

duties. It is useless to put people on the land, and then tax them off again.

The *New York Evening Post*, probably the most conservative and dignified journal in the United States, speaking of the adoption by the House of Commons of the Betterment principle with regard to Metropolitan improvements, gives utterance to the following interesting remarks:—

"The betterment principle has been so long imbedded in American jurisprudence that nothing seems to us more palpably equitable. A landowner who should insist that if a park was laid out in front of his residence, whereby its value was doubled, the entire expense should be borne by the public, would here be thought extremely unreasonable. If he should declare that any assessment for benefit levied upon his land under these circumstances was "robbery" he would be thought crazy.

At the time when the land upon which the exhibition at Chicago is now taking place was devoted to public uses as a park, assessments for betterment were levied upon land six miles distant. Yet who can say that the increased attractiveness of the city due to this park may not have increased the value of every foot of land within the corporate limits much more than in proportion to the cost of the improvement? The value to the city of New York of the acquisition of Central Park was inestimable. Not only the property in its vicinity was increased in value, but the city in general, as a place of residence, as a place of resort, and even as a place of business, has derived great pecuniary benefit from the existence of this "midway pleassance."

It is perhaps owing partly to this bigoted and irrational conservatism that socialistic proposals have come into so much favour of late years in England. Where rights of property are pressed to such an extreme it is not surprising that somewhat violent reactions should take place."

Evidently there are some things in which even the monopoly-ridden people of the United States can give us lessons.

The following account of the Prussian railways is interesting, in view of the awful mess which this colony has made of its railway finances:—Prussia, a poor country naturally, with no great resources, has made a successful financial experiment with State railroads. Her railroads, built by the State, paid in 1889-90 the interest on their cost, the interest on the State debt, and a surplus of £7,250,000. This annual surplus has diminished, but last year it was £4,650,000. In addition, the railroads have paid off £28,600,000 of their debts, instead of constantly adding to their cost as our railways do. The railroad system of Prussia includes 15,530 miles.

The city of Hyattsville, D.C., United States, adopted the unimproved value of land as the rating basis, but was compelled to return to the old system—that of rating all property—by a decision of the Supreme Court declaring the alteration illegal. Mr. Ralston, its ex-mayor, gives the following account of the results of the change:—

"The three smallest property-holders in Hyattsville are coloured men. The taxes for all three amounted to 58 cents under our system. Under the present law they will be taxed 1.25dol., or more than twice as much.

"During the year, when we had a Single Tax, the principal property-owner of the town paid taxes at the rate of 25 cents., amounting to 170dol. This year, when the same man has to pay three kinds of taxes, on land values, personal property, and improvement, at the rate of 15 cents, his taxes will be 50dol. less."

The following resolution was recently passed at a meeting of the unemployed at Liverpool:—

"That, in the opinion of this mass meeting of labouring men condemned to involun-

tary idleness, it is a crime against humanity that the benevolent intentions of the Creator should be frustrated by unjust man-made laws, which enable a few private individuals to keep idle 30,000,000 acres (46,875 square miles) of the food-producing land of our country, while tens of thousands of labouring men, who are anxiously seeking opportunities for producing food for themselves and families, are, in large numbers, condemned to starve in the streets of our towns. We hereby solemnly and emphatically protest against food-producing lands being kept idle, while labouring men, willing to work, are starving. We protest against the system which enables landlordism to rob the labourers of the products of their labours, and to discourage and hinder food production at home, while hundreds of millions are annually spent in the purchase of food from foreign nations. We protest against the folly and wickedness of draining, exhausting, and squandering the mineral resources of the country for the immediate enrichment of a favoured class, and the impoverishment of the present and future generations of wealth producers of this country; and we call upon every just-minded man to assist in ridding the empire of the blight of felonious landlordism, the root evil which is primarily responsible for causing the starvation and degradation of the workers of the United Kingdom."

It is also the "root evil" on this continent; and if suffered to remain, will ensure our working population a poverty greater in its degrading effects than that of England. Already the iron has entered deeper into the souls of our people than into the souls of the poor of England.—*S. Frisco Star*.

