

bounty-helped sugar of France and Germany which we can buy for three pence (six cents) per pound, cheaper than the retail price in the country where it is produced. British sugar refiners have suffered thereby, but the confectionery, biscuit, jam, marmalade and sweet drink industries have received an immense stimulus owing to the cheapening of sugar. With the sugar which France sends us under cost price, and the cheap fruit she also sends us, we make jam, which we again export to her at a handsome profit. If we had a tariff of 40 per cent. on imported sugar that industry would be all gone, and we should no doubt have a "sugar trust" to control prices, as they have in America, under similar conditions. Under the natural regime of free trade we gain in one industry what we lose in another.

The protectionist looks at one trade alone—the one in which he is interested. It is like looking at only one wheel in a complex piece of machinery where there may be thousands of wheels that depend on each other. The final result of the working of the machinery is the one thing to be considered. We look to the whole world to supply our wants, and in a country whose commercial system embraces so wide an area it is absolutely impossible for a clique of capitalists to capture our industries and impoverish our people.

We are behind America in some forms of political freedom, but we are far ahead of her in industrial freedom. The adoption of the free trade policy in the middle of the century gave us freedom of distribution. The free and independent voters of America have surrendered their industrial freedom and independence. They went to bed thinking that they had shut the foreigner out; they are waking to find that they have only shut themselves in. They are ruled by a gang of commercial dictators in the prison house they have built for themselves. Whether the descendants of the men who fought at Bunker Hill and Lexington, at Gettysburg and Richmond will be equal to the destruction of the new tyranny remains to be seen. But, surely, if political liberty was worth fighting for, industrial liberty is worth voting for.—Thomas Scanlon, of Liverpool, England.

"Dobley has just bought the Century Dictionary for his wife."

"Yes; he said something might come up she'd want to know about some time when he didn't happen to be at home."—Life.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

At the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, Sunday evening, April 8, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, delivered a lecture on the labor problem. What follows is an extract.

The deliverances of the pulpit on the labor problem may be boiled down to this: "Masters love your slaves; slaves obey your masters and keep sober."

The average preacher, if he is interested in the labor problem, thinks that the labor problem is only another name for the liquor problem. That is one good thing which prohibition might accomplish; it might demonstrate to the satisfaction of certain good folk that poverty has its roots, not in the drink vice, but in monopoly.

The real controversy is not one between capital and labor. It is between man and monopoly. It is all surface talk for a man to say that capitalists ought to give their workmen higher wages. If capitalists have the power to withhold from their men what is due them, then their men are slaves, and the remedy is to appeal to the voters to abolish the slavery, and not to appeal to the capitalists to be generous. But capitalists unless they are also monopolists have not the power to pay higher wages. They are in the position of the man described in the Bible: "He that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey." If the ordinary employer were to pay his men anything like a just wage, his business would be in the hands of a receiver in a month, unless he had a fortune to spend in charity. Charity is not what we want. We want reforms that enable men to be just without making a prey of themselves.

The labor problem will never be solved by preaching love in the pulpit. It can be solved only by practicing justice in the halls of legislation.

We must say to both labor and capital: "Confine yourselves to legitimate activities." When labor makes a pair of shoes, that is a legitimate activity. When labor employs itself going through another laborer's pocket, that is not a legitimate activity.

The great lesson for us to learn is that capital is doing things which are just as menacing to society as it would be if labor were allowed to employ itself in the highway business. Here is an illustration: Beneath one of the prominent business houses of our city there is a strip of land 16 feet in width which is owned by a woman who receives \$3,000 a year in rent for 20 years. Her contract binds her tenant to pay all the taxes during the term of the lease, and at the end of the 20 years the building erected on the ground reverts to her. She does not do a stroke of

work. Capital invested in a machine is capital invested for the purpose of aiding industry, and will perish if it is not useful. Capital invested in those 16 feet of ground is capital invested in the legal privilege of taxing industry and robbing the industrious to pension the idle. Wait until the people once see that. They will take the tax off from industry. They will put an end to that use of capital. They will stop this trafficking in man's right to live and work upon the earth. They will outlaw the capital that is engaged in the business of holding men up and robbing them of their wealth before permitting them to employ their labor and capital is useful employment.

Direct legislation will destroy the monopoly of the governing power. A scientific paper money will yet be found to abolish a monopoly of the money power. The nationalization of public utilities will abolish the railroad and telegraph monopoly. The single tax will abolish the land monopoly. That is the royal road of the reformer—to destroy monopoly; to break every yoke. Then, who knows, even the loftiest dreams of the socialist may blossom into being.

WHAT WE OUGHT TO DO FOR THE FILIPINOS.

Extracts from speech of Hon. William J. Bryan, in Los Angeles, Cal., April 10, as reported by the Los Angeles Herald.

There is a difference between expansion and imperialism. Expansion is the extension of the limits of a republic without a change of its character.

Imperialism is the policy of an empire. We have expanded before; we never had imperialism before. We expanded when we took in Florida; we expanded when we took in the Louisiana territory; we expanded when we took in Texas and New Mexico and California. But to-day it is not expansion. It is not taking in land that can be settled by American citizens and built up into American states. It is going across an ocean to get not land for settlement, but races for subjugation. Heretofore we have extended the area of the republic and every citizen has enjoyed the protection of the flag and the constitution, but the republican party now wants this nation to enter into a career of imperialism.

It wants the flag to be supported by the strength of the army, but it does not want the constitution to follow the flag when it goes into a distant clime.

