A COMING BILLIONAIRE

WHO WILL BE THE FIRST MAN TO OWN $1,000,000,000?

Thomas G. Shearman Shows How Our Present System of Taxation Tends to Produce the Billionaire—It Robs the Poor and Makes the Rich Still Richer—A Startling Exposure of the Tariff Robbery.

More than a year ago Thomas G. Shearman had an article in *The Forum* with the title, "Who Owns the United States?" which was very widely discussed at the time. He has now returned to the same subject in its relations to taxation, contributing a very striking paper to the January number of the same periodical on "The Coming Billionaire." The present article is concerned mainly with showing how our present system of indirect taxation tends to increase the wealth of rich men, while laying greater and disproportionate burdens upon the poor. Mr. Shearman's figures are not overdrawn, and his tendency to understate facts makes the results reached all the more startling.

In the article a year ago Mr. Shearman gave figures showing approximately how the wealth of the country is divided. In the present paper he recalls those figures. They are as follows:

Class.	Families.	Wealth.
Rich	182,000	$43,337,000,000
Middle	1,200,000	7,500,000,000
Working	11,620,000	11,215,000,000
Totals	13,002,000	$62,082,000,000

These estimates were made according to certain rules which cannot be explained within the limits of this article, but which certainly do not err on the side of exaggeration.

Using the same rules, Mr. Shearman proceeds here to show how the wealth produced in 1890 is distributed. This wealth he estimates at $13,000,000,000, and after allowing four per cent. for repairs and replacement he finds that the net incomes are distributed as follows:

Families.	Average income.	Total income.
180,000	$25,000	$4,500,000,000
1,200,000	1,250	1,500,000,000
11,620,000	560	6,500,000,000
13,000,000	$960	$12,500,000,000

In treating the above figures from the standpoint of taxation Mr. Shearman reaches results which are most amazing. Without any tax at all the 180,000 rich, he finds, can save on an average two-thirds of their incomes, while the rest of the people could scarcely save one-fifth of theirs. A system of taxation, therefore, like our tariff system, which is levied upon the expenses of the people, rather than upon what they own, bears far more heavily upon the poorer people, who must spend nearly all they make, than upon the rich, who need to spend only one-third of theirs. Estimating this tax burden upon expenses at 15 per cent., the poorer classes would pay $960,000,000 a year, while the rich would pay only $225,000,000.

But a part of the total thus paid by rich and poor goes, not to the Government, but to a small section of the richer class itself. This part Mr. Shearman estimates at one-third, which is certainly a very low estimate. In other words, about $400,000,000 is annually restored to the richest class. The results of this taxation may be thus displayed:

ANNUAL SAVINGS OF THE RICH.

Natural savings		$3,000,000,000
Deduct taxes, etc	$225,000,000	
Add profits from tax system	400,000,000	
		175,000,000
Total		$3,175,000,000

ANNUAL SAVINGS OF OTHER CLASSES.

Natural savings	$1,600,000,000
Deduct taxes, etc	960,000,000
Net	$640,000,000

In this way it will be seen that indirect taxation causes the rich to gain on other classes at the rate of more than $2,000,000,000 each year.

But if some fair system of direct taxation according to wealth were in use, a far different distribution of the burdens of taxation and of the accumulations of wealth would be reached. Mr. Shearman makes a rough estimate that a direct tax of one and one-fifth per cent. on all property at its full value would thus be required. Then the burden of taxation would be thus divided: 180,000 rich would pay $520,000,000, 12,820,000 others would pay $225,000,000. If a system of direct taxation were introduced it would result in a saving to the middle and working classes of about $750,000,000 a year forever.

To illustrate the force of these figures, Mr. Shearman takes an individual case. The owner of $10,000,000 need not now pay more than $15,000 a year in indirect taxes; and if he is a protected owner of mines or factories, this very indirect taxation often brings him in $100,000 a year. On the other hand, under direct taxation he would pay $120,000 a year in taxes, and he would get back nothing out of the pockets of other people. Mr. Shearman estimates that if the extra profits made out of indirect taxation even by a $10,000,000 capitalist were put at compound interest at 5 per cent., it would reach in thirty-five years an amount equal to his original capital.

As there is, however, already some direct local taxation, the estimates above given must be reduced by about one-eighth, the probable proportion of such taxation to the whole volume of taxes.

