

ment he would like for workingmen is that of the Czar, as described in a local paper's interview with Prof. Paul Milyoukov, of the University of St. Petersburg, one of the summer lecturers at the University of Chicago, who arrived a few days ago and secured apartments in one of the strike ridden hotels. "I can hardly realize it," said Prof. Milyoukov. "This would not be possible in Russia. Such a thing as a trades union would be entirely out of the question there. In my country it is illegal to form a trades union and a criminal offense to start a strike. The strikers are all regarded as criminals and punished as such."

To listen to the average business man's indictment of labor unions—much of which is a "true bill," it must be confessed—you would suppose he was appealing to your sense of justice. But he isn't. He is only appealing to your sympathy for him. If he were a workingman he would be guilty of every unjust thing they are guilty of; being a business man he is solicitous only for the business man's interests, which he calls rights regardless of whether they are rights or not. Leaving the hindmost to the mercy of the devil, he trots along with a placid conscience to the good old business man's song of—

Let him get who has the power,  
Let him keep who can.

When the workingman was a pitiable under dog in this game of getting and keeping, the average business man smiled. But now that the working man "butts" into the same game, the average business man is extremely sensitive to the injustice of it—for workingmen. When the average business man is ready to have justice done all around—to crush out institutions that rob workingmen as well as labor movements that annoy business men—his complaints about the injustice of labor unions will have a truer ring and his rights seem better worth conserving. What he needs to learn now is that he cannot go on preserving and unjustly profiting by

laws and institutions that disinherit a vast majority of the people, and yet enjoy his own rights in peace. Justice is impersonal. No one can appeal to her standards with reference to his own rights, unless he is willing to abide by them with reference to the rights of all; and this is something which would amaze your average business man if he found himself doing it.

Take for example the decision of Judge Holdom<sup>8</sup> in fining Chicago workingmen last week for breach of an injunction. Whether his decision was right or wrong legally, one thing he said in rendering it was profoundly true. We refer to his remark that "all have a right to work." This is a common saying also of your average business man. But he doesn't mean it. All that he means, and probably all that Judge Holdom meant, was that one workingman has no right to prevent another workingman from working for an employer. That is true, too, but if the principle it involves goes no further, it might as well be false.

Suppose the employer had already monopolized all the natural opportunities for work, what right would he have to ask a court of equity to enjoin a laborer from preventing another from working for him. Isn't there a maxim of equity jurisprudence that would apply in such a case—the maxim, namely, that "he who comes into a court of equity must come with clean hands"? Yet that is in principle the very situation. A particular employer may not have monopolized natural opportunities for work, and a particular workman might not be able to utilize them if they were not monopolized; but employers as a class have monopolized them, and laborers as a class could utilize them.

We need not go outside of Chicago, with its vast number of vacant but very desirable and much-desired building lots, for illustrative examples. It is this systematic exclusion

everywhere of laborers as a class from natural opportunities for work that accounts for efforts of individual laborers to prevent other individuals from working for employers. Yet Judge Holdom and the average business man, utterly oblivious to their own wholesale prevention of men from the full enjoyment of their right to work, are stentorian in their indignant ejaculations when a few poor men, struggling to raise the price of a casual job, try to prevent others from taking it away from them. This interference is bad, to be sure; but how petty and narrow and mean and swinish must be the disposition of any man, unless his ignorance may excuse him, who can condemn this interference while approving the other.

One of Mr. Chamberlain's advance couriers for his scheme of imperial protection is an intimation to workingmen that they are to be benefited by the scheme through the old age pensions it will provide. They are to pay—this is Mr. Chamberlain's explanation—75 per cent. of the proposed tariff taxes on food; but that is all to come back in pensions to the worthy among them as they grow old, increased by the other 25 per cent. which the leisure classes will have to pay. Think of that, now! The working people wear themselves out with work, but get so little that there is nothing for them in their old age; and they must be pensioned, three-quarters of their pensions being provided by themselves in taxes extorted from their own meager wages. But the leisure classes make their leisure so profitable that they get no pensions (not out of this deal), but must make up the other 25 per cent. for pensions to their working brethren. What does it all mean? Are we living with Alice in the looking glass, where work consumes and leisure produces?

On the contrary, it is a reasonable suspicion that Mr. Chamberlain's pension proviso for workingmen may prove disastrous to the British landlords whom he is seeking to protect.

