

beat it down by the majesty of their aroused ire and enlightened power.

In contemplating the subject, labor is confronted by figures authoritatively published by the United States Census Bureau at Washington, giving foreign and domestic indebtedness, which we reproduce from *Bradstreet's*, as follows:

From the figures given it appears that the debts of the several divisions above enumerated, less sinking funds, were as follows in the years 1880 and 1890:

DEBTS LESS SINKING FUNDS.		
Divisions	1880.	1890.
Foreign nations	\$24,636,075,840	\$23,181,072,185
The United States	245,462,112	1,322,417,764
States and Territories	227,107,784	209,236,671
Counties	111,940,845	124,105,027

The debts of the principal foreign nations in detail were as follows:

DEBTS BY COUNTRIES.		
	1880.	1890.
Austria-Hungary	\$2,224,000,572	\$2,866,129,639
Belgium	272,949,276	281,004,089
France	1,157,178,178	1,116,782,298
German Empire	No report.	77,577,719
Great Britain & Ireland	3,577,716,000	3,340,019,063
Greece	71,079,192	107,296,318
Italy	2,011,237,000	2,321,826,329
Japan	315,073,805	295,727,516
Mexico	117,183,728	115,000,675
Netherlands	\$82,410,317	100,589,828
Nicaragua	No report.	1,711,266
Russia	3,318,363,000	3,491,018,074
Spain	2,881,200,252	1,251,154,096
Sweden	50,531,125	61,220,807
Norway	15,548,877	13,978,752
Switzerland	5,873,200	10,912,225
Egypt	191,320,000	317,278,200

These figures deal with totals merely, and are not very informing until we go behind them to compare the relative burdens of indebtedness in the principal countries of the world. A comparison on the basis of indebtedness per capita shows that the burden of debt falls less heavily upon the inhabitants of the United States than upon those of the principal foreign countries. For example, France in 1880 had a debt per capita of \$116.25, which it appears does not include certain annuities of an unstated but large amount. Great Britain, whose debt is decreasing, had an indebtedness of \$87.79 per capita. The debt of Russia was \$30.79 per capita, that of Austria-Hungary was \$70.84, that of Italy was \$76.06, that of Belgium \$63.10, and that of the Netherlands \$95.56. The indebtedness of the United States, on the other hand, was only \$14.63 per capita, and nearly one-half of it was made up of non-interest bearing notes. Within ten years the debt has shown a remarkable decrease per capita, falling from \$38.33 in 1880 to \$14.63 in 1890.

What is said here refers of course to the national debt and not to that of the States and other local divisions. As will be seen by reference to the first table given above, the indebtedness of the States and territories in the United States has been reduced from \$290,236,645 in 1880 to \$223,107,883, a decrease of \$67,218,760 for the decade. The reduction per capita has been from \$7.79 in 1880 to \$3.56 in 1890. Part of the reduction, however, is due to refunding in some of the Southern States, the amount involved being estimated at about \$28,500,000. The debts of the counties show an absolute increase of over \$17,800,000 for the decade, growing from \$124,105,027 in 1880 to \$141,940,845 in 1890. This increase has not, however, kept pace with the growth of population, and as a result there has been a decrease in the debt per capita from \$2.47 in 1880 to \$2.27 in 1890. If now the indebtedness of the United States and of the States and territories and the counties be added together we get an aggregate of \$1,291,020,840 in 1890, as compared with a total of \$2,339,949,035 in 1880, a decrease of over \$1,000,000,000 for the decade. This is a reduction of somewhat less than one-half in amount,

while, owing to the change in population in the interior, there has been a per capita reduction from \$46.39 in 1880 to \$20.46 in 1890, or more than one-half. This decrease, it is pointed out, has been brought about mainly by voluntary taxation. It would not take long to wipe out the indebtedness of the country of every kind. If anything like the same rate of reduction were kept up. As it stands the record is a remarkable one for the United States.

Nothing like it is seen in the case of any foreign country except Spain, which shows a reduction from \$2,881,200,252 in 1880 to \$1,251,154,096 in 1890. The majority of the foreign nations show an increased indebtedness for the decade. Leaving out the German empire and Nicaragua, for which comparisons cannot be made owing to the absence of figures for 1890, the only foreign nations showing decreased debts for the ten years are Great Britain, Japan, Mexico, Spain and Norway. The debt of Greece has more than doubled in the course of the decade that of Switzerland has nearly doubled, while that of Egypt is about two and two-thirds times as great as it was ten years ago.

We are not so much interested in the details of the foregoing summary, as in the sum totals, the \$26,911,096,180. If this debt is ever paid it will be paid by the surplus earnings of labor. If we assume that this indebtedness is at 4 per cent interest, then labor, before it pays one cent of the principal, will pay an annual interest debt of \$1,076,443,847.

While the reader will doubtless be interested in the figures showing foreign indebtedness, they will be far more concerned in the statements showing domestic indebtedness, the debt of the Republic and the debt of the States, amounting in 1890 to \$1,281,020,840. If this indebtedness draws 5 per cent interest, then labor pays \$64,051,017 the first year, and whatever reduction of the principal is recorded.