The London County Council is considering the advisability of expending a million and a half or two millions on the erection of a palatial County Hall. Of course all the eligible sites are at prohibitive prices. So, like many other schemes of improvement now on hand, the project is to be held over till the incidence of local taxation is readjusted in the direction of taxing the ground landlords, who at present receive in ground rents alone £16,000,000, while the tenants submit to bearing all the taxes.

Catholic Socialism.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE REV. ISAAC MOORE.

REVEREND SIR,—During the course of the last month you have delivered a series of sermons under the above title, the main purpose of which was to show that private ownership of land is instituted by God, and therefore in accordance with the moral law. The point of these sermons was directed against the teaching of those who call themselves Single Taxers; and as special prominence has been given to your sermons in the pages of the "Argus," I am justified in subjecting to some criticism the statements and conclusions contained therein. I feel all the more at liberty to do so because the Rev. Father M'Glynn, whose sermons teach pure Single Tax, has lately received authority from the Church to continue his teaching, on the ground that it contains nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine. Your statements and conclusions are therefore not supported by the authority of the Catholic

Church, but purely personal to yourself, and therefore open to the test of individual reasoning. The space at my disposal unfortunately does not permit me to deal with your sermons as fully as they deserve, and I am therefore compelled to confine my criticism to their central and most important part.

Let me first show the premises which you lay down, and with which I fully concur. You say:—

"All the earth and the riches thereof are given not to any set of individuals, but to all in common" by God's bounty. "Until the intellect of man employ its ingenuity to utilise the force God has placed at his disposition, and the hand of man put forth its strength to labour, no golden harvest will wave and glitter in the sun, &c., &c." "Even for the fulfilment of His most benevolent purposes, God has been pleased to make Himself dependent on the co-operation of man.



THE REV. FATHER M'GLYNN.

Furthermore, by endowing man with free will He has called into existence a power able to thwart His most merciful designs."

These are your words; nor do you deny that the earth which God has given in common to all men, and all generations of men, has by our laws been made the property of a few and of their descendants, to the exclusion of the majority of men who live to-day and of their descendants. On the contrary you seek to justify this act of spoliation. I do not think that you hold the opinion that man's law can supersede God's law; that it can rightfully deprive any man of the bounty which his Creator intended for him. Yet, unless you hold this preposterous belief, you are, by your own premises, compelled to assert with me that the earth to-day belongs as rightfully to all created men in common, as it did at any previous period; and that the laws which have made it the property of the few are merely an outcome of that power of men "to thwart God's most merciful designs," which you have outlined so eloquently. God has given to men intelligence and reason to assist Him "in the fulfilment of His most benevolent purposes." They have selfishly used this power to thwart these purposes by laws which, instead of regulating the common property in land, have abolished it. Your own premises therefore prove these laws to be opposed to God's merciful intention, therefore unjust and immoral.

PHOENIX TOBACCO has no Rival for Flavour.

Moreover, you admit that God's gift to man can bear fruit only through man's co-operation which is exercised by his labour, and that the law, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread," is a revelation of infinite wisdom. Here also I fully agree with you, and therefore call upon you to declare, that any human enactment which enables some men to enjoy the fruits of the earth without labour is opposed to God's infinite wisdom. For the law which you mention, like all God-given laws, surely does not apply to some men, but to all men; moreover, if it is true, and you admit it is, that man cannot utilise the fruits of the earth except by labour, then those who enjoy them without labour of their own must deprive others of the fruit of their labour. They are therefore guilty of theft, of disobedience to the law which decrees "Thou shalt not steal."

Now this is exactly the position of the landowner. As a landowner he does not labour, he does not even assist present labourers with the result of any past labour of his own. All he does is to levy a toll on their labour for permission to make use of the earth, to which they are entitled as much as he is. This toll, levied from their labour, enables him to enjoy in abundance and without labour the fruits of the earth; this same toll levied by his descendants from the descendants of all other men will enable them to do the same. They need not sweat in order to eat their bread; they eat the bread made by others' sweat, and consequently God's laws are again set at defiance.

