

TO BUILD A NEW CITY.

OLD WAR VETERANS GOING TO THE SOUTH.

A Grand Army Colony in Georgia Which Promises to Be a Big Success—Emigrants Flocking In with a Western Rush.

The First Town.

A Fitzgerald, Ga., correspondent, writing of the new G. A. R. colony being founded there, says: The men who followed Sherman to the sea are once more "marching through Georgia." But the people of this State do not look upon the present invasion with such consternation as they did on that of over thirty years ago, for this is one of peace—the invaders have come to live with the invaded. The movement to colonize members of the G. A. R. in the South has made a fine start and already Fitzgerald, the "metropolis" of the colony, has a population of several thousand.

Fitzgerald is in Irwin County and not five miles distant from the spot where Jefferson Davis was captured. The original plan of this colony was to provide a home in a milder climate for the veterans of the Federal armies. The project started with Philip Fitzgerald, a pension attorney and wealthy property owner of Indianapolis. At least 4,000 veterans have put their money into this co-operative



FIRST HOUSE IN THE G. A. R. COLONY.

movement and decided to come South. These old soldiers and their families make a total of about 16,000 persons. It was at first intended to defer the opening of the colony until next spring, but the immigrants could not hold back and they are now coming by hundreds and thousands from all over the country north of the Ohio river, and between the Mississippi river and the Rocky Mountains, fleeing from the rigors of Northern winter.

The immigration is a reminder of the rush to the West before the day of railroads. Wagon trains are climbing the mountains and crossing the valleys. Of the 3,000 settlers who have arrived at Fitzgerald in the last thirty days a large proportion came overland by wagon. There are immigrants who drove all the way from the Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, and one family was six months on the journey from the State of Washington. These people drove every mile from the far northwestern corner of the country to the extreme southeastern corner.

The movement has gone far beyond the Grand Army and thousands of young men and a great many men who pioneered in the West have joined it. But old soldiers are in the majority. The pension dis-

BLOW TO THE G. A. R.

Western Railroads Refuse to Grant Traffic Concessions.

The next national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic may go to Buffalo, St. Paul was the prize winner at last year's national encampment, but the Western Passenger Association will not make a rate satisfactory to the Grand Army of the Republic, which fact may change the place of meeting. A delegation from St. Paul was in Chicago to try to "argue it out," and they brought the Commander-in-chief of the Grand Army of the Republic with them, but the Western Passenger Association was obstinate and held out for a high rate of fare. So Commander-in-chief Walker will call a council of war to determine where the next encampment shall be held.

At last encampment, which was held in Louisville, it was voted that the next encampment should be held in St. Paul. A stipulation, however, was made that it should go there only in case a satisfactory rate could be obtained from the railroads. The Western roads bid for the patronage of the G. A. R. encampment at St. Paul by authorizing a rate of 1 cent, per mile for the round trip, with a seven-day limit.

At the same time a rate of one fare for the round trip to the Knights of Pythias conclave, to be held in the same city in August, was granted and a thirty-day limit authorized. Commander-in-chief Walker and prominent citizens of St. Paul immediately took issue over the seven-day limit placed on the G. A. R. excursion tickets, and every effort has been made to get the Western Association to reconsider its action and deal as fairly with the G. A. R. as with the Knights of Pythias.

With one exception the tickets to all the Grand Army of the Republic reunions held during the past ten years have been based on a thirty-day limit. The exception was the reunion held in Milwaukee. A similar dispute took place at that time, the Western roads refusing to deal liberally with the veterans. Only one excuse is put forward by the railroads for the decided stand taken on the question. This is that the thirty-day limit, if granted, means a complete demoralization of rates in Western territory and a rich harvest for the scalpers.

CUBANS IN THE SEA.

The Filibustering Steamer J. W. Hawkins Sinks Off Long Island.

The steamer J. W. Hawkins, bound from New York to Cuba on a filibustering expedition, was abandoned at sea off Long Island Sunday night in a terrific gale, and of the 176 men on board only 113 are accounted for. Ten are known to have been drowned, and it is believed fifty-three others met a like fate.

The Hawkins was of 125 tons net, and was built at Kennebunk, Me., in 1880. She was for years engaged in the fishing business, but as she had proved unprofitable she had for a long time lain idle in Baltimore harbor. Two weeks ago a man representing himself as a Mr. Tinsley approached the owners with an offer, saying he wished to buy the craft for a Mr. Smith of New York. There was no haggling over the price, and it did not take him long to become the owner of the steamer. There was an old account of the crew hanging fire, but he at once paid it. Then a local ship yard came forward

and "art and invention" have been applied to the production of wagons and carriages until the cost of production has been cheapened one-half. How fares the labor that makes them? Its wages are reduced on an average 25 per cent, instead of being increased.

