

CASA BIANCA UP TO DATE.

(Puck.)

The boy stood on the rolling deck,
Whence all but him had fled,
His face was of a tombstone hue,
His hand was on his head.

And though he wore a sailor's garb
No cabin boy was he,
Athwart the rail he limply hung,
And gazed into the sea.

The captain spoke unto the lad,
"What ails you, man?" quoth he,
"I never saw a salt before
With landsman's malady."

"Great Hornspoon! Did you Chadwick me!"

You vowed that you could sail
This barkentine across the sea
And weather every gale."

"I did, I did," the pale youth gasped;
"But you'd be sick perforce
If you had learned your seamanship
By correspondence course."

What Are Just Land Laws?

In discussing the problems with which Liberalism has to deal, The Globe makes this statement: "We are free from unjust land laws."

What the ideas of the writer are respecting just or unjust land laws, he does not explain, and, therefore, we will now give him an opportunity to consider this subject more in detail. The first fact to be recognized with respect to land is, that it is not a manufactured article. It is the gift of God to his children, to all of them equally, just as much to everyone of every generation as it was to anyone of any generation. Is that idea kept in view in the land laws of Canada? Not at all. It could not be more thoroughly ignored than it is. The land is treated, not as a gift to be equitably divided, but as a manufactured commodity, to be bought and sold at the option or whim of the owner.

The second principle to be observed is this: When any man has produced a commodity, or done a service, he has established an indefeasible right to a reward; but in no way known to justice can a man establish a right to charge his fellows for the opportunity of living, moving and being on the face of the earth, or for access to its bounties. How is that principle regarded in this country? Not at all. Men charge for occupation of the land just as readily as they charge for the occupation of a coat or a house. Men make coats and houses, and, therefore, have a right to charge for the occupation thereof; but to charge for the occupation of the land, is to demand service for no service in exchange, and that is the essence of slavery.

When a farmer uses the land to raise crops, and when he demands pay for these crops, is there any injustice, or any extortion in his claim? Not at all. But when a speculator holds land, expecting to gain a fortune without raising or producing a fortune, is that a just claim or is it extortion? There is only one answer. It is extortion, unmitigated and unadulterated. How do the laws treat these two uses of the land? Do our laws do everything to prevent the use of the land for extortion and give every encouragement to the use for production? No, not at all. The taxation is arranged so as to give every encouragement to the extortionate use, while the productive, beneficent use is treated as a crime.

When a number of men make bricks, get the timber and then construct a house, they are adding to the wealth of the world. They have created a value. They have made an addition and an increase. But when population doubles on any area of land, then the amount of space for each one is divided, it is diminished, it has become more scarce. But with this increased scarcity there necessarily comes an increased value to the land. This second value is utterly different from the first. Individuals, as individuals, make bricks and build houses. We can count the men and tell the time of each man; but who can tell which man made the land in New York worth twenty million dollars per acre, or the land in London worth still more? No one can tell that, for the value of these sites is made, not by the individual, but by the community. Now, any land laws, to be just, must recognize the difference between these two values. Do the laws of this country recognize this distinction? Do they? Just the opposite. The value that is made by the individual is put into the same category as the value made by the community, and they are added together. The assets and the liabilities of society are added as though they were all assets. We would like to get The Globe's explanation on this point.

The land laws in this country are, in some respects, worse than those of Ireland, of which we have heard such great complaint. We are developing, just as rapidly as we can, all the worst conditions of the old world civilization, with its palaces for the idle and the slums for the industrious.

Fifty thousand a year for the man who does nothing, and five hundred for the man who helps to do everything. That is the kind of land law we have in this country of churches, where we pray most earnestly for honest hearts. Yes, we rob widows' houses, then we think we will be heard for our long prayers.

We shall wait with interest for the reply of The Globe.

This is only one sample of the manner in which the plutocratic press uses its pages for the despoiling of industry.

.. Prize Competition ..

Men, Women or Children, a Valuable Musical Box with 12 Popular Airs, will be given to the writer of the most popular short story sent us for publication. Story must be short, founded on truth, and bearing on unionism.

DON'T MISS THIS OPPORTUNITY

Lest We Forget

The tariff consists of two distinct parts, one very heavy and the other part very light. The one part runs up as high as 35 per cent, or more, while the other part is free.