Suppose these British workingmen should conclude that the pension idea is good, but that taxation on imported food is not the best way of raising the fund. Suppose they should conclude that old age pensions ought to be paid out of the land values which British industry has caused to become so prodigious and by means of which British landlords live in luxury without pensions. Suppose they should say: "Yes, indeed, workingmen ought to be pensioned lavishly when they grow old. Joey Chamberlain is right enough there. But the chaps to foot the bill aren't the workingmen. It is the owners of this tight little island, who charge us workingmen so handsomely for working on it and living on it—they ought to pay." Suppose the British workingman should say something like that? Perhaps he will. Maybe he intended vaguely to get pensioned out of land values anyhow, and Mr. Chamberlain has sprung the imperial protection scheme to throw him off the landlord scent. However that may be, the scent is there, and if the British workingman once gets on the trail of it no red herring is likely to divert him.

When Sir Charles Dilke, the Radical member of parliament, attacked Chamberlain's protection policy last week on the floor of the Commons, he ripped open another of the gas bags which Chamberlain and his protection supporters had sent out as a Protection envoy. They had pointed to the statistics of exports from protection Germany, protection France, and protection United States as evidence of the great things which Protection has done for those countries and could therefore be expected to do for free trade England. But Dilke reminded them that this was empty boasting, for Great Britain's exports were even now greater than the exports of Germany, France and the United States. He might have gone farther and shown them that free trade England gets pay for her exports, full measure and running over, while protection countries fall far

short of getting pay for what they export.

This comparison holds good, at any rate, regarding the United Kingdom and the United States. By reference to the Statesman's Year Book for 1903 we find that during the calendar year 1902 the United Kingdom exported domestic merchandize to the value of \$1,417,699,900—estimating pounds sterling in round numbers at \$5. Turning now to the United States treasury sheet of exports and imports for June, 1902, we find that during the fiscal year 1901-2 the United States exported domestic merchandize to the value of \$1,355,821,340. So free trade England exported more domestic merchandize in the one year of this comparison than did the protected United States. And England got her pay, while the United States did not. This appears in the same reference authorities. During the same year the United Kingdom imported foreign merchandize to the value of \$2,644,301,420, while the merchandize imports of the United States amounted to only \$902,911,308. Tabulating those figures we have this significant picture:

	United Kingdom.	United States.
Exports .....	\$1,417,699,900	\$1,355,821,340
Imports .....	2,644,301,420	902,911,308
Excess of income.	\$1,226,901,520	\$0,000,000,000
Excess of outgo....	0,000,000,000	452,910,032

But it may be supposed that what the United States appears to have lost in exchanges of merchandize, they made up in receipts of gold and silver. That is, as Mr. McKinley said, "we get our pay in pure gold." The supposition would be quite erroneous. For, although the United States did receive, in the year referred to, the comparatively paltry excess in gold imports over gold exports of \$807,938 (less than one-fifth of one per cent. of the net outgo of merchandize), this was more than offset by the exportation during the same year of an excess of \$21,500,136 in silver. Clearly, then, there was no payment in gold and silver for our excess of merchandize exports. Neither were we running up a credit abroad to be

drawn against in the future; for exchange in New York June 30, 1902 (according to Dun's Review for July 5, 1902), was \$4.84¼ to the pound sterling at 60 days, \$4.87% at sight, and \$4.88½ by cable. As these rates were above par of exchange, drafts upon London must have been scarce in New York, which shows that American exporters were short of European credits to draw against. So the foreign credit explanation of our exports fails. The only remaining explanation would be that the United States were investing their excessive exports in permanent foreign loans or other investments of some sort. But everyone knows this to be false. It appears, therefore, that free trade England exported more than protection United States in 1902, and that she was overpaid for her exports while the United States was somehow or other underpaid for hers. The statistics of other years would make the comparison even worse for the United States.

**HOBSON, ROOSEVELT AND THE BOYS**

Captain Hobson has an attractive personality which supports the natural inclination to admiration founded on his heroic performance. His face is kindly, friendly, and his manner is most pleasing. His whole bearing bespeaks withal a fine, noble nature. When one looks at him and hears that he is engaged in lecturing, you would expect that he is going about speaking in behalf of some high purpose for the betterment of the human race. When you actually hear him, and find that his final plea is for the expenditure of a billion dollars on the navy, one can only feel the pity of it—the pity that his training and environment have kept him in ignorance of a finer spirit that is getting born into the world.

President Roosevelt is a man of many splendid qualities, qualities that go to make power and influence. His face is full of an almost inspiring will and determination. His manner of presentation carries conviction. Whatever he says to-day is read by