

be never altered for the better designedly." Although Lord Bacon had never heard of the "stand-patter" by name, he was evidently well acquainted with the type.

+ + +

## LABOR AND PROTECTION.

A protective tariff bears the same relation to revenue raising that pocket picking does to stealing; and among the knowing ones, it has the same object and the same effect.

Like the orthodox sinner, it is conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity.

About two-thirds of our national revenues are squandered for worse than useless battleships and preparations for war. War itself has not one single virtue, and if taxes were levied upon monopolies, or the things created by government, instead of upon consumption, or the things created by labor, it would do more to discourage war and the rumors of war and the preparations for war and the war spirit so industriously inculcated by that element in society that profits by war, than all other efforts toward the abolition of war combined.

When the country gets into trouble, either domestic or foreign, and soldiers are needed to engage in martial strife, the first men who are called for, and the only class—in any great numbers—that can be depended upon to take up arms and lay down their lives in its defense, are the laboring men. These are the real defenders of the country in every and all senses of the word. And yet, if the protectionist doctrine is true, these people who can defend themselves and all others in time of war are wholly incapable of defending themselves alone in time of peace. And who is it that pretends to protect these helpless and unfortunate working men? It is men who do not make wealth, but who do make laws.

And what is it they would protect them against? Starvation, nakedness, the inclemency of the weather? But the only real antidote for these is food, clothing, houses and fuel; and labor produces them all.

And since it is men, and the things that men make, that they have to be protected against, what kind of men are they? Are they workers or loafers? No protectionist has ever pretended that the laboring men of America have to be protected against the loafers, either domestic or foreign; yet, if the truth were known it would be discovered that the social loafer is the real enemy of the laboring man, and not the social worker.

How can labor be protected against the very

things that labor produces here and everywhere for the satisfaction of man's desires?

It will be noted that the same quality of mind that believes that this nation can be industrially destroyed by the over-importation of wealth from abroad, thinks also that it can be vastly injured by the over-production of wealth at home. Yet wealth is the only re-agent for poverty. They also think that our present floodtide of prosperity cannot last because they take it for granted that prosperity, like the tides, must always ebb and flow, unmindful of the fact that if there is one single stable thing in society, with a constantly upward trend, by reason of increasing population and unceasing needs, it is the demand for wealth. Why should society oscillate between prosperity and adversity when the source of all demands for labor is as constant as human propagation?

Must it not be because the source of all prosperity, all wealth, all life, and all human energy, is sunlight, air and land, and that the first two are utterly impossible to mankind without land? But the latter, held as it is as the private property of an ever diminishing fraction of mankind, containing as it does the beginning and the end of everything that satisfies his material needs and desires, held out of use as a large portion of it is to exact a higher and still higher tribute from the workers for the privilege of working, ultimately in conditions in which the dearest thing in the world is the world itself, while the cheapest thing is men. This is why, and the only competent and true reason why, labor harbors the utterly fallacious notion that it needs protection.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

Zurich, Switzerland, February 14.—When on the 13th of December last the Imperial Diet of Germany was dissolved on account of its refusing a credit deemed necessary by the Government for carrying on the war in Southwest Africa, the Socialist members hailed the dissolution with a storm of applause. They had voted solidly against the Government, and they were sure that however the Government and the other parties might fare in the coming elections, their party would be on the winning side. And this feeling was nearly as strong among the politicians of other parties as among the Socialists themselves.

The growth of the Socialist party had been unparalleled in the political history of Germany. The omnipotent Bismarck had tried in vain all means to put a check upon its growth. And circumstances seemed now more favorable to them than ever before. But in spite of an enormous and most vigorous