

Is that from a sensational novel or from some socialistic newspaper? Neither, it is from page 163 of the Report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor of the State of New York (transmitted to the Legislature, January 21st, 1886). I wish everybody could read the whole of the Report carefully. It would open the eyes of some people and set them thinking about things in the future. The whole commercial world seems now to be governed by

"The good old rule, the simple plan
That he should take who has the power
And they should keep who can."

The above quotation from the Report of the New York Labour Bureau suggests another of the ways in which this "good old rule" affects the masses is the position into which it has brought women; why should it be an understood thing that they should always get less than men for the same work done? It is hard to say; yet such is the case. The maximum agreed upon lately for the salary of a male public school teacher in Toronto was, I believe, \$1,200; but a woman must not get more than \$600. She may be as efficient as the best man in the city, but she must take half the amount of his salary for her work on account of her sex. Then we tell her to read to her pupils something about a Kingdom in which there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female. It is the same in other employments. "But" somebody objects "she has less to do with her money than a man." Has she? I think she often has more; but I would like to know in what way it is the business of anybody to ask what she does with her money? It is given her in exchange for work done. If she does the work as well as a man surely she should get an equal wage. Let me quote the Report again (page 609): "That the workingwomen of New York City and other portions of the State are subjected to excessive hours of labor and low wages, coupled with unjust discrimination as between themselves and men engaged upon the same class of work, there can be no reasonable doubt. All the testimony taken proves it beyond question, that women are subjected to more frequent and greater abuses than men is equally certain." Is it just that men should compel the other sex to take less for equal work because tradition and competition enable them to do so? Bishop Wordsworth says, "they must remember that those women, especially those widows who had families dependant upon them, must always be a source of difficulty unless, indeed, a great change came over society as regarded the payments for women's work."

Again, is it just that a wage-earning woman should not be allowed to have anything to say in the management of her country? I do not ask would it be expedient? nor would it be good for herself to take part in politics? But is it just that she should be prevented if she wants to vote? Who can say that it is?

A word about the hours of labour. The workers themselves ask that a rule,—a natural rule, one as old as King Alfred,—should be restored, viz.: "Eight hours for sleep, eight hours for work, eight hours for what we will." You

want to know if they will take less pay for shortened hours. They answer that in most places they get little enough now (there are some bakers in New York and Albany who work sixteen hours a day for \$5.00 a week), but that for sake of the shorter time they are willing to take lower wages. Is it just that the wealthy alone should profit by the enormous strides made by the world in the invention of labour-saving, time-saving machinery? Yet J. S. Mill thinks that "it is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any single human being"! Is it just that the labourers should be debarred from sharing in our advancing civilization? Is it according to the "Divine law" that he that laboureth should not be allowed the time necessary for his mental and bodily health. Even under the ten hour system there is little or no leisure time for reading or recreation. Some of them know little or nothing of their own families. The eight hours plan is no longer on its trial. It has been proved most satisfactory for thirteen years in Victoria, Australia.

Upon the land question I cannot enter here. It is far too large. I shall only quote a few of some strong words I have just been reading upon it, "some method must be adopted of providing for the demand, if landed property is to have any true or stable foundation. The unsuccessful working of the present system cannot but enforce, ere long, radical changes. By the abuse of the present land tenures the country is crowded with paupers—the inhabitants of the country are driven in upon the villages and towns. Doubtless new and better arrangements are required for the peace and prosperity of this country; for the spirit of the times is not such as to hear anything which carries even the colouring of unfairness. Nothing is more dangerous than any appearance of a nation perishing for the sake of a few. In many places it is but too true that the poor are poor, the working classes miserable the majority wretched, in order that one may be aggrandized; unable, for one man's benefit to obtain ground to build or dwell on, they are huddled by hundreds into rooms where there should be but ten. And are they not patient in their misery. The Lord knoweth their patience. Meanwhile our prophets are prophesying smooth things! Lord, how long?" This is not from the paper edited by Henry George, but from a book (Present Day Papers, &c.) edited by the Rt. Rev. A. Ewing, Bishop of Argyle and the Isles. There is a great monopoly question too; and a troublesome usury question into which I would enter if I could. This is all I can say now. I shall close this paper with another quotation from Mr. J. S. Mill, who everybody will agree is, very properly, no friend of communism:

"If, therefore, the choice were to be made between communism with all its chances, and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices: if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it as a consequence that the produce of labour should be apportioned as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labor—the