In review of these remarkable figures, Mr. Shearman asks whether the billionaire will come. His conclusion is that if the existing system of indirect taxation continues, the billionaire is a certainty. If things continue as at present, at least one billionaire can be produced in forty years by merely putting money at 4 per cent. compound interest, and in sixty years several can be produced.

But Mr. Shearman thinks that the billionaire will not come, for the very good reason that our protective tariff system is doomed. The passage of the McKinley bill has set forces to work which will surely undermine it. The repeal of the sugar tax, which was intended to save the protective system will inevitably work its ruin by teaching the people by one great object lesson, the effects of protection. With the enormous permanent expenses which the Republicans have saddled upon the country, and a deficit of $50,000,000 in the near future, no system of tariff taxation can be devised which will produce enough revenue without a tax upon sugar.

But, once sugar is cheapened by the abolition of the tariff tax on it, no party will ever venture to reimpose the tax. The party that would do it would be voted out of existence at the very next election.

The Republicans, therefore, have themselves made some form of indirect tax, perhaps the income tax, inevitable. The last election has doomed the wool tax, and the wool growers have threatened that the tax on woolen goods shall follow the tax on wool. Blaine's reciprocity, too, is going to take the wind out of the protection sails. Altogether the outlook for the protective tariff system is extremely gloomy, and as the reign of the extortioner is fast drawing to a close the billionaire will not come.

TARIFF LETTERS TO FARMER BROWN.

NO. 13.

Does a Protective Tariff Restrict Exportation?

DEAR FARMER BROWN: In discussing in my last letter the question whether the tariff restricts foreign trade, I confined myself entirely to one side of this trade, that of importation. According to promise, I now take up the other side, that of exportation—Does the tariff hinder us from selling our products abroad?

Many protectionists profess to believe that we have no need for a foreign market, and contemptuously ask, with ex-Gov. Foraker of Ohio, "What have we to do with abroad?" Some seeker for protection said before McKinley's committee last year that we ought to eat all our beef at home, instead of selling our surplus beef in Europe. The *American Economist*, the organ of the Protective Tariff League, prints an article to show what we are losing by selling the greater part of our cotton in Europe instead of manufacturing it ourselves. This paper scouts the idea that we need a foreign market at all; it ridicules the idea that we can compete in the world's markets, pretends that those markets are comparatively worthless anyway, and yet faces about and tries to show that our tariff does not in any measure prevent us from selling our products abroad.

Contempt for the foreign market, however, is rapidly passing away, even among stanch protectionists, as is shown by the popularity of Blaine's tame reciprocity scheme. The great farming masses of the land are fully awake to the importance of a foreign market for "another bushel of wheat and another barrel of pork."

But to the main question—how does protection cut us off from the foreign market for our products? It does this in various ways.

In the first place, if a tariff wall was put up so high that no foreign goods at all could come into the country, all of our exports would have to be paid for in money. But it would be impossible for foreign countries to stand the drain upon their currency which this would cause. Our total sales in foreign countries for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, amounted to $789,000,000. If foreign nations should have to pay us this vast sum of money every year their money would soon be exhausted, and trade with us would cease. But what is still worse for us, if this enormous volume of money were added every year to our currency, our money would soon become so plentiful as to lose its present value; in other words, the price of everything we have to buy would go up enormously.

On this ground mainly the revenue reformers lay down their proposition, that we must buy from foreign nations if we wish to sell to them.

This proposition does not mean necessarily that our purchases from any one country must balance our sales to it; for it is a current custom in foreign trade that the merchants of one country exchange bills with those of a second country to wipe out debts with those of a third country. In this way our large purchases of coffee and rubber in Brazil are largely paid for by sending our farm products to England, the English merchants, in turn, settling with the Brazilians by shipping them manufactured goods of various kinds.

Again, if we could realize the protectionists' ideal of selling as much as possible to foreigners without buying anything from them, another serious difficulty would arise. If ships had to come empty across the ocean for our products, those products would have to pay double freights to get into European markets. On the contrary, when we buy largely in foreign nations many ships come to our shores laden with goods, and these ships are anxious to get cargoes to take back. This was well illustrated during the first week of last October, the last week of the old tariff law. An extraordinary number of ships were entered at the port of New York, and the exports of American products were enormous. So many ships were competing for return cargoes that the charge for freight from New York to European ports reached a very low figure, there being some cases, indeed, where grain was taken free as ballast.