These conclusions, so obviously true, arise naturally from your own premises. The curious fact that you have arrived at opposite ones seems to me to result from the careless use of such words as "to require" and "property." These are some of the sentences to which I refer:—

"This right to acquire and hold property is absolutely inseparable from nature. . . It is a right conferred by nature, not by society." The careless use of these words obscures your view. It has caused you to overlook the fact that, with the exception of land, God's equal gift to all, property cannot be acquired by any man, unless some man has produced it. The natural right of property therefore rests with the producer of that property. He can transfer it to others, who have then rightfully acquired his property; but if anyone acquires property without such transfer from the producer of it, he acquires it dishonestly, by theft.

It follows equally clearly that property which has not been produced by any man, which is God's gift to all, cannot be rightfully acquired by any man; that such property is not conferred by nature, but by society; that it is so conferred in defiance of natural laws, and therefore unjustly.

It seems, however, as if you also recognised that the making of a thing alone can confer the moral title to the ownership of it. For you say:—

"Suppose he (the labourer) live sparingly and save money, and invest his savings in land, that land is his wages in another form. Who will say that the land thus purchased shall not be at his free disposal?"

This attempt to trace the ownership of land to production, and thus to place it on the only moral basis possible, is however fallacious. It fails to recognise that purchase does not give a moral title, unless the thing purchased belonged to the seller. The

seller cannot transfer greater rights than he possessed. It thus avoids the only matter in dispute, viz, whether the land belongs to one generation of men or to all generations, whether a few men can deprive all future generations of their right to own God's gift. A slight alteration in the wording of your statement will make this quite clear, will show that if your argument justifies private ownership of land, it must equally justify the ownership of slaves.

"Suppose a labourer save money and invest it in slaves, those slaves are his wages in another form. Who will say that the slaves thus purchased shall not be at his free disposal?"

I dare to think that you would be one of the first to declare that this argumentation absolutely fails to supply any moral basis for slavery. It therefore fails equally to supply any moral basis for land ownership.

Nor is it correct to say that man cannot provide for his future wants, unless he "have the right to appropriate to himself the source whence, and whence alone, all that satisfies human wants is derived, namely, a portion of the earth's surface. On the contrary, it is just this appropriation of the earth's surface, the source of all wealth, by a few, which makes it impossible for the majority of men to satisfy either their present or future wants. They are excluded from its use, cannot therefore make any wealth; and if they do get permission to use it, they are compelled to yield up for it the bulk of wealth which they make. Private ownership in land thus obviously defeats the objects for which, you say, it exists. All that men require in order to reap the full reward of the exercise of their God-given faculties is free access to some land and security of possession for the improvements which they place on the land. They cannot be entitled to more, because more cannot be given to all. Whatever more any of them receive, must be taken from others who are equally with them the children of our common Father, and therefore have received from Him equal rights to the opportunity of exercising their labour and enjoying the fruits thereof.

This equal opportunity can be secured to all by our intelligent co-operation with the merciful intention of our Creator. For as the rent of land measures the better opportunity which the use of such land gives over the least advantageous land which must be used, the collection of rent on behalf and for the use of all would give to all an equal opportunity for the exercise of their labour, and an equal share in the exceptional opportunities now exclusively enjoyed by a few. It would, moreover, destroy the power of those few, to close exceptionally advantageous land against the exercise of anybody's labour; which action produces in our midst a large and growing class who either cannot exercise their labour at all, or can do so in intermittent periods only, and forces others to expend their labour upon inferior land.

This same laxity in the use of words has led you into many statements which your own better judgment must condemn. I call your attention specially to the following:—

"Inequality amongst men is a law of nature. To this inequality must be attributed the evils which arise from the colossal wealth of the few, the grinding poverty of the millions. God, by giving to some men ability beyond that bestowed on their fellows, enabled them to grind and crush the weak and poor. It is the strict duty of the state to

protect all rights—the rights of the rich as well as the poor."

To me, it seems that this conception is as mistaken as it is contrary to our idea of an allwise and beneficent Creator. It must, of course, be admitted that if the stronger and more able use their strength and ability to rob their fellows, they can succeed if the State permits them to do so. But you, who hold that "it is the duty of the State to protect all rights—the rights of the rich as well as the poor," do not hold that the robbery of the weaker by the stronger is one of the rights which the State is bound to protect. You, I am sure, hold with me that it is the duty of the State to protect everyone against robbery, to prevent robbery, and to punish the robber. Our complaint is that the State, instead of preventing robbery, specially provides the machinery for accomplishing it; deprives the act of all moral turpitude, by concealing it under the euphonious name of private ownership of land.

