

would submit to pay the stamp duty if it was moderated?"

"No, never, unless compelled by force of arms."

"Don't you think they would submit to the stamp act if it was modified, the obnoxious parts taken out, and the duty reduced to some particulars of small moment?"

"No, they will never submit to it."

"Have you not heard of the resolutions of this house and the house of lords asserting the right of parliament relating to America, including a power to tax the people there?"

"Yes, I have heard of such resolutions."

"What will be the opinion of the Americans on those resolutions?"

"They will think them unconstitutional and unjust."

Just as the McKinley administration, in the case of Porto Rico, wants to

**Supremacy of Parliament.**

establish a precedent for colonial administration, so

England in 1763, by the resolution of right, sought to establish a precedent determining the constitutional rights of parliament in legislating for the American colonies. It will doubtless be remembered what this "precedent" led to. The resolution of right is almost identical with the modern declaration of the "supremacy" of congress and reads as follows: "That the king's majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the lords spiritual and temporal and the commons of Great Britain, in parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have full power to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the colonies and people of America, subjects of the crown of Great Britain, in all cases whatsoever."

**THE CHICAGO STRIKE.**

The strike in Chicago forcibly illustrates the tyr-

anny and injustice of labor combinations, 55,000 men having been thrown out of employment. Arrangements had been made for the expenditure of \$12,000,000 in the construction of buildings. This must now be abandoned, because of the strike inaugurated at the instance of 6,000 machinists, who demand that the present wage scale of 15 cents an hour as the minimum and 25 cents the maximum, be increased to 28 cents an hour as the minimum, a nine-hour day, the employment of only union men and discharge of all non-union men and colored laborers.

The strike has already produced a riot, as a result of an attack upon non-union employees,

**Effects of the Strike.**

in which one man was mortally wounded and fifty others injured and removed to hospitals. The average daily wage is about \$2.00. This means a loss to workmen of \$110,000 for every day the strike continues or \$3,300,000 per month. The tying up of such a large volume of capital and the sudden

withdrawal of the purchasing capacity of this army of workmen seriously hamper the business life of the community and effects more or less directly all branches of trade. This is what the strike is doing for Chicago. In this, as in every other strike that has taken place in this country, the wage-earners themselves are the most injured. The history of strikes is proof of their futility as a means of correcting the differences between capital and labor. In the Homestead strike, after great loss of property and a deplorable sacrifice of life, not a single point of financial advantage was gained by the laborers, but was attended with an actual loss to them of thousands of dollars in wages.

The commission appointed by President Cleveland to investigate the Pull-

**The Pullman Strike.**

man strike, on page 18 of their report, under the heading, "Losses and Crimes," state: "According to the testimony, the railroads lost in property destroyed, hire of the United States deputy marshals, and other incidental expenses, at least \$685,308. The loss of earnings of these roads is estimated at \$4,672,916. Some 3,100 employees at Pullman lost in wages, as estimated, at least \$350,000. About 100,000 employees upon the twenty-four railroads centering in Chicago, all of which were more or less involved in the strike, lost in wages, as estimated, at least \$1,383,483." In the consequent riots and lawlessness 12 men were fatally injured and 586 placed under arrest.

Not only is the financial loss to the community large as a result of a strike

**Moral Effect.**

but the moral effect is most degenerating. It converts industrious workmen into idlers and, as is often the case, lawbreakers. It makes innocent families suffer. It affords an opportunity for the criminal, lawless element of society to ply their vocation. Too often they have their origin in grievances not real but imaginary. The walking delegate, the professional agitator, whose experience as a laborer is confined exclusively to the manipulation of his facial and vocal muscles, fills workmen with discontent, creates antagonism between employer and employee, altogether unwarranted and unjust, that he may exact a price for the termination of hostilities.

The principle of labor unions, which foster and encourage strikes, is wrong.

**Wrong in Principle.**

It is a trust or combination to raise prices and differs from the combinations of capital only in this—that the labor trust seeks to control and fix the price of labor, while the capitalistic trust affects the price of commodities. If it is against public interest for capital to combine to fix the price of commodities and eliminate competition as a factor in their regulation, then it is equally hostile

to public interest for labor to unite to fix the price of wages. If legislation is proper to suppress one form of combination, it should be applied to the other.

The labor trust is even the more tyrannical. Capital does not use force

**Tyranny of Labor Trust.**

and violence to prevent competition. The labor

trust, in Chicago, in the dispute with the New York and New Jersey Machinery Manufacturers' Association, and in every other strike, has demanded that only such men, as it recommends, shall be employed. It not only makes this demand but uses force and violence to make the demand effective. It not only attempts to fix the price but assumes to dictate who shall be employed at the stipulated price. It assumes the prerogative of determining what men shall have the right to make a living. Which is the more tyrannical and oppressive, the more un-American, the labor trust, evolved by the walking delegate, or the capitalistic trust?

**INITIALED EGGS.**

W. E. Curtis, in the Chicago Record,

tells this tale of poultry:

"Somebody down in North Carolina found an egg bearing the letters 'W. J. B.' as you learned in the dispatches to the Chicago Record the other day, and now we hear that a hen over in a Maryland village has dropped one with 'G. C.' marked on it as distinct and immovable as the north star. This places Arthur Pue Gorman in an embarrassing dilemma, because he has not yet expressed a presidential preference. Mr. Gorman will not believe that any well-bred Maryland hen would lay an egg with Grover Cleveland's initials upon it, and insists that some old goose must have committed this eggstraordinary folly under the hypnotic influence of Daniel S. Lamont or J. Sterling Morton. Mr. Gorman suggests that the 'G. C.' egg may possibly be a relic of the campaign of '88 or '92 and advises great care in handling it."

**GOVERNMENT BY COMMISSION.**

One of the striking features of the McKinley admin-

istration is the principle of government by commission. Political debts that the president was unable to pay by appointment to a regular federal position, were satisfied by sending the individuals abroad to inquire into the practicability of doing a lot of visionary things. The pleasure trips of political tourists to Cuba, the European bimetallic pow-wow, the peaceful declamatory conference at the Hague, and other junkets to congenial climes have cost the government three million dollars with absolutely nothing to show for it except a report of a good time by the beneficiaries and the satisfaction of the executive in possessing a receipt in full for the payment of political obligations.