Naturally one would suppose that the heavy part of the tariff was intended to fall on those who had large fortunes, and who would never feel the burden; and that the free goods were for those who were too poor to buy. But, instead of this being the case, it is exactly the other way.

Let the reader drive this fact into his memory so that he will never forget it. The tariff is arranged according to this rule: Whatever the richest of the rich have to sell and the poorest of the poor must buy, that is under the heaviest rate; but whatever the poorest of the poor have to sell and the richest of the rich must buy, that is in the free list all the time. The Government makes high rates against the poor and low rates in favor of the rich.

When the importer pays thirty-five dollars duty on a hundred dollars' worth of goods, he adds five dollars for his profit on the thirty-five. Then the retailer adds ten dollars more; so that the purchaser has to pay 50 per cent. Consequently, the poor man must often take three dollars to market to buy two dollars' worth of goods. This means that often the toiler, out of three days' work, must give one to the tariff or else to the protected manufacturer.

This method helps the rich man to sell dear and compels the poor man to buy dear. This trick juggles the poor man's dollar into the rich man's purse.

The poor man sells his labor and nothing else. How much is that protected? For years the workers in this country have been taxed hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to bring in the cheapest possible labor from the poorest countries in the world. Imported labor is in the free list all the time. Labor must stand the competition of the shoals of immigrants looking for a job at any price. This helps the employers to buy labor cheap, and it compels labor to sell at the lowest figure.

Thus the taxation is arranged so as to make the rich richer, and to keep the poor close to the bare-bone existence all the time.

In addition to labor, there is quite a number of other things in the free list, but it is very remarkable that in the whole of that free list there is scarcely a single article that is bought by the poor. The free list is exclusively for the employers. Anchors are free, but axes pay 25 per cent. Steel for the manufacturer is free, but tools for workmen are charged 30 per cent. Raw cotton, which the manufacturer buys, is free; but the cotton gown which the workman buys for his wife is taxed 3 per cent.

When the rich man sells to the poor the market is made dear so as to help the rich to "squeeze" the poor man's purse. But when the poor man goes to sell to the rich, then the immigration policy compels him to sell at the lowest rate; the market is made cheap in favor of the rich and against the poor. The rich have protection when they go to sell and free trade when they go to buy. The poor have to sell in a free trade market with the fullest blast of competition of the whole world, and then they have to buy in a protected market. The rich man's dollar is expanded, while the poor man's dollar is compressed.

The man who does his fair share of the work of civilization deserves a fair share of the rewards of civilization. The men who raise the crops, put up the buildings, make the clothing and perform the other services for society, so as to make everything abundant, should own the abundance. The man who does something has a right to be paid. But what right has a man to a crop when he never raises a crop? Of all the blunders made by humanity, the greatest is that which tries to stop labor from enriching labor, and which permits the land owner to crush industry into perpetual poverty.

When the village is small, the owner of the land says, "Pay me a few dollars per acre for the occupation of the land." When the village becomes a town, the land owner says, "Pay me a hundred dollars per acre per annum." When the town becomes a city, he says: "Pay me a hundred thousand dollars yearly for the occupation of this acre of land." When the city becomes a mighty metropolis, he demands a thousand or two thousand dollars per day for the occupation of a single acre. Without furnishing a dollar's worth of goods, he demands the product of five hundred farms yearly. Every day, without raising a hill of beans, he gets as his share of the products of industry the yearly product of a whole farm.

Industry needs protection, and needs it very badly. Industry is despoiled and degraded, but not by industry. Industry needs no protection from industry, but it does emphatically require protection from spoliation and extortion. The proper way to secure that protection is to abolish every kind of taxation that bears on the production or exchange of goods for goods, or service for service, and to confine taxation to the value of the land.

Marshall Field

A news item, headed "Lucky Little Folks," says that the three grandchildren of Marshall Field have a heritage of about forty million each. Whether or not these children are lucky is an open question. There is, however, a more important question to be considered.

Is the Field estate an example of social injustice or did the Chicago millionaire rightfully accumulate his wealth?

It is generally assumed that he earned what he left to these lucky or unlucky children. His case is cited as though it were a sufficient answer to those who claim that no man can, by his own labor, become a multi-millionaire.

The obituary notices speak of Mr. Field as a good millionaire because, they say, he was a prince of merchants and his fortune was acquired by his superior ability in serving the public.

The praise of Mr. Field as a good millionaire betrays the popular feeling as to millionaires in general. The praise concedes the point that most of our great fortunes are not the earnings of exceptional ability, but rather the fruits of some system of plunder which enriches some at the expense of others.