For, if your contention is to be understood in the sense that the greater production of wealth by the stronger and more able, must of necessity injure the weaker or less able members of society, if the former retain all the wealth which they produce, your conception is equally dangerous and false. How can it be bad for me that Brown makes and owns more boots, more food, more machines than I do? Is not abundance a good thing? Do not we all work for the purpose of increasing the abundance of labour products? Is not the nation considered most fortunate that possesses all these things in the greatest abundance? Clearly if this is so, then the man who produces most renders most service to mankind. He increases the abundance of good things, lowers their price, and therefore enables all, even the least able members of the community, to satisfy their wants with less labour.

If, however, he uses the greater abundance of his labour products for the purpose of enslaving the weaker members of the community, then the good is turned into evil. This he can do in one way only, since chattel slavery has been abolished, viz., by purchasing the land on which all other men must live and work. All other men are then dependent for their lives and for the opportunity of maintaining it, not on the bounty of an all-merciful God, but on that of a mere fellow-man, often only too merciless, as you have yourself seen. Thus and thus only can the greater ability of some men be used "to grind and crush the weak and the poor." Prevent private property in land, and the greater ability of some men will be, what a beneficent Creator meant it to be, the stay and support of the weak and the poor.

Equally mistaken is the notion contained in the statement: "Some of the millionaires of London and New York do not own an acre of land, or if in some instances the kings of commerce have purchased an estate here or there, such will be almost a negligible quantity."

The exact opposite is the case. There are three kinds of possible property to-day, land, buildings, and other fixed improvements on land and chattels. All other things such as shares, bonds, &c., are simply signs that the holder thereof owns a share in some land, improvements, or chattels. If now you were to examine the possessions of millionaires, you would find that, without exception, the bulk of their wealth consists of land and improvements, or in shares which repre-

"DON" TOBACCO AGAINST THE WORLD.

sent land and improvements, such as railways, tramways, mines, &c., while the proportion of their wealth which is represented by chattels would certainly be found to be "a negligible quantity."

There are many more such mistaken assertions, the repetition of which would be interesting, if my space allowed of it. While I regret my inability to deal with them, my regret is tempered by the consideration that neither in your nor in my opinion, can they affect the ultimate issue. For that issue must depend on the question of justice. If private ownership of land be just, if it be in accordance with the merciful intention of a benevolent Creator, then all other considerations must fail to shake it; just as none can have any weight, if it is once ascertained that it is unjust and opposed to God's law. On this I take my stand, and ask you, reverend sir, to reconsider this great question from the same standpoint; certain that, if you do so, your great ability will be employed in removing from our social State the great and manifold evils which arise from this, the main cause of the poverty, wretchedness, and vice which are the lot of so many of our fellowmen.—I have the honour to be, Reverend Sir, your obedient servant,

MAX HIRSCH.

Sacred Rights.

The following is extracted from Boswell's "Life of Johnson." The defence of slavery and the attacks on the abolitionists bear such a ludicrous family likeness to the attacks which the defenders of land monopoly make on the single taxers, that it is worth while to exhume them from their forgotten tombs and flourish them in the face of imitators. We hope they will recognise in this mirror the likeness of themselves and of the system which they extol:—

BOSWELL ON THE SLAVE TRADE.

"The wild and dangerous attempt that has for some time been persisted in to obtain an act of our legislature to abolish so very important and necessary a branch of commercial interest, must have been crushed at once, had not the insignificance of the zealots who took the lead in it made the vast body of planters, merchants, and others, whose properties are involved in that trade, reasonably enough suppose that there could be no danger. The encouragement which the attempt has received excites my wonder and indignation, and though some men of superior abilities have supported it, whether from a love of temporary popularity, when prosperous, or a love of temporary mischief, when desperate, my opinion is unshaken. To abolish a *status*, which in all ages God has sanctioned, and man has continued, would not only be robbery to an innumerable class of our fellow-subjects, but it would be extreme cruelty to the African savages, a portion of whom it saves from massacre, or intolerable bondage in their own country, and introduces into a much happier state of life, especially now when their passage to the West Indies and their treatment there is humanely regulated. To abolish that trade would be to

shut the gates of mercy on mankind."

