

statement by Dr. Walter Laidlaw, Secretary of the Federation of Churches and Christian Organizations, sent to all churches, indicates the judgment of the Federation of Churches which has endorsed the bill:

In the minds of many this bill is an application of the "Gospel according to George." This is only partially true, inasmuch as Henry George advocated the abolition of all taxes except taxes on land, and this bill does not do that. The Federation regards the bill as the most important piece of social legislation introduced at Albany in the last 25 years, not even excepting the race-track gambling measures.

It is a bill in the interest of the proper housing of the people of New York. The Federation has proved by its publications that New York, in 1940, will have less than 10,000,000 people. That is to say, the people of New York a generation from now could be housed on its area at an average of less than 60 people per acre, whereas Manhattan Island has 166 people per acre, with districts running as high as 731 per acre, and individual blocks as high as 1,674 per acre, while Brooklyn has wards running over 300 per acre, and 31.9% of the Bronx's population is housed at an average density above the average density of Manhattan. From July, 1902, to December 31, 1908, 62% of the dwellings erected in the Bronx were five stories or over.

"Tenement House Reform," as a rallying cry for housing movements in New York, should give place to "Tenement House Prevention"; and speculative land owners, who are opposing this bill, which penalizes the non-use of land by placing a larger measure of the carrying charges of the city budget upon it, and rewards the building of homes for the people by exempting them in 1912 10% of their value and adding 10% exemption per annum, till in 1917 50% exemption is granted, should be routed by the combined force of the churches and laboring people of New York. If the tenement many stories high is to house the people of New York of the future, every church will in time be compelled to become an "institutional church." The churches should be willing to assume this form of social service if they are compelled to, but it would be better if they should become "restitutional churches" and so compel the use of the livable area of New York as to restore the single, the two-family and three-family dwelling as the normal type of housing. Rapid transit should not be allowed to enrich a few land speculators, but should be so developed as to distribute the population of New York throughout the whole livable area.

The enactment of this bill cannot be defeated, although it may be delayed a year or two because political organizations represent property interests and not the people's.

BENJAMIN C. MARSH,

Executive Secretary of The Committee on Congestion of Population in New York.

* * *

THE AMERICAN WORKINGMAN AND THE TARIFF.

New York.

The most sensible utterance yet made upon the connection between a high tariff and wages, was by Representative William Hughes of New Jersey in a speech printed in the Congressional Record of June 19, 1911, and quoted in large part in the Public of July 7. Endless hours have been given up to discussion and reams of paper have been covered with written argument as to the pro and con of the question whether a high tariff means high wages. Those who know that it does not, and those

who believe that it does, can never find the exact spot where their arguments—founded on facts in both cases—diverge. This missing link in the chain is revealed by a casual sentence in Mr. Hughes' speech. He says: "I do not deny that the tariff enables manufacturers to pay high wages—but it does not compel them to do so."

This simple truth is the crux of the whole situation, and shows up the utter futility of so much argumentation as to whether a high tariff means high wages—or not; or if not, why not. That's why—but nobody has said so until now.

The American workingman, however, is clearly conscious of the fact. While he is supporting a high tariff to kill competition with the products of foreign labor, he is trying to build up an organization that will enable him to share in what he is thus helping the manufacturer to earn. In other words, he does not trust the manufacturer to divide the plunder of his own free will. He would force him to do it. But Mr. Hughes cleverly points out the futility of this line of conduct. The labor organizations would have to make themselves so perfect and complete that they could say to the manufacturer: "When you're stealing from the public, steal enough for me too, and give it to me."

But as the organization is not strong enough for such action, the American workingman who votes for a protective tariff, is in the position of a man who helps to build a strong room in which to garner plunder stolen from an entire people—and then discovers that some other fellow has the key and has no intention of giving it to him. Then he has to train himself to be big and strong enough to take the key from the other fellow. And he isn't that just yet, so he keeps on with his futile Sisyphus task of first building the strong room, then building an army to conquer it, and take some of the plunder for himself. And meanwhile he is laboring under the disadvantage of being one of the plundered.—a fact that sadly hampers the full exertion of his strength.

Now when so much time and mental and physical strength are devoted to building up organizations—things excellent in themselves, but apparently useless in forcing manufacturers to share the plunder—why not give just a little of this time and strength to destroying the manufacturers' opportunity for plunder? That would give the workingman a fairer chance to get some more of his share of what he earns. For it is surely the honest share of his own earnings he is trying to get. He certainly cannot prefer a share of loot unjustly wrung from a whole people—including himself and his family.

GRACE ISABEL COLBON.

* * *

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN OHIO.

Cincinnati, Sept. 11.

In "The Public" for 1st September it is stated at page 900 that the United Constitutional Committees of Hamilton county, Ohio, demand "the submission separately to the people of a Constitutional provision on the question of licensing or prohibiting the liquor traffic." But what the Committees formulated reads: "Shall the Constitution provide for the licensing of the traffic in intoxicating liquors.