

ship bought by public subscription such a blooded stallion, for the increase in the value of horses would soon have exceeded the outlay. Yet, when one of its citizens at his own expense attempted to do what they all knew should be done they layed a penalty upon him as though he had done a wrong to his fellows. That is what New Orleans continues to do. It fines men who will bring ships to its harbor. Upon one hand its "booster" citizens are loudly proclaiming the city's advantages as a business point, while upon the other hand they pounce upon and fine everyone who brings business to it. So great are the city's natural advantages, and so much has the Federal Government done for its harbor in deepening the mouth of the Mississippi, that some new business does come to it. The city does grow a little. Yet, though every new enterprise that comes to the city adds to the value of its land—and to the land only, for increasing population and business do not add to the value of houses and goods—the city levies upon the new comer, rather than upon the lands that have been increased in value because of the new business. No, the Indiana assessor is not the only man in this country who is standing between his community and prosperity.

S. C.



Striking at Symptoms.

The owner of a dilapidated building in Chicago, condemned by the sanitary bureau, was fined \$100 in the Municipal Court on September 19. When one considers, however, that he would have been fined much more than that had he torn the building down and erected a sanitary modern structure, the disposition of the case does not seem at all impressive. A system that punishes a man regardless of what he does can reform nothing. As long as builders are subject to fines—technically known as taxes on improvements—the most that can be accomplished by fines for maintenance of unsanitary dwellings is to stimulate the vacant lot industry.

S. D.



Encouraging Industry.

One of the chief functions of the Congressman is to "encourage industry." And the most approved method is to clothe the constituent who is unable to stand upon his own feet, with power to tax his fellow citizens for his own private benefit. The most popular form of tax-farming heretofore has been the protective tariff. But it is now discovered that there are other ways of encouraging industry; and incredible as it may

seem, one of them is to remove tariff duties. For fifty years the sugar growers of Louisiana have been allowed to tax the people of the United States to raise their income to what they thought it should be; yet, they were more helpless at the end of that half century of public aid to private business than they were at the beginning. But since the passage of the Wilson tariff bill there is a possibility that the Louisiana sugar planter will be able to lift himself out of the eleemosynary class.



The New Orleans Times-Picayune—than which there has been no louder voice raised in behalf of public largesses for sugar growers—notes the fact that the "better farming" movement in Louisiana is one of the "most important signs of the times." The paper adds:

Perhaps the most striking developments, for reasons which have to do with recent Federal legislation, are those noted in the sugar parishes, whose agricultural leaders have resolutely set about the task of reorganizing their farming systems. Sugar planters of national prominence, who refuse to be driven by adverse tariff laws from the culture of cane, frankly admit that their farming methods have been faulty and are definitely abandoning the so-called "one-crop system." By addresses and by practical example, moreover, they are winning the smaller farmers over to adoption of the same policy. The better-farming campaigns planned in Iberia and St. Mary parishes, for example, contemplate the continued culture of cane, with a rotation of crops that will rebuild their cropped-out soils and increase their yields, the production at home of adequate supplies of foodstuffs and forage, and the development of live stock and dairying industries to supplement the farmers' cash returns. Agricultural "rallies" were held last week in several "strategic points" in Iberia parish. A creamery has been established at New Iberia, and the work of tick eradication is well begun. Activities of much the same sort are reported from St. Mary. Unless all signs are utterly deceptive the years just ahead will witness a wonderful, and wonderfully helpful, reorganization of Louisiana's farming industry. In no other State of the Union, we venture to say, has the "better-farming" movement made greater headway during 1914. And the campaign is only well begun.