Whatever may have passed elsewhere about it, the House of Lords is wise and independent."

Vickory's Folly—a Parable.

By W. E. G. SHACKLE.

There was a settlement on a certain island—some people call it a continent, but let that pass—and one of the settlers was Mr. Vickory, formerly Farmer Vickory.

He has been in trouble lately, which trouble has all arisen from the ambition of the young Vickorys, and has been the result of misguided inventiveness, which is as bad as stupid conservatism, and a good deal more expensive.

These young Vickorys were always dabbling in small experiments, and taking up "courses of study" without troubling themselves about the practical issue. They needed ballast in the shape of an ultra-practical parent, but, unfortunately, old Vickory was flighty himself.

The oldest young Vickory was the only level-headed man of the crowd, and he was not a business man. He had been brought up to farm work from his boyhood, had married early, worked hard, and raised up children and crops with unflinching regularity.

Old Vickory had thirteen children in all, five with wives and families of their own, and they all lived in the big farmhouse, so that they mustered pretty strong. Old Vickory grew quite patriarchal, in his manner at first, and, finally in his aspirations. He was the head of the Vickory tribe, he said, which was true enough; but, as he got older, and the birth rate got higher, the old man was fired with the idea that his tribe was going to be a nation all by itself—which was a mistake.

In the midst of this infatuation young Mel Vickory came to him one day with a brown paper parcel under his arm, and, putting it down unopened, said—

"Dad, I've been thinking what a lot of feet there are amongst us to shoe."

He was a fellow who went straight to the point, was Mel.

"True," said the old man, "we're increasing in numbers, my son."

"And in expenses."

"Yes—one follows the other."

"Well, Dad," said Mel, "why shouldn't we reduce our expenses by making our own boots and shoes for instance?"

"I don't know," said his father. "I never thought of it. It might be done."

"Might be done!" said Mel. "Good heavens, Dad, do you think I've been studying the 'Practical Bootmaker' for the last three months without knowing how to make a pair of bluchers?"

"My boy," said old Vickory, "I really didn't know you had been studying it."

"That shows all the interest you take in your family," said Mel, plaintively.

"Well, Mel, my boy," said his father, "I have a lot to look after, as you know, but I shall be only too glad to encourage you in any useful pursuit which you may feel inclined to follow. Is that a sample you've got there?"

"Yes, it is," said Mel, and then he untied the straps.

They were not altogether models, those boots, but they had one advantage, they were constructed on a liberal scale.

Mel said so, and said it proudly.

"No scant measurement here. No pinching times with these on your feet, Dad," he observed.

"No-o," said old Vickory, looking down at them. "Now, how much, Mel, do you reckon that pair of boots is worth?"

"Well," said Mel, "Come to pay for the leather, interest on tools and my time at a fair allowance—say 16s. 6d."

He said it quickly, but old Vickory had a ready apprehension. "As much as that?" he asked.

"I know it's more by a few shillings than Stubbs would charge," replied Mel, "but you must remember, Dad, it would be giving employment to your own family."

All this time there were a thousand acres of good land on the farm lying idle; the fact didn't seem to strike old Vickory though, as you would have thought it would, and Mel went on—

"I don't take altogether to the farm work, nor Alice to the milking and dairying—this would suit us down to the ground. Besides you would have your boots made on your own premises, and the money you paid for 'em would be all kept in your own family."

"By George, that's so," said old Vickory. This was what really clinched the matter. It presented a new and fascinating aspect to old Vickory, and he bought the boots.

"Of course, if it doesn't pay, you can easily give it up," said Mel.

"Oh, of course," said old Vickory.

Thereupon Mel sold his hobnails to his brother Jack, made himself a pair of slippers, and established a shop in a back room. Thus the manufacturing idea took root at Vickory's; it soon bore seed and flourished.

Mel had no sooner got fairly started than Jim and Bill, who had been seen conferring together a good deal of late, approached their father on another tack. Jim was spokesman. He pointed out that they paid away a good deal each year for new machinery, repairs to rolling stock, &c.

