

but it is not the only one. Following their accustomed modes of living they can do work for a far lower rate of wages than an American can live upon and support a family. For this cause large numbers of our own citizens are thrown out of employment to give place to them.

They are an ignorant, filthy, law-breaking body of men; neither life nor property are safe where they congregate in large numbers. Besides, they keep up a constant drain of several hundred million dollars on our money circulation.

It is said that they leave their work behind them when they return homeward. Would it not however be a wiser policy to have the same work done by the thousands of our own citizens who are constantly out of employment; men who would spend the money earned for the necessaries of life, and thus save it to our circulation?

Statesmen talk much about the good or evil of our protective tariff system, both parties claiming that herein lies the salvation of the working man. How can we protect our labor against the pauper labor of Europe when we allow the cheap labor to come and return at will? Of what avail is it to try to protect by taxing the products of cheap labor in Europe when we place no restrictions on the same cheap labor being done right here in our own country? What matters it where the cheap laborer is located, whether he be in Italy, Hungary, or in the United States, as long as he has the preference of doing our work at pauper prices? Where is the protection? Were a choice to be made it would seem the better economy to patronize them at their own homes if possible. How can the protection of American industries give full protection to the American laborer under such circumstances? No wonder that so many claim that our protective tariff does not bring around the desired results.

Men complain of hard times, of the supremacy of the capitalist over the laborer, but they are likely to continue under this state of affairs. How can differences between capital and labor be justly settled when a second set of laborers is always

ready to assume the place of the first. This order of things has been seen by observing men for some time, but the remedy seems slow.

There is a law prohibiting the importation of paupers, but that was passed to protect our poor houses and not the working man especially. There is also a law prohibiting the contracting of foreign labor. This law might in some cases be an injury, by not allowing an intelligent and skilled workman to enter our midst; while it in no way effects the great class of foreign workmen.

There is only one remedy for this and that is the remedy which was used against the Chinese, exclusion. It is talked about as being unconstitutional. But why can we not exclude them as we do the Chinese? He is just as big a nuisance and not half so law-abiding as is the Chinaman. Already we have seen too much of this foreign invasion, and the time has arrived when America has no room for foreigners except those who come to make their homes here. A free government ought not to permit the lowest classes of other countries to make of us a dumping ground, whereon to enrich themselves by living half civilized lives and otherwise encroaching on the rights and privileges of our citizens.

Popular sentiment is growing slowly toward a demand that the evil must in some way be suppressed, but how long the proper legislation will be withheld is difficult to predict. Our commercial relations with the governments which these people represent are scarcely to be noticed, hence no very complicated disputes could arise between us over the question of declaring certain classes to be public nuisances and detrimental to the good of our institutions. Justice demands that we should first protect our poor before we try to make an Eldorado for those of countries entirely foreign both to our civilization and to our commerce.

John Hopkins has accepted the \$100,000 given by women to open the medical school, with the condition upon which it was presented, namely that women should be admitted to the school.