Take the manufacture of carpets, where a marvelous cheapening of cost of production has been brought about by "art and invention." No sane man will pretend that carpet-weavers are paid higher wages now than formerly. Take another line, steel. When the Carnegie company, by the aid of "art and invention," so cheapened the cost of its manufacture that other manufacturers were threatened with destruction of their business, how much of an increase in wages did it bring to the workmen? Let the story of the bloody strike make answer, where, by power of arms, a heavy reduction of wages was enforced. Carnegie can produce steel cheaper—yes, does produce it cheaper—than any of his competitors. Does he now pay—has he ever paid—the highest wages in his line? I say no; he never did, nor does he now.

I could follow this into a score of other lines and in each one demonstrate the fallacy. I simply dismiss the fallacy with this remark: It will not stand the analysis of application to existing industries; it is shown to be theory run to seed. I tell the people that high wages never have been, are not now and never will be predicated on the low cost of production. Cheap cost of production means, in its last analysis, cheaper wages, not higher. This is the irresistible logic of the situation.

In spite of the vigilance of the Spanish emissaries a brass cannon worth \$7,000, ammunition that cost \$25,000, and 176 men were taken safely on board. Sunday night she sailed from that port, commanded by a Capt. Woodrow. Unfortunately, however, the boat was unfit for sea, and the hasty preparations had allowed no time for a thorough examination of her bottom, for she had proceeded only as far as the eastern end of Long Island when she sprung a dangerous leak and began to settle in the water. In spite of all the crew could do the leak gained with fearful rapidity, and within twenty minutes had taken to the five small boats.

McAuliffe's Bad Wrist.

Lightweight champion, Jack McAuliffe, has determined to make one more effort to condition himself to re-enter the ring. But before he can make this effort he will

have to undergo a course of rigorous training to get his physical condition into such shape that a surgical operation may be performed, that may restore to McAuliffe the use of his left arm, or may leave it a useless cripple. The lightweight champion broke his arm in a fight with Owen Zeigler, and as now known it was a transverse fracture of the radius and was improperly treated. Calenli have formed around the fracture, owing, it is

said, to the rapid gait at which McAuliffe has been traveling of late, and these make the case more complicated. McAuliffe has been plainly told what he would be compelled to undergo, and has accepted the chance.

The three men who floated away from Cleveland on an ice floe in Lake Erie are believed to have been lost.

THE PEOPLE'S MONEY

GOLD STANDARD CHEAP WAGES

EDWARD ATKINSON, in the Record, lays down the proposition that "high wages, in money or what money will buy, are the correlative or result of a low cost of production in all arts to which modern science and invention have been applied." He then adds: "The highest prices are or will ultimately be paid at those points at which any given product or fiber can be made at the lowest cost and sold at the lowest relative price."

I ask this plain question: Is the above proposition true in fact?

I hold that it is incorrect. I lay down this proposition: That the whole theory of reasoning by which the conclusion is reached is fallacious, and cannot stand the test of a thorough analysis. The idea of high wages being the result of a low cost of production whether art and invention have been applied is absolutely ridiculous.

To illustrate: Art and invention have been applied to the manufacture of locomotives until the cost has been reduced one-half, or 50 per cent., to the consumer. If Mr. Atkinson's reasoning be true, then the laborers who make the locomotives should now receive more wages than when the higher price was paid. The plain and simple truth is that they receive much less wages now than then. Mr. Atkinson's theory will not apply to the conditions that environ the laborers at this time. "Art and invention" have been applied to farming until the cost of producing wheat and corn has been very greatly reduced. Do farm hands receive higher wages now than then? I tell Mr. Atkinson that instead of increasing wages for farm hands have been steadily growing less in Indiana for the last fifteen years.

"Art and invention" have been applied to the production of wagons and carriages until the cost of production has been cheapened one-half. How fares the labor that makes them? Its wages are reduced on an average 25 per cent, instead of being increased. Take the manufacture of carpets, where a marvelous cheapening of cost of production has been brought about by "art and invention." No sane man will pretend that carpet-weavers are paid higher wages now than formerly. Take another line, steel. When the Carnegie company, by the aid of "art and invention," so cheapened the cost of its manufacture that other manufacturers were threatened with destruction of their business, how much of an increase in wages did it bring to the workmen? Let the story of the bloody strike make answer, where, by power of arms, a heavy reduction of wages was enforced. Carnegie can produce steel cheaper—yes, does produce it cheaper—than any of his competitors. Does he now pay—has he ever paid—the highest wages in his line? I say no; he never did, nor does he now.