"Why shouldn't we do it here?" he asked. "I reckon I can weld two pieces of iron as well as Steel the blacksmith, though I may take a little longer over it, and Bill here is a cute hand with the saw and adze."

"So am I," said Jack, who was passing, "and so ought every farmer to be."

No notice was taken of Jack.

Well, they started. How strangely familiar the procedure seems, doesn't it? Wait a bit though.

The thing spread like an epidemic of measles, and ran right through the Vickory family. Every spare space was turned into a workshop.

Dick, who had married a tailor's wife, took three months' leave, went away to a big city, and learnt the art of cutting—so he said. He made the family clothes. The best point about these Vickory's was that they were intensely loyal, and patronised each other without a murmur at the 50 per cent. increase in cost. Even Jack, who suffered most in pocket, never thought of ordering over the heads of his brothers.

In a comparatively short time they were making their own machinery, boots and clothes, even down to dresses and millinery, for Aunt Maria claimed her share of "protection" as she called it, and the women had to submit—with a very bad grace though, I regret to say. Alexander opened a general store and Cornelius a brewery and distillery. Old Vickory grew intoxicated—with success it was said. That's as may be. Any way he raised money on the property, made Herbert his banker, and built a flour mill.

All this time, of course, the area of land under cultivation grew less each year, for Jack and his family were eventually the only tillers of the soil left in the family.

SMOKE PHOENIX AROMATIC TOBACCO.

But this was not heeded, for the others claimed that, inasmuch as they provided the implements and necessaries for Jack and his family, they were genuine producers also. And it sounded logical too.

The whole place seemed such a busy hive of industry that old Vickory could not but think that things were flourishing, and scarcely ever consulted his bank book.

He was therefore astonished when, one of the mortgages falling due, he found himself without sufficient funds to pay it off. However, Herbert got it renewed, so that was all right. But his balance grew less and less, and pretty soon he found it hard work to raise the interest on the loans.

All the members of the family who had any money put by had, of course, to come to the rescue; but they grumbled over it—ungrateful children, when their father had done so much for them.

These disbursements necessitated economy, and the thriving artisans got less work to do, and began to lounge against the doorposts. But none of them thought of going into the fields with Jack. So they held a council, and resolved to send young Thomas out to canvass for orders; for Thomas was a smart, affable lad—just the type of a commercial traveller—it would be a good thing for him as well as for them, they said. He went out with his samples, and they sat down and waited. In a fortnight he returned without having booked an order. Some of the goods were all right, he said, but the prices were all wrong; and some of the prices were all right, but the goods were all wrong. They made elaborate calculations on receiving this report, but found themselves unable to either lower prices or raise qualities. Then they said that Tom was a failure.

Then a nasty change came over old Vickory.

"Of course you can't sell at a profit outside," he said; "it was only intended that you should manufacture for the family, there's too many of you at it, that's what's the matter."

After this they sold some of their stock at a sacrifice, and waited for the harvesting of the new crop. They had a prolific yield that year—but so had everybody else—the market collapsed and they barely cleared expenses.

"Look here, father," said Jack, "we must get more land under crop. Some of these fellows have got to come out with me or we shall all starve. Paying these fancy prices for everything we get is crippling the farm."

Old Vickory had been thinking all the night of those mortgages, and his visions had been of the Insolvency Court and of the sale of the old estate that he had held ever since he was a young man. So he was shaky and unstrung, and leaned on Jack heavily.

"You're right, Jack," he replied; "I see that now. It was my fault; but what's to be done? They won't go out on to the farm; I know they won't."

"Then," said Jack, looking the old man square in the eyes, "we must get others who will."

The old man gasped.

"And," went on his eldest son relentlessly, "we shall have to buy in the cheapest market, and that's at the town, not here."

Again old Vickory gasped.

"But," said Jack, "I hope we shan't have to get outside hands—I don't care for strangers, myself—and I don't think we shall need to, between you and me. You know

how big my family has grown—I've got grandchildren following the plough—and if we withdraw our custom from these home tradesmen, who can't supply us as cheaply as others can, they must come out or starve."

"I want your permission to do it," he continued; "and, if you don't give it, I shall shift out."