Now it is clear that the cheaper ocean freights are the cheaper will our products be put down in foreign markets, the greater will be their sales, and the more successful will be their competition with the products of rival nations. But grain which has to pay two freights is necessarily sold at a higher price, and the consumers of grain will buy elsewhere if possible.

Considerations of this kind have already found expression in England, which takes by far the largest part of our exported products, particularly farm products. When the McKinley bill was passed the London *Economist* commented upon that unwise measure by saying: "Many of the staple commodities we now import from the United States we can buy elsewhere, and if the cost of production in the States is enhanced, as it must be under the new tariff, these other markets will become the cheapest for us to buy in."

Even before the McKinley bill was passed the English had begun to turn their attention to other sources of grain supply. The London correspondent of the New York *Times*, in a cable dispatch to that paper early in September last year, said of the McKinley bill:

"For one thing, it has already made it certain that Europe will take no interest in the Chicago exhibition, and will practically be unrepresented there. Even more important is the impulse it has given here to consolidate capital in an energetic effort to immediately push railways throughout the Indian and Russian wheat belts, and thus render the European market independent of American grain supplies."

In this way a natural retaliation will be the result which we shall reap from our McKinleyism. But our foreign trade is not to be restricted by natural forces alone. Direct retaliation will be tried by legislation in some countries. Mexico, indeed, has already imposed retaliatory duties upon some of our products. France is even now busied with a plan to increase its tariff duties. The men having this measure in charge referred to the example set by the United States as an excuse for the high duties they are trying to enact into law. Many of those duties bear heavily upon our farm products. In Spain there is also an agitation for a higher tariff, and again the McKinley law of the United States is offered as an excuse. While the McKinley bill was still under discussion Spain laid a duty upon our flour which practically excludes it from Cuba, where we had a growing trade.

But there is another important respect in which the tariff hinders exportation. The tax upon the raw materials of manufactures adds so greatly to the cost of the finished product as to exclude it from the foreign market. The tax on wool increases the cost of making cloth, and we can export no woolen cloth or clothing to other countries. A great exporting merchant of New York has pointed out that in those manufactured articles in which the labor cost is greatest he can offer successful competition in foreign markets, while those in which the cost of the raw material is greatest he cannot successfully sell abroad in the face of foreign competition. In proportion, then, as the tariff increases the cost of production, in like proportion do we shut ourselves out from successful competition in the world's market. Yours truly,

RICHARD KNOX.

RAILROAD LABOR.

Wages Differ Greatly on Our Railroads—The Bearings of This Fact on Protection to Labor.

The protectionists claim that it is our tariff which causes higher wages in the United States than in Europe, and that if the tariff were wiped out wages with us would at once sink to the European level. But if there is any warrant for such a claim the protectionists ought to be able to explain why it is that wages differ so widely in different parts of our own country.

The fifth annual report of the United States Labor Commissioner, Mr. Carroll D. Wright, is devoted entirely to railroad labor, and this document gives some facts as to wages which ought to prove very puzzling to protectionists. The following table displays the difference in wages paid to railroad employes:

AVERAGE DAILY RATE OF WAGES.

	New England.	New York.	Georgia.	Ohio.
Brakemen	$1.80	$1.73	$1.26	$1.86½
Conductors	2.82	2.54	2.58½	2.61½
Engineers	3.32½	3.15	2.91	3.07½
Firemen	1.89	1.72	1.29½	1.79½
Laborers	1.51	1.23½	88	1.21½
Tel. operators	1.42½	1.34½	1.50½	1.47
Switchmen	1.78	1.27	1.11	1.53½

	Texas.	Northwest States.	Pacific States.	Average.
Brakemen	$1.95	$1.75½	$1.96	$1.78
Conductors	2.92½	2.85½	3.00	2.63
Engineers	3.55	2.79½	....	3.22½
Firemen	2.04	1.90½	....	1.79½
Laborers	1.21	1.30	1.87½	1.26
Tel. operators	1.67½	1.38½	2.09½	1.43½
Switchmen	2.30½	2.15½	2.20	1.50½

