, according to Col. Wright's data, increased from \$1.93½ in 1892 to \$2.18½ in 1899 in establishment 1, and in establishment 2 from \$2.14 in 1892 to \$2.22 in 1899. Yet, according to the interstate commerce figures, there was no increase in machinists' wages.

According to Col. Wright's data the section foremen got a raise in each establishment quoted; but according to the interstate commerce figures their wages fell from \$1.76 to \$1.68.

According to Col. Wright's figures, flag men and watchmen got a slight raise; but according to the interstate commerce figures they had a slight fall.

The foregoing table, which, as stated, is principally of manufacturing wages, shows an increase of nearly six per cent. since 1896. Yet the most complete and reliable statistics of manufactures, those of Massachusetts, show that average earnings have fallen since that date, and that average wages have fallen still more. Even in Pennsylvania, where there has been a boom in the leading manufacturing industries, according to

the report of the Pennsylvania commissioner of internal affairs, the average wages were three cents less per day in 1899 than in 1896.

It is further remarked by Col. Wright in his September Bulletin, that "the figures for 1899 to 1900 show a gratifying average increase over the conditions of 1891 and 1892, when wages in gold were higher than at any period in the history of the country prior to the present year." This last statement, as Col. Wright must be well aware, is not true. Fairly summarized, the data of the Aldrich report show wages (gold values) 20 per cent. lower in 1891 than in 1873. In a full and fair analysis of the data of the Aldrich report, made in "Present Concentration of Wealth in the United States," by Charles B. Spahr, Mr. Spahr proves that result. Only by the most palpable juggling of figures can the Aldrich report be made to show even a slight increase in wages in 1891 over 1872 or 1873.

H. L. BLISS.

Chicago.

THE PARTY OF PROGRESS.

In a country which believes in progress it is natural that every party should claim that it is the party of progress. It is manifest, however, that this claim cannot in all cases be substantiated. Two parties diametrically opposed to each other on vital issues cannot both be parties of true progress. As a matter of fact, in every great contest in the political world, like our present national campaign, one of the two great parties represents and embodies the principle of real and true advance, genuine growth and progress, while the other represents and embodies the principle of retrogression and decay, perhaps even the principle of revolution and ruin. Which is which in the present conflict?

It will not do to judge in such a matter by professions or declaimings. The body that mouths the most about the forward march, expansion and the like, may really be the retrogressive or revolutionary party, claiming everything but cloaking its real designs, intentions and tendencies under fine phrases and loud boasts.

Nor will it do to judge entirely by the past, without taking into consideration new factors that may arise.

Men change. Parties change. Issues change. Nothing is more frequent in human experience than to see a party which has gained one great victory for reform or human progress pitch its tent upon the once won field, become demoralized through giving itself over to the enjoyment of captured spoils upon its Capuan plain, or fight to the death those who desire to win another victory and make another advance.

The republican party of to-day loudly claims to be the party of progress. It ardently and noisily proclaims itself as the advocate of expansion. Its claim, however, will not bear analysis.

The forcible annexation of conquered territory and unwilling people is no more expansion, in any true sense of the word, than the dropsy is healthy growth. The dropsy adds to a person's weight. The imperialistic annexation of purchased or subjugated peoples adds, likewise, to the nation's extent. But in each case there is the addition of disease, there is gross and perilous deterioration, there is the surrender of health—in the one case individual, in the other national. How can we extend our institutions to the Philippines when, in order to reach and seize them, we drop our institutions on the way? How can we extend our government over the Filipinos when, to govern them at all, we must abandon the fundamental principles upon which our government is based and degenerate until we become low and base enough to join the barbaric parade of nations whose only right is might and whose only god is greed? How can we even expand our trade when we either kill those with whom we are talking of trading or treat them in such fashion as to invite their everlasting enmity? Is it not easier to trade with live men than with dead men? Is it not easier to trade with friends than with foes? We might have had—we might still have—the friendship of the Filipinos, by the simple expedient of treating them justly, a road "as plain as way to parish church." The contention that imperialistic subjugation is essential or even advantageous to trade expansion is an argument too hollow and too canting to deserve aught but contempt. Trade follows

the flag! How comes it then that the trade of the United States is larger with Great Britain than with any other country in the world? How comes it that Great Britain's trade is greater with the United States than with any other country in the world? Alleyne Ireland shows, in his recently issued work on "Tropical Colonization," that while the annual purchases of English goods average only \$1.02 for each colonial subject, such purchases average \$1.50 for each citizen of the United States. Furthermore, Mr. Ireland shows that the United Kingdom's tropical colonies consume annually only 71 cents' worth of English goods per head of population. Trade follows the flag? Bosh! It follows the converging lines of demand and supply.

In flat contradiction of the contention that the conquest of distant and alien peoples is genuine or truly profitable national expansion, history speaks. James Anthony Froude unanswerably says, in his life of Julius Caesar, modestly called by him "A Sketch"—"If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this, that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties." Prof. Thorold Rogers, in his admirable "Story of Holland," bears like testimony. He says: "If one searches through history, one can never find a single case in which public opulence can be traced to foreign conquest, in which the cost to the public of occupying and maintaining such conquests has not been greatly in excess of all the profit which private interests have secured from them." No standard or reliable historian says other than this. This is the verdict of universal history. Is it "progress" to disdain the universal lesson of all trustworthy history?

The simple fact of the case is that the present republican administration's course in regard to both Puerto Rico and the Philippines is the most marked retrogression. It is reversion to the barbaric type of government, the type our revolutionary forefathers had outgrown—government resting on no better basis than military