

sides, he can be quoted on one side and be shown to have acted on the other. The question Mr. Bryan raises is not whether McKinley made anti-slavery reservations outside the treaty, but whether he in fact protects slavery in the name and by the authority of the United States as the suzerain power in Sulu. And that question is easily and incontrovertibly answered. Slavery does exist in Sulu; it exists there under the protection of the American flag; it exists there by the permission and in virtue of the authority of the American army, which McKinley commands. Mr. McKinley's reservation, which Meikeljohn quotes, is ignored by the Sulu sultan, by the Sulu slaveowners, by the American army, by the secretary of war and by McKinley himself.

INFLATED AND FALSE PROSPERITY.

The true character of McKinley prosperity is innocently exposed by one of the McKinley side shows in this presidential campaign, a "faked up" labor organization which calls itself the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political League" and has national headquarters in room 802 Grand Northern building, Chicago. From its literature there is no difficulty in discovering that the officers of this Hannaistic organization are much closer to the railway trust than they are to railway workmen.

One specimen of its pretentious labor literature is intended to demonstrate by figures the great prosperity which railway workmen are now enjoying as compared with the depression under which they suffered before Mr. McKinley waived his wand and brought forth good times. The whole first page of the document is accordingly devoted to sad pictures of the railway workmen's life in 1896, side by side with glowing pictures of his active and prosperous life in 1900. The other pages are devoted to a great display of comparative figures, which make it appear to careless readers that railway wages have risen wonderfully since 1895.

One is really impressed when he sees thus displayed a "gain of 143,899

in employes, "of \$77,459,635 in wages," and so on.

But let us examine these boastful figures somewhat in detail.

According to this veracious republican document there has been a great increase in the number of employes.

Here are the figures:

Number in 1895.....	785,034
Number in 1899.....	928,924
Increase	143,890

So far, then, so good. There has been, let us say, an increase in the number of railway employes.

Likewise with the amount of freight carried:

Tons of freight carried in 1895.....	696,761,171
Tons of freight carried in 1899.....	959,763,583
.....	263,002,412

Upon the faith of these republican figures, therefore, the roads carried much more freight in 1899 than in 1895.

Now let us see what these lump figures imply as to the individual work of the men. Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when 696,761,171 tons of freight were carried, the average per employe was 887 tons; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when 959,763,583 tons were carried, the average per employe was then 1,033. So the increase of work in carrying freight averages 146 tons.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if heavier work is the same to them as prosperity. They had to handle 146 tons more per employe, which is nearly three tons more per week, in 1899 than in 1895.

Not only did they do more work; they made more money for the roads.

This same republican document claims an increase of net earnings of the railroads, over and above operating expenses, as follows:

Net earnings in 1895.....	\$349,651,047
Net earnings in 1899.....	456,641,119
Increase	\$106,990,072

Now what proportion do these net earnings of the road bear to the number of men whose labor helped earn them? Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when the net earnings of the roads were \$349,651,047, the average per man employed was \$445.39; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when the net earnings had risen to \$456,641,119, the

average per man was then \$491.58. So the increase of net earnings for the roads averages \$46.19 to each employe.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if larger net earnings for the roads are the same thing to the men as prosperity. They turned over to the railway treasuries, over and above operating expenses, \$46.19 more per employe, which is nearly \$1.00 more per week, in 1899 than in 1895.

But that is not all. They increased the dividends of stockholders.

It is claimed by this same republican document that there has been an increase of dividends to the amount now shown:

Dividends in 1895.....	\$ 85,287,542
Dividends in 1899.....	111,009,822
Increase	\$25,722,280

What proportion do those dividends bear to the number of employes? Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when dividends were \$85,287,542, the average per man employed was \$108.64; and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when dividends had mounted up to \$111,009,822, the average per man employed was then \$119.50. So the increase of dividends for railroad stockholders averages \$10.86 to each employe.

It follows that the railway employes were more prosperous in 1899 than in 1895—if larger dividends for stockholders are the same thing to the employes as prosperity. They turned over to railway stockholders \$10.86 more per employe, which is over 20 cents a week, in 1899 than in 1895.

We venture to question, however, whether larger dividends for stockholders, greater net earnings for the roads, and heavier work, constitute in themselves what may be called prosperity for railway employes. Such prosperity may be satisfactory to the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political league," who possibly regard work as a greater boon than wages, and it may be a complete fulfillment of the McKinley prosperity promises; but to the traditional "man up a tree" wages would appear to be the most important considera-

tion to men who live by wages. Let us see, then, what this same most interesting McKinley campaign document discloses on the subject of railway wages. Here are its figures:

Approximate amount of wages and salaries in 1895.....	\$445,508,261
Approximate amount of wages and salaries in 1899.....	522,967,896
Increase	\$77,459,635

So wages do appear to have increased in the aggregate.