These figures are collected with absolute impartiality, and can be implicitly relied upon. They show that wages for precisely the same labor have by no means sunk to the same level even in our own country. Firemen, for example, earn $1.29½ a day in Georgia, $1.90½ in the Northwestern States, and $2.04 in Texas. In the Northwestern States engineers earn $2.79½, but in New England they get $3.32½, and in Texas $3.55. Ohio pays its brakemen 6½ cents a day more than New England does, but New England pays its switchmen 29½ cents more than Ohio. Engineers in New York get 35½ cents a day more than in the Northwestern States, but switchmen are paid 88½ cents more in the Northwest than in New York. Throughout the table similar differences and cross differences are found, and nowhere is there uniformity.

Railroad employes have better facilities than any other class of laborers to inform themselves of the condition, wages, etc., of their fellow workmen in other parts of the country; they have fewer local ties to bind them to any one place, and can easily begin life in another part of the land, yet the firemen earning only $1.29½ in Georgia do not rush off to Texas to earn $2.04. Common railroad laborers do not desert Texas, where they get $1.21 a day, to compete with the same class of laborers in the Pacific States, who earn $1.87½.

There must be something wrong in the protectionists' wages theory.

Hard on Manufacturers.

In discussing the mower and reaper trust, the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*, the leading high-tariff organ of Ohio, displays a very poor opinion of our business men. It says: "If business men would be less savagely ambitious, less grasping, less malevolent toward their neighbors, and would be satisfied with the fair and decent earnings of their endeavors," etc.

This is a rather harsh opinion, but it is no more harsh than that expressed by Senator Plumb in his attack upon the McKinley bill. The Kansas Senator said: "Merchants go down; farmers fail everywhere. They do not expect to be exempt from chances of this kind. The manufacturer is the one person who insists that he is never to fail so long as laws can be written and passed putting duties enough upon the articles which he manufactures to enable him to make a profit."

The Senator, in the same speech, quoted approvingly a business friend of his from Chicago, who assured him that "the American manufacturer does not manufacture anything he cannot make a certain and great profit on, and that he stands out of the way of the foreign manufacturer as to other articles on which he cannot make satisfactory profits."

Yet when Democratic opponents of our high-tariff system say things like these, they are denounced as "enemies of American industry" and as "serving European interests."

Still Fighting McKinleyism.

The Farmers' Alliance is not letting up in its opposition to our McKinley high tariff taxation. At the recent meeting of the Minnesota Alliance at St. Paul the following tariff resolution was adopted:

"We demand that the war tariff, which has too long survived the object of its creation, shall be radically revised, giving very material reductions in the necessaries of life and placing raw material on the free list, to the end that we may compete with the world for a market, and that such luxuries as whisky and tobacco shall in no measure be relieved from internal taxation till the high protective tariff has been wholly rid of its extortions, and we especially denounce the McKinley bill as the crowning infamy of protection."

MOST fellows who go from this world leave nothing but a "void" behind them, the most eloquent thing, by-the-way, to recall them to those who take any interest in vacuums.

PARAGRAPHS OF LIFE.

IN THE GREAT AND GLORIOUS STATE OF INDIANA.

Hunters Ignoring the Law—Impaled on a Pitchfork—Burned to Death—Suicides—Deaths.

Indiana Legislature.

The Legislature of Indiana convened at the State Capitol, January 8. The House was called together by Secretary of State Griffin. The following officers were thereupon selected:

Speaker, M. J. Biblack, of Knox; Clerk, Thomas Newkirk, of Rush; Doorkeeper, Frank D. Haimbaugh, of Miami; Assistant Clerk, Charles Crawley, of Sullivan. For Speaker the Republicans voted for Mr. Hess, of Wabash, and for W. F. Severson, of Tippecanoe; B. A. Nay, of Jefferson, and John Childs of Delaware, for Clerk, Assistant Clerk and Door-keeper respectively.

The Senate was called to order by Lieut. Gov. Chase, and the following officers were elected: D. H. Fenton, of Lake, Secretary; Geo. F. Pleasants, of Switzerland, Assistant Secretary; O. T. Wells, of Marion, door-keeper, and W. Mannix, of Allen, Postmaster.

The Governor's message was read January 9. In the Senate a resolution was presented looking to a redistricting of the State for judicial purposes.

