

"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-

ers for like altruistic or "scientific" reasons.

Prof. Le Rossignol, however, is a dubious advocate for his land monopoly cause. One point he dwells upon in a way well calculated to make votes for the Bucklin amendment (which would allow each county to exempt personal property and improvements if its voters wish to), rather than against the amendment. Considering the probable effect of the system of taxation which the adoption of that amendment would permit if desired, this astute economist says:

Already, in anticipation of the possible adoption of the amendments, the depression in land values which began with the panic of 1893 has been unduly prolonged. If the amendments are carried at the November election, this condition of depression will no doubt be greatly intensified and the value of unimproved land is likely to fall in anticipation of the adoption of the land tax in one or more counties of the State. If, at the general election of 1903, a single county should adopt the tax, there would follow a sharp decline in the value of unimproved land in that county, together with a sympathetic decline throughout the state.

What possible objection to that result anybody could have who is not a land forestaller, it is extremely difficult to imagine. The basis of prosperity is cheap unimproved land, as the history of this country abundantly testifies. Cheap land makes prosperous farmers, high wages, brisk business; dear land checks prosperity and culminates in hard times. The Denver professor argues for dear land neither wisely nor well, but fallaciously enough to induce the forestallers of land in Colorado to publish what he writes in order to humbug the monopoly-ridden people of Colorado into voting for dear land. When dear air and dear sunlight are good things for anybody but their owners, dear land will be a boon. But never before, and let the voters of Colorado mark it well.

If it were not for our tolerant disposition a good many people that we know would lose our friendship.—Puck.

STRIKE BREAKERS AND STRIKE MAKERS.

A new business has sprung up under the pressure of that thickening conflict between labor and monopoly, which is so often miscalled the "conflict between labor and capital." It is the business of supplying "strike breakers."

To illustrate the character and scope of this detestable occupation we quote from the advertising card of a New York detective agency which has embarked in it, evidently on a large scale:

Special.—We are prepared to furnish strike breakers, men to take the place of strikers, in every capacity from messenger boys to locomotive engineers on reasonable notice. This includes machinists, boiler makers, blacksmiths, carpenters, conductors and brakemen for steam roads, conductors and motormen for trolley roads, etc., etc.

If labor were in great demand how could "strike breakers" be so easily secured. If there were real prosperity they would be better employed. That they can be secured, however, does not depend upon the unconfirmed advertisement of a detective agency. It is demonstrated by actual experience. A large squad of "strike breakers" was recently taken by a Chicago detective agency a distance of 1,000 miles from Chicago to New Orleans to break a street car strike.

Rioting resulted, of course. So long as human nature is what it is, such things will cause violent outbreaks. If you dispute it, put yourself for a moment in the place of the New Orleans strikers. You have your home in that city. Your family is dependent upon your wages. Your wages are low and your hours are long. You solicit of your corporate employer a consideration of your condition, asking for a few pennies more in wages and a few minutes less in working time. Your solicitations are ignored. Then you do the only thing you can do, unless you merely keep on at your work, with its exhausting hours and shabby pay; you join with your associates in a peaceable strike. While this is in progress a group of strange men, imported from a thousand miles away, come into your city, in charge of a private

detective. They do not come to settle among you as neighbors. They do not come to cast in their lot with the citizens of the city where your humble home is established. They come as aliens, as enemies, as professional "strike breakers," and their coming means the loss of your home as the alternative of continuing in the slavish dependence for a negligently livelihood upon the soulless body corporate for which you work.

Perhaps you wouldn't heave a brick at the interlopers. But have you ever been put to a similar test and withstood the temptation?

If it were true that strikers wantonly prevent their fellow citizens who are nonunion men from working, something might be said for the "strike breaking" business. But it is not true. When they do interfere in this way it is not wantonly, but as part of a struggle between two sets of men, each wanting the same scarce jobs and each needing them in order to live and rear their families. One set is meekly willing to suffer greater impoverishment to get them, while the other adopts the more strenuous policy of fighting for them.

"We are contending," protested the president of the Erie railroad, referring to the anthracite coal strike, "for the right of the American citizen to work without regard to creed, nationality, or association," and he went on to declare that it is a crime to prevent this.

Is that liberty loving gentleman quite sure that he was not talking just for buncombe? Didn't he really mean that he and his monopoly associates were contending for power to control the American citizen's right to work? And isn't that what his sympathizers wished to see?

For instance, the anthracite coal area of Pennsylvania is very extensive. Only a small part of it is open for mining. The rest is kept closed by so-called owners.

If their privileges of monopolizing natural resources were abolished, American citizens, "regardless of creed, nationality or association," could voluntarily exercise their right to work by working there. Nor would capital be lacking to open and