Was His Fortune Earned?

It will not be denied that Mr. Field got his start by excelling in a legitimate business. Had he been a dry goods merchant and nothing else he might have been a very rich man. It is useless to speculate as to how rich his ability as a merchant might have made him. No one should begrudge him any amount of wealth which he could accumulate as a storekeeper. Since the dry goods business is open to competition, wealth accumulated in the business must, in the main, be a measure of the merchant's superior ability to serve the public. Such wealth is the fruit of his labor. Each man has a moral right to the full fruit of his labor.

But there were opportunities created by our laws for Mr. Field to so invest his rightful earnings that they yielded him an unearned increment. The greater part of his vast fortune came, no doubt, as a result of these investments. If it had not been for these opportunities, which should never have existed, he could not have left his grandchildren forty million each.

In proof of this it is only necessary to refer to Mr. Field's holdings in city lands. He owned forty million dollars' worth of Chicago real estate, and ten million dollars' worth of real estate on Manhattan Island.

A Professor's Comment.

Mr. Field deserves credit for his shrewdness in investing in the land of New York and Chicago, because such investments enabled him to acquire a fortune without earning it. They enabled him to grow rich at the expense of other people. They enabled him to add to his rightful savings as a merchant the unearned profits of a landlord.

Upon this point Franklin H. Giddings, Professor of Sociology in Columbia University, writes as follows in the New York Independent:

"If so happens that the really desirable parts of the earth's surface are limited in area, and as population grows the demand for them increases. The narrow island of Manhattan, for instance, is advantageously situated for commercial purposes, and a large number of human beings may be observed here carrying on various industries and trades. Little strips of land on the main thoroughfares have, in consequence, become so valuable that they are now sold, not by the acre, or even by the foot, but at so much a foot, in certain instances even at so much an inch. The men that own these parcels of land do not themselves, as individuals, create its value, they only take it."

Thus Professor Giddings affirms what Henry George has made common knowledge. The case has yet to be cited which proves that a man, "starting with nothing, can, in the United States, amass a fortune of many millions by his own productive effort."

Herbert S. Bigelow,
Pastor Vine Street Congregational Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.
February 11, 1908.

Only a Living Wage

A Strong resolution Adopted by the Allied Printing Trades

Whereas—This, the Allied Printing Trades Council, composed of Printers, Bookbinders, Stereotypers, Electrotypers, Press Feeders, Mailers, Web Pressmen and Photo-Engravers, having learned through the medium of the public press and other sources of the strenuous opposition of the Employers' Association of Toronto, through their Secretary Mr. Merrick, to the resolution offered by Controller Ward to establish a minimum rate of two dollars per day for civic employees, take this their first opportunity of expressing their disapproval of the aforesaid opposition on the part of the Employers' Association, believing such action to be essentially selfish and uncalled for.

Therefore be it resolved that we place ourselves on record as citizens and taxpayers of the municipality of Toronto as being in favor of paying the rate of two dollars per diem, firmly believing that no man with a family can live decently on less; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Controller Ward and the public press for publication.

That "Needle's Eye"

By the Rev. Charles Stelzel.

Sometimes workmen insist that if rich men were to carry out the commands of Jesus Christ they would give away all their wealth, because Jesus commanded the "rich young ruler" to do so. And because they do not give away all their wealth, workmen declare that these rich men are not Christians. They forget the circumstances under which this command was given. Jesus said that the riches of the young ruler stood between him and the thing he seemed to desire, namely, "The gift of eternal life."

Some of the richest men in Bible history were considered the best men. Abraham was one of the wealthiest men in the world, and yet we are told in several places in the Bible that he was the "Friend of God."

It is true that riches frequently stand between a man and Jesus Christ. For this reason Jesus gave that unusual picture.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God."

Of course, Jesus Christ did not refer to the eye of a sewing needle.

In those days, most of the cities were enclosed by a wall in which was a large gate that was open only during the day. Anyone coming into the city after sunset was compelled to enter through a small gate which would barely admit a camel. Indeed, that it might enter, the merchandise and other trappings had to be removed from the camel's back. Frequently it became necessary to tie about the camel's neck a rope which was pulled vigorously by a man inside the gate, while outside the driver of the camel belabored the beast with a club in order to get it through. Finally, after considerable grunting and strong opposition, the camel would squeeze its clumsy body through this opening, known as the "needle's eye."