Minor State Items.

—The name of New Providence, Clark County, has been changed to Barden.

—A movement is on foot to start a bank at Darlington, Montgomery County.

—John S. Donham, near Brazil, has in his possession a flax-hackle, bearing date 1761.

—John R. Moore has been employed as a compositor on the Wabash *Journal* twenty-one years.

—Fred C. Dahne was arrested in Laporte, Wednesday, charged with scattering "green goods."

—John Hitz, Madison fruit-grower, says his raspberries net him a yearly profit of $50 per acre.

—Bud Whitesides was kicked in the head by a mule at Jeffersonville and has gone violently insane.

—Michigan City is counting on getting the shops for the manufacture of the Hoffman ice machines.

—Edwin Terrell, minister to Belgium, cabled to his home in Richmond the announcement of his wife's death.

—Natural gas, with a strong flow, was struck at Princeton at a depth of 630 feet. The town went wild with enthusiasm.

—A stationary engine at the O'Brien wagon-works, at Lafayette, "ran away," demolishing itself and everything within reach.

—Mrs. Daniel Forrester, of Liberty, a young widow, was shot twice by Mrs. Harry Griffin. A love affair was the cause.

—Mrs. John Hartun was instantly killed near Clay City by the discharge of a revolver lying in a trunk she was moving.

—Horace McPherson, near Akron, was terribly disfigured by the accidental discharge of his shotgun in his face. He may die.

—Mrs. Edward Poindexter, colored, Marion, was found dead lying by a gas fire, badly burned. Believed to have been murdered.

—The daughter of L. N. Redman was fatally injured by being thrown against a desk while romping in a school-house near Millersburg.

—A farm-hand named Newby, near Cartersburg, upon entering the barn at the Davis farm, was shot and seriously wounded by tramps.

—Henry Baker, a Chicago and Indiana coal road brakeman, was struck on the head by a detached car, at Coxville, and will die of his injuries.

—Citizens' natural gas company, Shelbyville, in opposition to the one now furnishing the city with gas, will sink wells near Fountaintown.

—Joseph Plew, serving a life sentence in the prison north, from Warsaw, for murder, died recently. He confessed his guilt on his death bed.

—Mrs. Edna Fearley, of Shelbyville, got $2,000 damages from Samuel Hamilton, of Madison, for injuries received by falling into his open cistern.

—Dr. Edward Viets, of Plymouth, has been held in $2,500 bonds, charged with assaulting Mary, the 14-year-old daughter of Bradley C. Southworth.

—John Creamur, of Jeffersonville, who was injured by the fall of a derrick at the Union Cement Company's works, has been paid $4,000 in settlement of his claim.

—Mrs. Jacob Carl, Jonesboro, kept count of the pies she baked in 1890, and says the total is 696. Says nothing about the number of dyspeptics in her family.

—The Business Men's Association at Crawfordsville, are determined to get the New Market hub and spoke factory, which can be secured for $5,000 and five acres of land.

—Muncie *Herald* tells about a man named John Edwards, living there, who is so inhuman mean to his wife that the "White Caps" ought to lash him three times a day.

—William Park, teacher at Tiflinger's school, Clark County, refused to give the usual holiday treat, got into a fight with some of the larger pupils, and was roughly handled.

—Dr. Solomon Davis, an old soldier and prominent citizen of Lexington, died of heart disease. The old man had been confined to his room for several years from the effects of a fall. He was found sitting in his invalid chair, dead.

—Elder Wm. Green, living near Duggar, married and the father of three children, was arrested, charged with being unduly fond of Miss Lou Cade, a member of his flock. They waltzed him out of the pulpit so quick "his head swimmed."

—The Montgomery County grand jury has returned an indictment against a young lady for stealing chickens.

—Farmers in the southern part of the State are killing all the quail they want, just utterly ignoring the quail law.

—At the house of James H. Davis, near Hagan, his little daughter, aged 3 years, was horribly burned by her clothing igniting while alone in the house, and died within two hours.

—Mrs. James Stinson, near Danville, poured coal oil all over herself, and then applied a match. Her husband was badly burned trying to save her, and both are in for repairs.

—Thomas B. Foster, living near White Hall, one of the best known citizens of Monroe County, died from paralysis. He was 71 years old, and a member of the Christian church.