I could follow this into a score of other lines and in each one demonstrate the fallacy. I simply dismiss the fallacy with this remark: It will not stand the analysis of application to existing industries; it is shown to be theory run to seed. I tell the people that high wages never have been, are not now and never will be predicated on the low cost of production. Cheap cost of production means, in its last analysis, cheaper wages, not higher. This is the irresistible logic of the situation.

Let me say right here, that the farmer whose land is most productive and who therefore produces wheat, corn, hay, oats, and barley at the least cost per bushel, and the manufacturers who produce the output of their works at the least cost, regardless of what they make, are the ones who reap the benefit of "low cost of production," instead of the laborers who do the work. So the railway company that has built a line that has been honestly built, whose stock has not been watered, that has been honestly managed, is the road whose owners reap the profit of cheapened cost of transportation instead of the men who do the actual work for the company. The road that has been so dishonestly managed that its stock is worth 5 cents on the dollar pays its engineers, firemen, trainmen, trackmen, and conductors just the same wages that are paid by the company whose stock is worth 50 per cent. more than par.

Lower cost of production means lower wages, for the reason that labor is the chief item of expense in the production of all articles where art and invention have been principally utilized, and how can you cheapen the cost of production without cheapening the price of the principal element of its cost?

High wages are paid only when lower wages cannot be secured. The rate of wages is controlled by demand, not by cost of production. It is the inexorable demand for labor, skilled and unskilled, that regulates wages. If 300 men are struggling to secure 100 places wages cannot be so high as they will be if 300 places are open to 100 men.

Abraham Lincoln said: "You can safely reason upon the greater by the smaller affairs of life," and he was right. The practical demonstration of a principle on a small scale will apply to a larger one, or to any one. I know—I do not merely believe, but I know—that labor is most prosperous when not only wages but prices are high, and when wages were high the cost of production was high. I lay down this proposition, that cheap prices are the

worst enemy labor ever had. It is the mortal enemy of labor. Why? Because the real measure of prosperity of the laborer is what he has left after he provides for himself and those dependent upon him the absolute necessities of life.

To illustrate: If I pay my laborers \$1 a day and it costs them 75 cents to live, the measure of their prosperity is 25 cents a day. If I can advance them 50 per cent, and pay them \$1.50 a day and the increased cost of living is raised from 75 cents to \$1 a day I have increased the measure of their prosperity 100 per cent by raising it from 25 to 50 cents a day. I only increase wages 50 per cent, their prosperity was increased 100 per cent. Hence, when any one talks about cheap things I know he is no friend of labor. Talk is cheap; only works count in this contest.

The single gold standard means cheap prices for the products of farm, mine and factory, and cheap prices for these means cheap wages. Cheap wages means less money to spend for food and clothing, and this means for the laborer and his family fewer comforts of life and to every avenue of our retail trade restricted sales and small profits, and in its last analysis it means cheaper manhood and womanhood, when we all know that the life of our nation depends upon the virtue and intelligence of its citizens.

Hence, I conclude that cheapness is not only the mortal enemy of labor, but of liberty itself.—J. B. Cheadle, in Chicago Record.

True Financial Gospel.

The Senate substitute for the House bond bill, if it could only become a law, would change the gloom of agricultural and business prostration as if touched by the wand of Prosperus.

The bond bill and the Senate substitute are from two opposite schools of finance. One is the school of the money king, and leads to extreme wealth for the few and poverty and want for the millions. The other opens up the pathway of independence to all who are wise and industrious, and lifts the weight of poverty from the masses of the land. One leads to low prices for the labor of the world; the other to prices commensurate with the true value of man's industry and skill. One is the school of the plutocrat, the purse proud, and the oppressor; the other is the school of humanity, basing its teachings upon the wisdom and experience of mankind.

The Senate substitute restores silver to its constitutional pedestal as a monetary metal. It opens up the mints to its coinage upon an equality with gold.

It gives to it what the framers of the constitution and the first American Congress conferred upon it, and that which they secured for it for the first eighty-three years of the nation's life, to be enjoyed by the nation, to be used for the power to coin money; and hence that a currency intended to circulate as money shall be issued, and its volume controlled by the Government only, and should be legal tender.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We hold that the power to control and regulate a paper currency is inseparable from the power to coin money; and hence that a currency intended to circulate as money shall be issued, and its volume controlled by the Government only, and should be legal tender.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.

We are unalterably opposed to the use of gold and silver into standard money, at the ratio of 16 to 1, and upon terms of exact equality, as they existed prior to 1873; the silver coin to be still legal tender, with gold coin, for all debts, and due public and private.