

## COL. WRIGHT'S STATISTICS.

It will be recalled that the bureau of labor at Washington prepared some statistics, which were much used by the Republicans during the campaign, going to show that wages had been increasing more than the prices of the cost of living. This was shown to be true during the boom period of the past half-dozen years, when the money volume in circulation increased by some 40 per cent.

The New York Times, a sound money organ, while admitting that these statistics are necessarily inconclusive and unsatisfactory, still considers them as exact as any available, and appears disposed to accept the conclusion which they enforce, namely, that the cost of living has not increased "in anything like the ratio in which wages have advanced."

If this is the truth, two very important and remarkable conclusions follow: (1) That the boom period has adversely affected the employing classes, since they have been unable to recover, in the prices of products sold, the increased cost of labor; and (2) that an inflation of the currency with its attendant rise in prices is more favorable to the wage earners than the employing classes.

The first of these conclusions is apparently absurd, for nothing is clearer on the face of things than that capital, and those employing capital as economic undertakers, have chiefly, if not exclusively, profited from the speculative and industrial booming of the past six years. Wages have nominally advanced, but interest and profits—the wages of capital and of the industrial promoter or director—have advanced much more.

However, if this be not the case, and if the first conclusion stands, then does the second stand also, and what follows from this? Clearly that the advocates of sound money and the gold standard in 1896 misled the people when they declared, with all the repetition and emphasis they could command, that wages always lagged behind prices in an upward movement, and that, therefore, currency inflation or the cheapening of the dollar through free silver coinage or any other means, must injure the wage classes and profit only the producing or employing classes.

Is this the fact? Were the people misled? Is monetary inflation, or the falling dollar and rising prices, chiefly helpful to wages? If so, then a weapon has been put into the hands of the next cheap money movement which can be used with deadly effect. The statistics in question were gathered under the direction of Carroll D. Wright. Is he pre-

pared to stand by them, and defend as true this inevitable deduction to be drawn from them?—Weekly Springfield Republican, of Nov. 27.

## A REFORMER'S SYMPATHIES.

For The Public.

"I am content to see them trying to pound some sense into each other."

"But don't you hope the Japs will win? They are progressive, and seem sent by Providence to smash the power of that Russian despotism."

"If they are sent by Providence to do that, I am glad to see them do it. But the despotism of Russia is a military despotism, is it not—a tyrannical aristocracy sustained by the army?"

"Yes, and by the police."

"But it is the Cossacks that inflict outrages, knout the crowds and suppress resistance to the tyranny?"

"Of course."

"And what evidence is there that the Japanese aristocracy at the end of this war would make any better use of an army out of a job?"

"Well, even if they would not, you must admit that as Japan was the one threatened by Russia's practical annexation of Manchuria the Japanese people are in the right."

"Do you think the Japanese people or the Russian people, the peasants who never heard of Manchuria and don't know where it is even when they get to it, care anything about who annexes it?"

"Certainly not, but if Russia were allowed to annex it the next thing would be they would attack Japan from that point of advantage."

"The Russian peasants are much like the Japanese peasants, are they not? They don't want Manchuria or to attack Japan, do they?"

"No, they don't; but the aristocracy does."

"Then would the Russian aristocracy attack Japan?"

"Not themselves, of course; but they would send the soldiers, the peasants you talk of, to attack the Japanese people."

"Oh, then it is the harmless peasants who would attack other harmless peasants, and it is the attacked peasants that you are sorry for?"

"Well, yes; the attacked ones are certainly to be pitied."

"But you said the attacked are just the same sort of peasants as the attackers; neither of them have any sense till they pound it into one another."

"Well, but others than the peasants will suffer if Japan comes under the Russian tyranny, the well-to-do, the self-sacrificing reformers, the men of progressive ideas."

"The intelligent and progressive can evade the tyranny themselves, can they not? or they can leave the country?"

"They can, but that leaves the peasants in ignorance, and suffering for their ignorance."

"True, so if they stay, they stay because, being such as they are, they want to stay. But will not the Japanese peasants, flushed with victory and excited by the praises of their women and by loot, be very likely to thirst for more war—to think national glory and success belong to force, and that they are the nation that has the force?"

"It seems probable that it would be so, unless as you say, somebody pounds some sense into them."

"Yes, unless those poor deluded 'foreigners' find by trial that the way of transgressors is hard, and unless somebody—men like Crosby or Tolstoy—teaches them and our poor deluded workmen the better way with trumpet voices, and men like you and me wheresoever we can make our voices heard."

BOLTON HALL.

## THE GARDEN OF THE GODS.

From a discourse delivered in Cincinnati, O., December 18, 1904, at the Vine Street Congregational church, by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

"The National Sunshine Legion," what is it? A circular announces that an organization by that name has opened in Cincinnati a day nursery for the care of the children of "deserving poor mothers who are obliged to go out to work."

The circular concludes with the statement: "All we want is to help the poor to help themselves."

If a man lays a burden upon his ass greater than he can bear, and I take a part of the burden and carry it, which am I helping, the man, or the ass? If I make a business of giving assistance to the ass so that the master counts on it and loads his beast accordingly, is it not plain that I am only making an ass of myself, and not helping the heavy laden at all?

The Pullman company knows that you are going to fee the porter. That custom is one of the assets of the company. In view of that custom, the wages are lower. When you give the porter a tip, you may flatter yourself that you are helping the porter. But you are not. You are gratifying your own vanity and chipping in on the Pullman pay roll. That is the way it works out in the long run. Charity comes to the same end. If to-day charity were to stop, there would be more misery to-morrow, but the day