—A Midland train and a freight on the C., C., C. & St. L. collided at a crossing at New Ross. The Midland engine was destroyed and the engineer severely injured. The property loss was $8,000.

—Ruth Hollingsworth, a young lady 24 years old, living near Dana, was fatally burned by her dress catching fire from an open fireplace. Her clothing was consumed and her body burned to a crisp.

—J. B. Foster, of the Fort Wayne *Sentinel* composing-room, has invented a contrivance for printers' use while distributing type, called the "compositor's bracelet wrist protector." Said to be just the thing.

—Among the members of the Seventh Cavalry killed in the battle of Wounded Knee were James Coffy, of Richland Township, and James Campbell and W. F. McClintock, or Benton Township, Monre County.

—Albert Cochran, while walking on Main street, Brazil, accidentally slipped and a gun he was carrying discharged itself into his body, tearing one leg off and inflicting a dangerous and perhaps fatal wound.

—Robert Holloway, of Crawfordsville, has received notice from the Canadian Queen, at Toronto, that he had won one of the first prizes in the word contest, which will either be a free pass to Europe with expenses, or $750.

—Jefferson Vest, a resident of Greenwood, met with a severe accident the other day. He was working with a revolving emery-wheel when it burst, striking him in the face, breaking both jaw-bones and knocking out his teeth. At the time his injuries were considered fatal, but now he has good prospects of recovery.

—Miss Martha Miller, daughter of Judge Miller, of Greensburg, visiting at the residence of Mr. Joseph I. Irwin, Columbus, went out riding with Mr. Wm. G. Irwin. When the two returned to the residence the horse took fright and ran away, throwing Mr. Irwin to the ground and cutting a gash on the top of his head, from which he bled profusely. The buggy was turned over and Miss Miller was thrown out. She suffered a slight wound on the head.

—William S. Pope has filed a suit in the Circuit Court at New Castle, against his mother-in-law, Martha Kendall, a wealthy farmer's wife, for alienating the affections of his wife, and asking for $5,000 damages. He alleges that shortly after his marriage to the defendant's daughter, the latter was coaxed and persuaded to leave him, and that by reason of her desertion of him he has suffered great mental anguish, and had his life rendered a barren waste.

—It is seldom that three weddings occur in one family on the same day, but such a transaction took place at the Funderburg residence in Rock Creek Township, Huntington County. The first couple united were Madison McIlwain and Mrs. Mary Funderburg. Next came Edward Funderburg, son of the former named bride, and Nellie McIlwain, daughter of the first named groom. Then James Gray and Lillie Funderburg, the latter also Mary's daughter, took the binding obligation.

—The result, with the average percentage of the examinations, for the appointment to West Point for the Eighth district, is as follows: W. S. McBroom, Montgomery County, 94.2; L. G. Cavins, Sullivan, 85.1; Herbert L. Jones, Vigo, 83; Howard Griest, Montgomery, 82.8; Hardy Conver, Fountain, 75.8; Wallace Wheat, Parke, 75.2; Robert F. Darby, Vermillion, 73.4; H. R. Rosencranse, Parke, 63.7; Wm. Plumb, Brazil, 55.6.

—A big fall of slate in the Diamond Mine at Coal Bluff crushed Henry and Joe McCahan, father and son, and slightly injuring William Lawhorn and B. Morgan. The former is in a critical condition and may die. In the same mine, Dan Piper caught his hand under a bolt on an ascending cage and was hoisted to the top, nearly a hundred feet. The cage had to be lowered again for his release.

—The enterprising farmers of Greenwood have undertaken the cultivation of tobacco. Parties from Louisville will erect a large tobacco warehouse, furnishing them a home market for their products. Several acres were cultivated last year with marked success and large profit, and this year about one hundred acres will be planted. The tobacco shipped from this place last year was graded first-class and commanded the highest price. This fact promises to make this a great tobacco region.

—A South Bend poultry buyer had to pay $5 for bringing a load of ducks to town with their legs tied. South Bend has a vigilant humane society.

—Mack and Woody Underwood, colored, aged 11 and 13 years, at Terre Haute, confessed to the robbery of their grandfather and father of $139, and that to cover the theft from the father they burned the house. This was about a year ago and so cunningly did the youngsters plan the crime it was only recently that they were suspected.

