

McKinley said that "the job hunts the man now, and not the man the job."

In order to acquit the chief magistrate of the nation of willful falsehood we must presume that he was deplorably ignorant as to the industrial conditions prevailing in this country. And surely the President of the United States ought not to be ignorant on so important a matter as that. The statement herein quoted implies that as a rule there is plenty of employment for all willing workers, and if the demand for workers exceeds the supply, or is even equal to it, wages must necessarily be good. Is such the case? Hardly. Every sensible man in the country knows better, unless he is blinded by the glare of some artificial surroundings, as is liable to be the case with a naturally egotistical President.

Let me mention one instance, or incident, which occurred in Los Angeles a few days ago, from which a valuable lesson may be drawn. And the metropolis of Southern California is certainly as prosperous as the average of cities containing 100,000 population or more.

The inventor of a new kind of health food in that city decided to run a delivery wagon. He accordingly inserted in a local paper a brief announcement that he wished to employ a man to run such a team. On going to his office the next morning he found a crowd of men on the sidewalk and a string of them reaching up the stairway to the office door. He counted them and found there were just one hundred and fifty. Their ages ran from about 18 to 60. Some of the applicants were well dressed, educated men, others were evidently very poor and in straitened circumstances, but all were eager for the job. The advertiser suggested to several of the most intelligent applicants that their services were worth more than the small sum of one dollar a day, which was all he could afford to pay, as the business was experimental. But every one insisted that he would gladly work for even such a small wage, as it was the best he could do and he needed to work for somebody at any amount of pay he could get. As there was a job for only one man of course one hundred and forty-nine of those who applied had to go away without any encouragement, and renew their hunt for employment, with the chances of finding it overwhelmingly against them.

There is no reason to suppose that Los Angeles is an exception to the general rule of over-supply in the labor market. What intelligent man really believes that jobs are around hunting

for men to work? Such a supposition is too absurd for serious consideration. And that the President of the United States should publicly make a statement so destitute of truth, and so palpably at variance with existing industrial conditions all over the land, is shameful.

The time when jobs will hunt men can never come till all men are permitted to freely use those natural elements from which every human being must procure the needful things of life. With land monopoly upheld by law, the man and not the job, will continue to be the hunter.

RALPH HOYT.
San Francisco, Cal., December 1st, 1898.

JUDGE MAGUIRE ON THE CAMPAIGN IN CALIFORNIA.

The contest in which we are engaged is much broader than the money question or the railroad question or any of the specific purposes for which we stood. They are but the phases of the contest against privilege and in favor of equal rights.

This fight once intelligently begun on principles as it has been must go on to ultimate success. Every fight for freedom has ultimately triumphed and so will this. This is a struggle for industrial freedom, for equality, not of wealth, but of opportunity, for the overthrow of the unnatural power which some men now have to control and limit the opportunities of others, and by the mere assertion of privilege to command the services of others without giving an equivalent in return.

The establishment of political equality required a struggle of centuries. The abolition of chattel slavery was the ultimate result of a long and often hopeless struggle conducted by men who had no direct interest in the result and who could hope for no assistance from the helpless creatures for whose natural rights they strove and sacrificed, but never for an hour was ultimate success doubted by those who believed in liberty and had faith in the justice of God. So, in this struggle for industrial freedom, while we have political equality established and those who suffer most from the injustice which we would overthrow are armed with the means of immediately and finally establishing their own rights, we find a very large proportion of them using their suffrage to defeat their own emancipation.

This is due to many causes against which we must patiently contend. The first is that men in society must and do adjust their interests to the existing industrial system whether it be

good or bad, and they naturally fear a disturbance of that adjustment until they can be certain that the changes proposed will in fact as well as in appearance be better for them. They therefore vote against change lest they might make their conditions worse while trying to improve them. The trite arguments "Let well enough alone" and "Half a loaf is better than no bread," either consciously or unconsciously move the minds of the poor, to whom the fear of want, caused by the conditions against which we fight, is a life-long nightmare.

Again, the present monopoly system, by which all industry is controlled, degrades a large proportion of the laboring classes to a point at which they feel no interest in the country or its institutions and are led to sell their votes and services to the very monopolists by whom they know they are being oppressed. Again, the shrewd and designing representatives of privileged interests avail themselves of all racial and religious prejudices, by skillfully fomenting which the laboring classes may be divided into bitterly hostile political forces, and even by deception, as in the last election, may all be rallied to the support of the monopoly interest. Again, insidious bribes to localities and to classes, which great monopolies can offer, substantially strengthen their support.

We did not underestimate these forces in the last campaign. We allowed for them and expected to win in spite of them. But we underestimated another force, namely the popular sentiment in favor of congratulating a national administration, under which a successful war had been fought, by supporting the party representing the administration. The people unwisely but very naturally allowed this sentiment too largely to control their votes to the defeat of their own substantial interests and rights. Another cause with which our movement must reckon for the next four years is the reaction from depression to industrial activity which is now going on, and which will in my opinion continue for the next four years. Whether or not that temporary improvement in industrial conditions will be strong enough to counteract the increase of knowledge among the working classes concerning their own interests and rights remains to be seen.

After 1902 I look for the decennial period of industrial depression which never failed to come to our country on time during the last hundred years. These periods of industrial depression are the periods of social and political evolution for which the forces of prog-

ress should always be prepared by thorough organization. In my opinion the absolute and unreversible triumph of our principles may be looked for not later than 1904 if it does not come to us earlier.