This is the picture that Jesus Christ intended to impress upon the minds of his hearers. They were quite familiar with it. What Jesus Christ meant was—there is great danger that riches will prove to the rich man just such a hindrance as the merchandise on the back of the camel.

However, it sometimes happens that very small riches keep some men out of the "Kingdom of God." But that rich men are not Christian men, simply because they are rich, is an erroneous idea. I would not defend the rich man as such, still less would I champion the cause of the rich man who is a rascal and who abuses those in his employ. Jesus Christ had nothing but words of condemnation for such. If he has come into the church it is because of the good company he will get into. But such men are not the church—they are the parasites of the church. They might better be out of it so far as the good they do is concerned.

When King Frederick of Denmark was travelling through Jutland he one day entered a school and found the children lively and intelligent, and quite ready to answer his questions.

"Well, children," said he, "what are the names of the greatest Kings of Denmark?"

With one accord they cried out, "Canute the Great, Waldemar and Christian IV."

Just then a little girl to whom the schoolmaster had whispered something, stood up and raised her hand.

"Do you know another?" asked the King.

"What great act did he perform?"

"Yes, Frederick VI."

The girl hung her head and stammered out, "I don't know."

"Be comforted, my child," said the King, "I don't know either."

Iron Moulders

The regular meeting of the Iron Moulders' Union was held Wednesday night. President Wm. Worrells in the chair. It was a largely attended meeting, owing to the vote to be taken upon the coming convention, which is laid over until the next regular meeting. There were three initiations and three propositions.

John T. White, of Chicago, spoke in regards to the religious phase of the single tax. Mr. White occupied the floor for one hour, and from the comments of the moulders, after Mr. White retiring, goes to show that the majority are in favor of his theory. Owing to the sickness of 23 members there was one hundred and thirty-three dollars and fifty cents paid out of the Sick Fund. Communications from Worcester, Mass.; Philadelphia, Pa., and Dallas, Texas, in regards to strikes and lockouts in those places were received, and \$10 was donated to each. The audit reports of the committee shows the books of the financial secretary and treasurer in good shape. Strikes are still on at McClary's, a London; Gurney and Canada Foundry Co.'s, of Toronto, and Dougherty and John Goodison Thresher Co., of Sarnia. A communication from the Tribune, asking payment from members in arrears was received.

Mr. John T. Richardson is appointed to receive subscriptions for the Tribune until further notice.

Wood Workers Local 114

Woodworkers Local 114, held their meeting last night which was well attended. The finances are reported as being in a very sound basis and never have the prospects of the union been so bright. There was one initiation and one re-instatement.

Textile Workers

Nearly 100 employees of a carpet mill in Kensington, Pa., were locked out. It is charged that the employers' action was on account of the employees' sympathy with the Textile Workers' Union.

Strike of the Cloth Hat and Cap Workers at The Cooper Cap Co., 11 and 13 Jarvis St.

Owing to a little trouble at the Standard Cap Co., which was settled amicably, and which the Cooper Cap Co. resented, the men were told by Mr. Cooper that he would run an open shop, and was prepared to fight the Union to the bitter end. 28 employees were thus forced out, leaving only two ladies, Miss D. Richmond and Miss N. Wienzimer in the shop. The men on applying to other firms for work were told they could not be employed because they were from Cooper's shop. This looks as if the bosses had a good strong union.

P. Ginsberg, Sec.

Bakery Workers Local 204

The Bakers held the second successful dance in St. George's Hall last Saturday evening, the 10th inst. The hall was crowded and everybody appeared to enjoy themselves. Like the former one the proceeds go to buy (ammunition powder) to educate the unwary and uninformed ones to the fact that Tomlin's, Weston's and Bredin's are not fair to organized labor.

Call for the Label.

Rooms, Lunch Counter, Cafe, Separate Dining Room up stairs for Ladies. One minute walk from Boat Landing, three minutes walk from Union Station.

BOARD OF TRADE HOTEL

EUROPEAN PLAN
J. D. CHOLWELL, PROP. PHONE MAIN 2754
29 Yonge St., Toronto

WHEN YOU

Think of Buying

GLOVES

the Time has Come for You to Think of

The Big 4 Glove

The Only Union Made Gloves Made in Canada.

Manufactured by

A. C. Chapman, Ltd.

8-10 Wellington St. East