EMMA ABBOTT IS DEAD.

THE GREAT OPERATIC SINGER SUCCUMBS.

She Passes Away After a Two Days' Illness at Salt Lake City—Remarkable Career of a Vocal st Who Made a Million with Her Voice.

Emma Abbott (Mrs. Eugene Wetherell), the gifted and well-known opera singer, died of pneumonia in Salt Lake City, Utah, after an illness of but two days' duration.

Miss Abbott's career had been a remarkable one. She was born in Chicago in 1850 and went with her parents to Peoria, Ill., when four years of age. Here her early life was spent.

Her taste for music was hereditary, her father having been a music teacher. He was not very successful financially, however, but before she was ten years old Emma was able to give him considerable aid in keeping the family by singing at concerts, accompanying herself

EMMA ABBOTT.

on the guitar. She sang and played at country town concerts for several years, gradually widening the circle of her tours, and at sixteen gave it up for a while and settled down as a school teacher in Peoria. After a time she resumed her musical performances and at Toledo, Ohio, in 1870, she attracted the attention of Clara Louise Kellogg, who was struck with her talent and took an interest in her. Miss Kellogg sent her to New York, where she studied under Errani, and after a time was engaged as soprano at the Church of the Divine Paternity, of which Rev. Dr. E. H. Chapin was pastor. There she attracted the attention of many prominent people, among whom were Horace Greeley, C. D. Huntington, George G. Lake and others. Mrs. Lake took her to her house, and an organized effort was made to give her a thorough training. She was sent to Italy in 1872, where she studied for some months under Giovanni at Milan, and then by the advice of Christine Nilsson, whose attention she had attracted, she went to Paris. There she took lessons in vocalization from Wartel and at the same time took lessons in French, Italian, dancing, fencing and acting at the Conservatoire and Opera Comique.

Miss Abbott made her debut at Florence and was enthusiastically encored. She then went to England and made her first appearance at the Royal Italian Opera, Convent Garden, and was received with great warmth. Then she went to the Crystal Palace, where her singing brought her to the favorable notice of Col. Mapleson, who engaged her for three years. She sang in all the principal towns in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and became a great favorite. She had already achieved a reputation abroad before her own country had an opportunity of hearing her after her voice and taste had been thoroughly trained.

She returned to the United States in 1880, and made her first appearance in New York, turning over the proceeds to a charity connected with the church through which she had been enabled to go to Italy. From that time on she became a general favorite all over the United States. She married Eugene Wetherell, her business manager, and organized a company of her own, which soon became very successful. Miss Abbott always selected her own assistants, tried their voices and assigned to them their parts. Her company was run on business principles. Mr. Wetherell died in Kansas City about a year ago while his wife was in Denver, and she retired for a time from the stage. She contemplated a permanent retirement, but was induced to give up the idea. Miss Abbott was very wealthy, her fortune being estimated at over $1,000,000.

Gossip About Women.

THE question of higher schools for girls in London has recently been attracting much attention.

THERE are now women students at the universities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiew, Charkow and Odessa.

THE Queen of the Belgians is an excellent linguist and has just accomplished the task of learning the Walloon language.

PRINCESS BEATRICE is engaged upon a birthday book, which will soon be published, but it is only to be privately circulated.

SOME fond mothers are holding off the christening until they hear the full returns, after which some baby boy will bear the name of the winner.

MISS GRACE HARRIMAN, an English woman who has started a scheme for employing women as market gardeners, has subscribed all the capital for starting the work.

MISS HENRIETTA VINTON DAVIS, of Baltimore, is the name of a colored actress who made her debut in Washington in 1883 and has played Juliet, Desdemona, and Leah with success.

THE Silver Cross Circle of King's Daughters proposes soon to open a house where apartments of one, two or three rooms will be rented at the lowest possible rate to widows with children to support.

"Well, here is a photograph of the lady whom I have described to you." "But, my dear sir, according to this picture the lady is much older than you gave me any reason to believe." "O, I assure you that is a very old photograph."—*Fliegende Blaetter*.

THE accumulation of wealth, estimated at 14 per cent. of the gross earnings of mankind, now aggregates $5,000,000,000 per annum, and is increasing, relatively as well as absolutely, from year to year.

LITTLE ones for a scent—Violets.