

earnings per man are a very different matter." It then goes on to give official statistics of annual earnings in German coal mines for 1897, which, though small, compares well, it observes, with the earnings of our own miners. For, while wages here are higher, when measured by the day, the annual average is as low or lower, owing to lack of steady work. To prove this the Journal makes the following tabular comparison of average annual earnings in the two countries:

United States.	Germany.
Ohio \$192	Upper Silesia. \$180
Pa. (ant'rite) 200	Lower Silesia .197
Pa. (bitum.) . 230	Aachen 239
W'st Virginia. 277	Dortmund . . . 282

"In addition to this," adds the Journal, from which we quote, "the German miner is insured against sickness and accident, and is provided a small pension when old age disables him. A small deduction is made from his wages for the insurance fund, but that charge is not included in the average wages given. Moreover, the miner in West Virginia and some other states draws most of his necessities from the companies' stores, and it is notorious that many officials depend upon these stores for any margin of profit they may realize in their business. So far as living expenses go, the advantage is with the German. It costs less to live there than it does here." Yet Mr. Dingley had put a tariff of 67 cents a ton on bituminous coal for the purpose of raising American coal miners above the level of the pauper coal miners of Europe!

George H. Reid, the premier of New South Wales, who went into office as an advocate of absolute free trade and direct taxation, has acquired enviable fame in the United States as one of the most democratic of democrats. Few persons in this country could name the premier of Victoria, but no American with the slightest pretensions to acquaintance with Australian affairs would confess to being ignorant of the name of the premier of New South Wales. Mr. Reid drove

out of office and out of politics the spurious free traders of his colony, mere revenue adjusters, who advocated a kind of customs duties which fall with greatest severity upon the classes least able to bear tax burdens. His policy was to get rid of customs duties altogether, and to transfer tax burdens to the land monopolists. After a hard but splendid fight he succeeded in carrying out this policy to a marked degree. In the process, he was obliged to appeal to the country against the stubbornness of the upper house, whose members had their seats for life; but he returned triumphant. The people of the colony were with him. And his policy in practice worked satisfactorily. True, it did not work without friction; but that was evidently due to imperfections in detail, and to the obstructions which those imperfections enabled the courts to throw in his way. Of his ultimate success, however, there was no doubt. It was merely a question of going on.

Unfortunately, Mr. Reid has decided not to go on. He has turned in his tracks. How great the difficulties which confronted him were, we at this distance cannot venture to guess. But we can feel assured that they could not have been great enough to excuse him for reversing his policy. Yet that is what he has done. Threatened with a deficiency, due to temporary causes, he has proposed for the purpose of meeting it, not only an increase in the probate tax, which does not stultify his policy, but a large increase in the customs tax, which does stultify it. And worse even than the new customs taxes is the reason he gives in their defense. They were to be laid chiefly upon tea, coffee, chocolate, chicory and cocoa. These he said were legitimate "revenue duties;" yet he had made his great fight and achieved his triumph in the past by opposing that kind of duty. Nor was this all. When charged by an opposition member with proposing by these duties to tax the workingman, he explained

that as the people were relieved from taxation through the land and income taxes, he was "entitled to come to the working classes in a time of financial emergency and ask them to bear their share of taxation." But it was never supposed that Mr. Reid, in relieving the working classes of customs taxation, was relieving them of any burden they ought to bear, of any share of public expense which they ought to contribute. On the contrary it was understood that his policy was based upon the theory that both as a measure of economic expediency and as a measure of justice, public expenses ought to be borne by the classes that are enriched by government through what is sometimes called "unearned increment," and not by workingmen through deductions from their wages. His excuse, therefore, for taxing workingmen is a virtual declaration of his abandonment of the principle that put him in the lead among Australian statesmen. Rather than further excite the hostility of landed monopolists by making up his deficit through an increase in the land tax, which is still much less than it ought to be, he turns to the working classes with a demand that they, out of their hard earnings, bear a share of the taxation which land monopolists escape. Mr. Reid, we repeat, has turned in his tracks.

The federal office which William E. Curtis, correspondent of the Chicago Record, appears to be working for, through the generous courtesy of his paper, will have been well earned when it comes. Such acuteness and industry as he displays are almost without precedent. The virtues he has discovered within the past two months in Mr. McKinley, in whom he had before discovered few or none, are as varied and numerous as they were unexpected; and he laboriously describes them day by day in the Record in a spirit of devotion that might appropriately express itself in sonorous hexameters.

The catechism which the Philadelphia Single Tax society has issued, is