

"practically worthless." He also says that it is impossible to ascertain "by ordinary census methods, whether or not the average earnings in any industry or in the country as a whole have increased or decreased." Also in the census report itself it is admitted that the change in method "undoubtedly invalidates in a marked degree any comparisons that may be attempted between the returns of the two censuses." Yet in that report, as finally published, comparative tables of average wages are given! Why? Of what use are comparative tables of incomparable statistics? Of none whatever, that appears upon the surface, except to enable partisan speakers and editors to quote them as evidence of "prosperity among the working classes," without quoting the few words that are buried in the text and which invalidate them. If the census officials can make any answer to Mr. Bliss's damaging arraignment it will be wise for them to do so. As the matter now stands the census computations appear to be not merely valueless but fraudulent.

Single tax men over the country cannot complain of being overlooked this year by the Democratic party in the distribution of nominations for offices in which they might promote their cause. There are a large number of Democratic candidates who qualifiedly indorse single tax principles and methods, and no inconsiderable number are pronounced advocates of this reform. One of these is Franklin K. Lane, the Democratic candidate for governor of California. Another is L. F. C. Garvin, the Democratic candidate for governor of Rhode Island. Herbert S. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for secretary of state of Ohio, has been heard upon the single tax platform from coast to coast. William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, one of the oldest single tax men, is the Democratic candidate for sheriff of Mahoning county, Ohio; and Prof. Lybarger, a single tax orator, has the legislative nomination in a Pennsylvania dis-

trict. For Congress, Edmund G. Vail, of Cleveland, is the nominee in Tom L. Johnson's old district. Robert Baker has been nominated in the Sixth district of New York. George A. Miller, a prominent New York lawyer, is the nominee in the Seventh New Jersey district. Vernon J. Rose is running in Jerry Simpson's old district, the Kansas Seventh. And James O. Monroe is contesting the Eleventh of Illinois. All these are not only democratic Democrats, and able men, but single tax advocates of long standing.

Mr. Monroe's Congressional district is distinctive in that it lies in an agricultural region. Yet he does not shrink from the principles he has espoused. He has issued a platform of his own, in which he urges "the abolition of all special privilege," declaring that—

it is by special privilege, national, State and municipal, that the great monopolies of our land have been incubated, encouraged and protected. This has destroyed labor's opportunity, has forced organization in self-preservation, which, to be effectual, must result in the strike, and thus the masses must suffer as the result of the folly of their own creation.

In harmony with this general doctrine he demands—

the greatest freedom of trade permitted by the constitution of the United States, and calls the attention of the people to the fact that the commercial greatness of this country is due to the absolute free trade existing between the States.

Even a few men like that in Congress, clear in perception and courageous in expression, would soon create a political sentiment in which monopoly could not breathe and trusts would be asphyxiated.

In answer to the tales of Republicans about trusts in free trade countries, ex-Gov. Boies, of Iowa, makes an offer to which only three kinds of reply are possible. These Munchausenites must either prove up, back down, or, after the manner of Mr. Hanna, "stand pat." Gov. Boies makes them this offer:

If they can establish by competent testimony before an impartial tri-

bunal that there is one trust or combination of any kind in any free trade country on this earth that manufactures articles of necessity of any kind and makes a business of exporting them to other countries and selling them in markets foreign to their own at regular market prices substantially below those for which they sell the same articles in their own markets at regular market prices there, as our trusts are doing every day in the year, I will pay every dollar of the expense of obtaining such evidence and withdraw from this campaign and permit the election of the Republican candidate for Congress in this district without the expenditure of another hour of time or another dollar of money.

Out in Colorado, seated in the chair of economics of the University of Denver, they have a professor of the name of Le Rossignol, whose pen is now being utilized by the land grabbers and land speculators of Colorado to discredit the Bucklin amendment, which is to be voted on by the people of Colorado this Fall. Prof. Le Rossignol's profound respect for the right to life and liberty may be fairly inferred from his declaration that "if it could be shown that private ownership would best tend to the improvement of land, air or sunlight, then it would be right and beneficial for society to permit of such private ownership under proper restrictions." Voters of Colorado, how would you like to have your right to the light and warmth of the sun, and your right to breathe the air, left to the will of private owners, subject to "proper restrictions," if somebody, perhaps before you were born, had thought private ownership of privileges in sunlight and air a good thing? Prof. Le Rossignol might like it, but how about the rest of you? The spirit of this Denver professor is really borrowed from the Nehemiah Adamases of our old slavery days, who thought chattel slavery right because they thought it improving to the slave and beneficial to society. It is much the same thing whether you make men subject to ownership by others, "for their own good and that of society," or make their sources and conditions of life—land, air and sunlight—subject to ownership by oth-