But, according to the same document, so also has the number of employes. Let us ascertain, then, from these McKinley statistics what has been the effect upon per capita wages, for each employe lives upon his own wages and not upon wages in the aggregate.

Since there were 785,034 employes in 1895, when wages were \$445,508,261, the average wages per employe was \$567.50, and as there were 928,924 employes in 1899, when wages had risen in the aggregate to \$522,967,896, the average per employe was then \$562.98.

So the average of wages per employe, instead of having increased at all, had decreased. It was \$4.52 less in 1899, under McKinley, than in 1895, before McKinley.

How, then, do the figures of this McKinley campaign document indicate prosperity for railway workingmen? We confess our inability to figure it out.

The workmen handled more freight on the average per man in 1899 than in 1895 by 146 tons. They earned a larger net income on the average per man for the road in 1899 than in 1895 by \$46.19. They turned over fatter dividends on the average per man to stockholders in 1899 than in 1895 by \$10.86. But they got less pay on the average per man in 1899 than in 1895 by \$4.52.

It is easy to see that this means prosperity for the railway trusts, but where do the railway employes come in? How does this McKinley prosperity benefit them?

Not the least important thing about this railway workmen's "prosperity" document is the fact that it fairly exemplifies the kind of prosperity that Mr. McKinley has blessed all American workingmen with. In

every other line of employment, as well as in railroading, hired men are working harder, producing more, and getting less.

That they are working harder is a painfully familiar fact to most hired men of every class—mechanics, unskilled workmen, clerks and all. We cannot prove it by statistics proffered by Mr. McKinley's supporters, because these statisticians are as a rule more astute than the managers of the "Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political league," whose statistics we have analyzed above. They do not give us in general employments the statistics of both wages and work. But it happens that in the republican campaign book for 1900, published by the republican national committee, they do give, on page 293, a table of statistics from which the average of wages per employe, though not the average of work, can be ascertained. And from that table it appears that the average of general wages, instead of having risen since 1895, has, like the average of railway wages, actually fallen. It has fallen from \$478.04 down to \$451.40.

The republican table in question is introduced by the national committee with this explanation:

The following table shows the returns received from 200 manufacturers in the United States of the number of employes engaged and wages paid by those firms from 1890 to 1899 inclusive.

Then comes the table, from which we take the figures beginning with 1895. They are as follows:

Year.	Number of Employes.	Wages Paid.
1895	110,556	\$52,851,317
1896	112,551	53,209,420
1897	109,600	54,412,774
1898	131,428	62,247,940
1899	174,645	78,835,069

If, now, the reader will take the pains to divide the aggregate of wages each year by the number of employes for the same year, he will find that the average wages per employe in 1895 were \$478.04; that in 1896 they fell to \$472.75; that in 1897 they rose to \$496.46; that in 1898 they fell to \$473.64; and that in 1899 they fell still further, to \$451.40, which is \$26.64 lower than they were in 1895.

On republican statistical authority, then, we find, when we analyze

the figures, that hired men are not only doing more work per man than they did before McKinley's election, but that they are getting less pay per man.

And the condition of employers who have no monopoly privileges is not much different from that of their men. They, too, are doing more work, but making less profit than before. McKinley prosperity is what for two years we have insisted that it is, and what so respectable an authority as the Philadelphia Times now bluntly calls it—"inflated and false."

THE STUNTED CHILDREN OF THE COAL FIELDS.

"For, oh," say the children, "we are weary,
And we cannot run or leap—
If we cared for any meadows, it were merely
To drop down in them and sleep.
Our knees tremble sorely in the stooping—
We fall upon our faces, trying to go;
And underneath our heavy eyelids drooping.
The reddest flower would look as white as snow.
For, all day long, we drag our burden tiring.
Through the coal-dark underground;
Or, all day we drive the wheels of iron
In the factories, round and round."
—Mrs. Browning.

When the big hearted Fred Dilcher, of the executive board of the mine workers, conceived and organized that procession of half clad, half starved children in the anthracite coal fields last week, he swayed the hearts and stirred the souls of his countrymen to greater depths than could have been done by the greatest orator in the world.

Here was a procession of young little old men, from eight to sixteen years of age. Stunted and blunted, robbed of the playground and the school-room, they knew of nothing but work! work! work! The day that witnessed that demonstration was a glad day to those children. Somehow they felt that their deliverance was nigh, and a thrill of joy and hope quickened their steps as they marched through the town.

In a conversation with the writer, Thomas I. Kidd, who witnessed the procession, said: "I never saw such unbridled joy as was manifested by those boys. Two of the kids were so intoxicated with the excitement of the occasion, with the liberty which it gave them to do something inde-