"Don't talk like that, Jack," said the old fellow, with tears in his eyes; "I'll give you permission."

"Right you are, dad," said Jack. "Now all you have to do is to stand firm, and don't you forget it."

Jack was as good as his word. His horses went into the town to be shod, and his machines to be repaired. The storekeeper supplied him with his groceries, the shoemaker with his boots. Everything that was cheaper there he bought in the town; what was not he purchased at home. And he began to get straight again. Meantime, among the manufacturers there was dire dismay. They held meetings and petitioned their father, and then deputationised him. But he held firm and even grew stronger. And when they came beseeching him for relief, he simply pointed to the idelands and the rusty ploughs.

And it became apparent to these young Vickorys that some of them must go out on to the farm land or—starve, just as Jack said. Then the question arose—Who was to go? And that question was debated long and furiously, and the end of it was that—no settlement was arrived at at all.

But who do you think was the first man to go out—voluntarily, too?—Thomas! The youngest young Vickory, and the brightest and smartest and toffiest and best educated; he was the first man to turn out, and Mel was the last.

But they are all out now, or pretty nearly; and the mortgages will be repaid shortly, and all things will be pleasant and profitable again at Vickory's, just as they used to be, and just as they should be.

There were sacrifices of plant and stock, of course, but the lesser evil is merged in the greater good.

Fiscal Fancies.

Thus speaks the "Age" on the 6th ult.:—His (Sir Henry Wrixon's) affirmation that Victorian productiveness has declined was sustained on no better ground than a falling off in exports. This, as the proverbial schoolboy ought to know, is an absolute confusion of two separate things. It is quite possible for the volume of production to largely increase while exports diminish, because a people which supplies its own internal wants has necessarily less to sell to its neighbours.

At last even the "Age" is compelled to admit that Protection cannot increase employment, that it merely shifts the labour of the people from the industries which produce for the markets of the world to those which produce for the narrow home markets. Thus have the Protectionists to abandon every pretence, and to acknowledge that their teaching has been a delusion and a snare.

Mr. W. J. Mountain, member of the South Melbourne City Council, has given it in evidence that

There were 10 factories in South Melbourne. In 1890 these employed 3000 men, and paid £6000 every week in wages. On Wednesday last there were only 700 men employed, and £1700 paid in wages. Thus in three years there had been a falling off in the number of men employed of 2300, and in wages paid of £6300 per week.

Thus does Protection give "constant" employment. Outside the lothouse fostered industries, such a decline in the number of men employed has not yet been witnessed anywhere in the civilised world.

Once more the Protectionists have admitted in practice what they deny in theory, that Protection increases prices. That shining light among them, Mr. Williams, M.L.A., led a deputation to the Minister of Customs, and joined most heartily in the demand that the duty on cartridges should not be held to include a duty on the powder and shot which they contain, because the latter course increased the cost of cartridges to the consumers. How this admission will affect the logical mind of the member for Richmond is not yet known. Probably he will apply to Mr. Williams the same loving epithet to which he treated Sir Graham Berry and the "Age," when those authorities made a similar digression into the realm of truth. He called them "fools."

MR. TRENWITH'S CONSISTENCY.



I am one of those Protectionists who holds that a protective duty was not a tax which the consumer paid at all; that where the duty did not keep the imported article out it was paid by the person who desired to dispose of the imported article, and therefore was a tax upon the foreigner who used our market. It is only because I am a Protectionist of that kind that I support Protection at all. If I thought Protection was a tax in any case, I would oppose it altogether. —Oct. 11th, 1892.

Hence the goods taken out of bond have been taken out to be distributed, and have been distributed, and the increased price has been paid. Then how are the Government to return the money to the persons who have really paid the duty? The merchants have not paid the duty; the merchants never do pay the duty; if they did they would very soon be out of business. They simply pass the duty on to those who deal with them.—Nov. 2, 1892.

How protection and private railways promote industry may be gathered from the following statement taken from the San Francisco "Star":—Some years ago several stove-moulders in this city formed a co-operative company, and placed stoves on the market of unsurpassed quality, at less than Eastern stoves could be sold here. When the wholesale houses notified Huntington,

Smoke "DON" TOBACCO for Enjoyment.