The Labor World

Vol. I. *DULUTH, MINN., AUG. 1, 1896.* *No. 9*

Sixteen to One of Gold.

ELLIS B. HARRIS.

Air—Tramp, Tramp, Tramp.

In this land of liberty,
Greater far than all the rest,
Where the ballot is the scepter of our rule,
What a pity 'tis to see,
Thousands by their wants distressed,
Robbed by Shylocks and their ever ready tool,

CHORUS.

Tramp, tramp, tramp, the boys are marching,
Cheer up comrades let's be bold,
And beneath the azure sky
We'll have silver by and by
In the coinage of 16 to 1 of gold.

In this land of public schools,
Builded by a nation where
Education's free to those of every land,
We have raised a set of fools
Who would make the toilers bear
Every burden brought by Rothschild or his band.

Through the dark and cheerless night.
Struggle now the silvery rays,
Which will brighten up the ocean of our woes,
Free us from our sor'ful plight,
Bring to us the brighter days,
Now denied us by our plutocratic foes.

The Danger of International Money.

JOHN A. KEYES.

There has been a great deal said recently about an "international agreement" for the coinage and regulation of money, and the republican platform pledges that party to do all in its power to bring about such an agreement.

There are many foolish things in this world, but about the most foolish, and dangerous, too, is this international agreement scheme, now being advocated by the tory element in American politics. Thrice already has this country proposed or entered into a "conference," and every time she has come out with no results.

All this time the European money power has been tightening its grip upon the homes of the people of this country and forcing them into hopeless indebtedness. Notwithstanding this we are told that we are not an independent nation, but that we are dependent upon the monarchies of the old world and upon the caprice of the combined bondholding fraternities of those countries.

What does an "international agreement" mean? It is easy to say "Let us have an international agreement," but do those who use the phrase understand its meaning or consequences? If it means anything it is that the United States shall join with European countries of commercial importance in the coinage of gold and silver at some fixed ratio and perhaps the issuance of all money upon some agreed plan. Now, everybody knows who knows any thing about the subject that this country is what is called a debtor nation. Both it and its people are in debt to the money loaners of Europe. They hold our government bonds, our railroad bonds, our state and city bonds, and the bonds and mortgages of our individual citizens. They caused the demonetization of silver in this and other countries in 1873 for the purpose of cutting off the future supply of money and thus making the dollar more valuable, higher priced, harder to get, and consequently the bonds and mortgages they hold would have to be paid in a dearer money which would take more labor to procure and more produce to exchange for.

In that way they could silently rob the country and her toiling millions without their knowing how it was done. Now, when a great many people have come to see what the trouble is these creditor bondholders talk about an "international agreement."

How absurd! Just think of it! You have given a mortgage on your home. It is at 10 per cent interest. You think it is too much. You think you will try to secure a loan elsewhere at a lower rate.

"No," says somebody, "don't try to do that, go and fix things so that no other loan can be secured and then go to the man who holds your mortgage and ask him to enter into a conference to reduce the rate of interest." Will he do it? No. He knows your situation; you are at his mercy; he knows it, and you will have your labor for your pains.

It is just the same with our country. A debtor country goes to her creditors and asks them on her bended knees to enter into an agreement which she confesses is to better her at their expense.

Will they agree to international coinage? Not unless the agreement is such that it will be favorable to them. If they can get an agreement that will tie our hands then they may consent, but not unless they do so.

A great many people do not know anything about the practical details that have to be considered. Politicians never attempt explanations of things they know they cannot explain and, therefore, we have heard nothing about how the agreement is to be brought about.

The commissioners sent by the various countries will not in themselves have any power to perfect an agreement that will be binding, because they are not like a congress of states which convenes and reconvenes and can enact and repeal its enactmeuts and, therefore, when any agreement is reached by a commission it must be referred to each country separately for ratification, and if ratified by all then it must be established and maintained by treaty. How long would it take? Several years at least. What could we do in case the agreement should turn out to be detrimental to the interests of the United States? Nothing. It might ruin our foreign trade, sweep our navies from the seas, hamper us in domestic legislation and cripple us in many ways, but we would be bound by treaty obligations, to break one of which would mean war. Can this nation, which is a great producer of silver, afford to go into any such hazardous and doubtful experiment? Must she ally herself with monarchy. in her financial legislation?

It is absurd, and not only absurd but dangerous to the liberties and future prosperity of the people of this country. Any party that advocates such a policy is a menace to the republic and her institutions. No, we can coin and use our own money for our own purposes, and if we have plenty of gold and silver in circulation to do our own business our foreign commercial relations will take care of themselves.

We do not pay in gold but in produce and the gold bug's scare is only a kind of argument he uses to fool the people, and his international agreement is a delusion and a snare of the worst kind, undesir able even if it could be secured.

Workingmen's Savings.

A. H. LEE.

Since we often hear it emphatically declared by the defenders of capitalism that the only difference between a capitalist and a workingman is that the former has saved his earnings and used them wisely, while the latter has spent his in riotous living, it may be worth while to apply to this theory the test of facts.

In the Seventh Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, volume 2, tables 23-25, pages 1677 and following, we find an account of the incomes and expenditures of 4,319 typical families in the cotton, woolen and glass industries. These families include 22,741 persons, of whom 12,425 were children. In 1,388 cases the family had some additional source of income besides wages. The figures show that if all these people had saved all the money that they did spend in liquor and tobacco, and added it to their surplus, they might have made an average yearly saving of $103.51 per family.

In order to maintain this standard of earnings it was necessary for

plicate Exposure