Now then, if there are those who contend that there can be any plan devised by which the debt can be paid except by the surplus wealth created by labor, now is the time to state it. Now is the time for the world to know the fact.

The world is full of cranks, but not one will be found sufficiently demented to deny the proposition that labor pays for all.

In view of such facts is it surprising that labor demands so much of the wealth it creates as to make it comfortable, respectable, independent? To this it is coming. Labor is mustering its mind resources. Labor is going to school. Labor is reading, thinking, planning, looking forward to a time when justice will bear sway.

Labor is not despondent. It is hopeful. It is courageous. It is winning battles, and when defeated is not discouraged.

One of our correspondents remarks: "In reading the communication of the gentleman who writes from Milwaukee for the *B. of L. E. Journal* (pages 728 and 729 of the August number), it occurred to me that if he would dismiss his initials and change the first letter of his name from W. to F. it would not only suit his calibre but would be vastly more significant."

PARENTALISM.

The *Journal of the National Association of Railway Surgeons* says, the question, "How shall Railways take care of their employes when injured?" is one of great importance. The same question used to be asked "down south" by the owners of slaves, together with several other questions in the same line. The master, notwithstanding he was always ready to buy a "nigger," held that Providence had placed the human chattel under his control—that if the nigger got sick he ought to have a doctor; that he ought to have some sort of food and clothing and shelter, and a great many of these masters were conscientious men, often very religious men, who getting all the work possible out of the "nigger," were solicitous for his physical comforts.

They frequently asked, How shall we "take care" of these niggers? It was a question of "great importance," just as the *Journal* referred to, says it is a question of great importance, "How shall Railways take care of their employes when injured?"

A railway employe is generally a white man, a sovereign citizen of the great American Republic. He works for wages. He is free and independent, or ought to be. When his day's work is done, his employer has no more claim upon him than he has upon an arch angel. How he is to be taken care of, when, and by whom, is no more concern of the Railway corporation than how, and under what conditions, a Railway official shall be "taken care of," is the concern of the employe.

Does the Railway ask, How shall we take care of our President, Vice President, General Manager, and so on? Not at all. They pay such men salaries sufficient to enable them to take care of themselves, and this is just what should be done for the other employes of the Railway.

If an employe gets injured in the line of his duty, then, in that case, there should be a question of pay—not give, nor charity—and the question, "How can we take care of our employes?" should be answered by paying them sufficient wages to enable them to take care of themselves. If they are totally disabled, pay such damages as are just, and not attempt to evade responsibility as is now the universal practice.

As we write we have a sample case in mind, where an engineer was disabled from ever running an engine again. A clearer case for damages was never presented in Court, but the victim could not so much as get into Court. The railway officials fought him at every step, and finally, standing upon the threshold of the Court, he was told to limp his way through life. There was no law for the course pursued by the Railway and the Court; simply some antiquated decisions, made before man was

redeemed from savagery, handed down through centuries of ignorance, bigotry and prejudice, but held to be justice in the closing years of the nineteenth century, at a period when the gush about the star spangled banner, liberty and independence, justice and right, were it water, would float the British Navy. Such facts demonstrate that as yet, Railway corporations are not losing any sleep in lamentations over the woes of their employes.

On the New York Central, the Vanderbilts, the Webbs, Depews, *et al.*, are agitated fearfully upon the question, "How can we keep our employes clean?" The idea is to have them bathe daily, perhaps, at small expense, and engage in gymnastics when they have a leisure hour, so as to make themselves robust, and that the philanthropists (?) may pose before the public, and exclaim, "See how we take care of our employes!" And how long will it be before the employes will be required to exhibit their wives and babies for the gratification of Railway officials, that they may exclaim, "Look at them, and note how we take care of our live stock?"

Railways are neither built nor operated upon principles of sympathy. It is proverbial, that "corporations are created without souls." Why attempt to exhibit them with such attachments? Why attempt to parade a corporation before the public with tears in its eyes, or wearing cape or other insignia of mourning? It never grieves with a grievance committee, nor rejoices when the "boys" secure an advance of wages. Its purpose in the world is to make money, and if it were upon honest cash investments the world would applaud; but the corporation has one supreme idea of existence, and that is to make money. What it does is to make money, and what it does not do is because if it were done, it would not be a money making venture.

Parentalism, deep solicitude for the welfare of the employes on the part of corporations, will be credited something better than a sham when the corporation pays employes honest wages. Till then their solicitude and sympathies find proper illustration in the story of the spider to the fly.

SCIENTISTS, who make evolution a study, are investigating a Baltimore frog, which, when annoyed, cries. It is thought that the reptile is in the first stage of development towards becoming a citizen of "Maryland my Maryland."

In Texas the Railway Commission are slashing rates on wheat bagging and ties, and work has just begun. The intention is to save, if possible, enough from the crops of the state to enable farmers to purchase seed for the next crop.