What defense have you ever heard

of imperialism? I have heard of three defenses: First, that there is money in it; second, that God is in it; third, that we are in it and can't get out. Have you ever heard any others? I will give you the substance of every republican speech you hear in defense of imperialism. The speaker will start out by telling that the republican party didn't do this at all; that it was God's work; that God opened the door, pointed to a career of conquest, and commanded us to proselyte by the sword and spread the blessings of civilization through bursting lyddite bombs, and after the speaker has laid it all on Jehovah, he lowers his voice and says: "And it will pay, too." It is philanthropy and five per cent. That is what Secretary Gage called it a year ago last December. He said he thought philanthropy and five per cent. would go hand in hand. They have traveled together in all wars of conquest. Philanthropy chloroforms the conscience of the conqueror, and five per cent. picks the pocket of the conquered; and whenever philanthropy gets weary and rests by the wayside, five per cent. goes right on and never feels lonesome.

You say we must stay in the Philippine islands because American blood has been shed upon Philippine soil.

I reply that American blood was shed at San Juan hill and El Caney, and yet the president told the Cubans we would get out of Cuba. You say that the flag has been raised over Manila, and that when the flag is once raised it can never be hauled down. I reply that the flag was raised over Havana a year ago last January, and yet the president told the Cubans that he would haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic was ready to rise in its place. You tell me that the American flag cannot be hauled down. I would rather a thousand times that the American flag should be hauled down and a Philippine republic's flag hoisted in its place, than that our flag should be made the emblem of a despotism that has cursed the world. Better two flags of a republic than one flag of an empire based on force.

You cannot point to a reason for staying in the Philippine islands that would not compel you to stay in Cuba. The only difference between Cuba and the Philippine islands is that we promised the Cubans that we would get out and we didn't promise the Filipinos. But if you will read the resolution you will find that it reads that the

people of Cuba are and of right ought to be free. And if we told the truth in those resolutions, the rights of the Cubans existed before we recognized those rights and would exist whether we recognized them or not; and I dare you to draw a line between the rights of the Cuban and the rights of the Filipino. Say, if you dare, that God gave the Cuban a right to his liberty and gave to the Filipinos only the right to be an American subject without the protection of the American constitution. You cannot do it, my friends.

Do you say that the people of the Philippine islands are not capable of self-government? I tell you that that is the doctrine that kings have used in all ages of the world. Let me read you what Lincoln says about this: "Those arguments that are made that the inferior race is to be treated with as much allowance as it is capable of enjoying, that as much has to be done for it as its condition will allow—what are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class. They always bestrode the necks of the people; not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden."

That is what Lincoln says, that your argument is simply the argument that kings have used in all ages of the world for enslaving the people. Read what Henry Clay said 50 years ago. He said in defending the right of the people of South America to their liberty and independence—he said that any man who denied that any people were capable of self-government was guilty of impeaching the wisdom of the Creator. I repeat what Clay said, that God never made a race incapable of self-government.

When the ratification of the treaty came up there was a difference among our people. Some believed that it was best to reject the treaty. I believed that it was best to ratify it and correct its defects by legislation. I believed that if we would ratify the treaty and close the war and bring the volunteers home, stop the expense, we could give liberty and independence to the Filipinos quicker by legislation than we could do it through diplomacy with Spain.

I believe that we can stop the war to-day. I believe that the moment this nation announces to the world that it is fighting not for land, but for lib-

erty, that when a stable government is established that government is to belong to the Filipinos and not to us—I believe when this declaration is made, the war will stop, and it will not take 5,000 soldiers to establish a stable government. And then I want this nation to announce to the world that when this nation helps a republic to stand upon its feet, the ground whereon it stands is holy ground, and that no king shall ever set foot upon that soil.

THE KAFFIR AS POLITICIAN.

A leading Englishman remarked to me recently that he supposed the Kaffir did not concern himself much with politics or take much practical interest in the public life of the Cape Colony.

I replied, somewhat to his amusement, by telling him what an educated Kaffir said to me. "There are only two sections of the population of the colony," said this Kaffir, "which have the true political instinct—the Dutch and the Kaffirs." The English, he added, were always splitting over trifles, but the Dutch and the Kaffirs subordinated smaller issues to larger.

The Kaffir I allude to was Mr. J. Tengo-Jabavu, a Fingo.

A good many years ago Mr. Jabavu, who was educated at Lovedale, matriculated in the Cape university, afterward serving for a time in, I think, the Cape civil service. When the Kaffir newspaper *Imvo* was started in Kingwilliamstown he was appointed editor. From that time to the present he has edited *Imvo*, and he now owns it. He has recently taken into partnership the Rev. John Knox Bokwe, a Xoso. *Imvo* is the only native newspaper of any weight in South Africa. It has a couple of columns in English for English readers, but otherwise the whole paper, including advertisements, leading articles, notes, telegrams, etc., is in Kaffir. It circulates among educated natives and some white people, from Cape Town to Rhodesia, and has among its subscribers such men as Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr and the Bechuana chief, Khama. Mr. Jabavu is an orator (as is Mr. Bokwe) both in English and in Kaffir, and a man of great ability and singular balance of judgment. Hardly a journalist in South Africa has, since 1896, pursued so just, fearless and level-headed a course as Mr. Jabavu, or kept so firm a hold on the essentials that underlie our present troubles.

What Mr. Hofmeyr has been to the Dutch, that Mr. Jabavu has been to the natives. He has educated them in