These suggestions are not in the nature of prophecy, but are based upon the reasonable expectation that the alternation of periods of prosperity and depression which have followed each other during the last century with the regularity of changes in the moon's phases will continue for some time in the future.

As to the issues which will be paramount in the next three elections, I can but surmise. In my opinion the money question will be the paramount issue of the campaign of 1900 and may cut an important figure in the state campaign of 1902. The land question in some form will, I think, be one of the prominent issues, if not the paramount issue, in the campaign of 1904. Whether it will take the form of a struggle for the adoption of the single-tax or otherwise I do not attempt to predict, but it will be a movement intended to attach the people of our country to the soil of our country as the holders and owners of independent homes; to turn back the tide of rural population now congesting the labor markets of our cities, restore the individual independence of our citizens which for the last 30 years has been steadily undermined, and elevate American labor to a plane of industrial freedom and freedom of opportunity never before enjoyed in the history of the world. That in my opinion is the destiny and the early destiny of our nation. The alternative is the fall of our republic, not through revolution nor by invasion, but through the destruction of liberty by monopoly.

During the depression from which we are just emerging I saw a newspaper published in one of the middle western states which contained 12 pages of foreclosure notices embracing about 30 notices to the page. Every one of those notices meant the reduction of an American family from the independent position of occupying ownership to the homeless and helpless struggle for existence in the labor market. This tendency must be arrested, and it will be in my opinion. The single-tax is our proposition to that end. If a better remedy for land monopoly is suggested which will be at the same time practical, just and constitutional, I for one will readily accept it in place of the single tax; for the single tax is to me but a means to the accomplish-

ment of the end, namely, the universal attachment of our people to the soil of our country as the occupying owners of independent homes.

The single tax was not a political issue in the late campaign in California because no party had declared for it. I do not know whether or not it will be a political issue in this state in the near future, but it is an issue in modern civilization, and must some day, and I trust at an early day, be the paramount issue in state and national politics unless, as I have suggested, some better and equally effective remedy for the evil of land monopoly shall be presented.—Hon. James G. Maguire, in San Francisco Examiner.

QUEEN WILHELMINA'S CORONATION.

The coronation of 18-year-old Queen Wilhelmina of Holland has called out many pleasant comments and good wishes for the young sovereign. This is natural; for, according to all accounts, Wilhelmina is a good and intelligent girl, as well as a charming one. Even newspapers strongly opposed to suffrage for American women are warm in their congratulations of the winsome Dutch maiden.

This shows how completely the opposition to political rights for women is a matter of habit and prejudice. Every argument used against allowing a woman to vote applies with double force against allowing her to be a queen. Is it said that contact with public affairs must be destructive to womanliness? Then Wilhelmina should be pitied instead of congratulated. Is it said that political rights involve too much publicity? What amount of publicity is incurred by the average American voter, in comparison with "that fierce light that beats upon a throne?" Is it said that political duties would take so much time as to compel a woman to neglect her family? Wilhelmina during her whole life will have to give more time to political duties than 99 voters out of 100. Yet the very persons who object to equal suffrage for fear some woman might occasionally be elected to office, are ready to congratulate Wilhelmina on her being placed for life in the highest office in her country.

Nearly 40 years ago Henry Ward Beecher called attention to this inconsistency. He said:

For ages, woman has been advanced to honor, influence, office, and the highest public trusts, if she will accept them in aristocratic forms. She may be an abbess, a countess, a queen. It is only woman without a title that must have no privileges. With a crown on her brow, she may enter parliaments and govern empires.

With only her own simple virtues, she may not lift up her hand to cast a vote. Now, as a Christian democrat, I assert for her every right and every privilege that aristocracy accords her. That which is good enough for a queen is not too good for my wife. That which is noble in a duchess is honorable in my daughter.

Good and bright as young Queen Wilhelmina doubtless is, yet there are thousands of American girls just as good and bright as she. Why should they be debarred as unfit from all share in political rights and responsibilities? Thoughtful men are more and more coming to say, with a late distinguished senator: "If women are fit to rule in monarchies, it is difficult to see why they are not qualified to vote in a republic."—Alice Stone Blackwell, in New Christianity.

NATIONAL EXPANSION UNDER THE CONSTITUTION.

Extracts from an address on the above subject, delivered by Edwin Burritt Smith, of the Chicago bar, before the Sunset club of Chicago, October 27.

"In vain we call old notions fudge,
And bend our conscience to our dealing;
The ten commandments will not budge,
And stealing will continue stealing."
—Lowell.

The new policy of national expansion, into which we are drifting, calls for a reexamination of the essential conditions of free government. What will our new possessions do with us, not what shall we do with them? is, as Bishop Potter suggests, the real question. Our institutions rest upon the proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This consent means more than mere acquiescence. It contemplates the active participation by the governed in a government which is their own and which they alone control. Our governments, local, state and national, exercise only such authority as is conferred upon them by the people. None of them claims or exercises original or arbitrary power. All, as the agents of the governed, execute none but delegated authority.

The president and the congress of the United States must govern all new acquisitions of territory under and by virtue of the constitution, or by self-assumed and arbitrary power. The constitution created a nation of states, "an indissoluble union of indestructible states." It called into being a United States of America, not a United States of America and Asia. Every person born or naturalized within its borders was to be a citizen of the nation and of the state of his residence. All the people of the nation were to constitute a brotherhood of citizens having equal rights before the