That is the voice of a man, as distinguished from the whine of a beggar. As long as the sugar planters were permitted to tax the rest of the people of the United States they whined, fawned, and grovelled before any one who would conserve their privilege. But now that they have at last been shaken loose from the public teat they stand up like men. "Sugar planters of national prominence," says the Times-Picayune, "who refuse to be driven by adverse tariff laws from the culture of cane, frankly admit that their farming methods

have been faulty and are definitely abandoning the so-called 'one crop' system." That is the finest thing that has come out of Louisiana since the Civil War. That is the way men talk. That is the kind of Americans we like to have Europeans think of when they turn their attention this way. But how long would it have taken those Louisianans to find their manhood, with their hands full of public largesses? This will explain the Doctor-Jekyll-Mr.-Hyde citizen who at one moment boasted that Louisiana had the richest soil and finest climate in the world, and at the next pleaded with Congress for sufficient bounties to enable him to live. It was this pernicious, un-American commercial charity system that did the mischief. Louisiana is a fine state, and her citizens, with the exception of those who have fed on public bounties until their muscles have grown soft and flabby, are good Americans. Now that they have been thrown upon their own resources we shall soon see them all walking upright, and looking the world in the face like men. Never did Congress do a better turn for any state than it did for Louisiana when it put sugar on the free list.

s. c.



Confusing Cost and Price.

The Chicago Evening Post, in a labored editorial intended to show the iniquitous nature of the new tariff law, because the first few months showed an increase in imports and a falling off of exports, says:

If wages and working conditions in Europe were uniform with those in America, no regret might be necessary over this deflection of a part of our home trade. It might act simply as a stimulous to greater enterprise and efficiency of American industries and contribute to lower prices for the consumer. But since the competition of Europe is based on cheaper labor, the tendency is to force a reduction of wages in this country.

Where did the Post learn that labor is cheaper in Europe than it is in America in any goods that come into competition with our manufacturers? Is it not thinking of wages, instead of the cost of labor. The price of labor there is lower than here, but investigation has almost invariably shown that the cost of labor is greater there than here. That high wages mean cheap labor is shown from the fact that it is from the highest waged countries in Europe that we have most competition. If low wages meant cheap labor we should need tariffs against China and India, rather than against England and Germany. Is not the Post encroaching a little on the time limit for the use of the "cheap-labor" argument? It is no longer

considered good form in the more enlightened circles to argue that the earth is flat. s. c.



More Topsy-Turviness.

When Henry George suggested as an alternative to the plan of the good woman who spilt a pot of grease on her kitchen floor—in order that she might give a poor woman fifty cents to clean it up—that she might have accomplished the same result by paying the poor woman fifty cents to make her husband a shirt, he did not qualify himself for an editorial position with the London Nation. That generally excellent journal is cautioning well-meaning citizens who are prompted to relieve the stress of the poor who are suffering on account of the war, lest they do more harm than good. "The first impulse of a man or woman," says the Nation, "who lives a comfortable and leisured life in a time of national emergency is to turn his or her hand to some job for which others are paid, without reflecting on the consequences." Thus they are cautioned against offering their services to the farmers to get in the crops, lest they deprive farm laborers of a job. Women of leisure who have set about making clothing are warned that to do this will be to take jobs from shop assistants who are out of employment. It is announced, however, that this latter nefarious scheme has been checked by protests, and that the Queen has invited the War Emergency Workers' Committee to appoint five representative women workers to serve as an advisory committee to suggest and organize suitable schemes for unemployed women.



It is to be hoped the Advisory Committee will be able to find jobs for everybody, without taking a job from anybody. But in order to do this the leisure class will have to exercise its utmost self-restraint, and refrain from doing anything useful itself. The problem seems really to be one of gymnastic charity, that is, of keeping the people at work without letting them produce anything, after the manner of the poor woman who earned her fifty cents by scrubbing up the purposely-spilled grease. The Committee is, indeed, face to face with the problem that Bolton Hall presented to the Conference of Charities and Correction at New York. "You get a man a job," he said, "— you do not make a job—you cannot make a job. Whose job do you get for him? And having got that man a job, you then have the displaced one—a little less efficient, or a little higher