

THE SINGLE - TAX COURIER.

Vol. III #47.

GEORGE'S SPEECH

AT COOPER UNION? NEW YORK CITY, NOV. 3, 1894.

"Too Much Tariff Reform and Not Enough Free Trade" -
Land Monopolist Devices.

Ladies and Gentlemen - I am here tonight as somewhat of an outsider. For a good many years I have been accustomed to look upon every great election with something of solemnity. I care little for men; I care nothing for organizations, and nothing whatever for parties. I care everything for principles. I cannot open a daily paper without seeing something, generally a little item or many of them, that, if in this great city I had not grown case-hardened to such things, would give me a nightmare. I cannot pass along the streets of this great and rich city without having people accost me, asking for food and shelter. I turn my back to most cases. What else can a man do? Yet there is always that feeling that what they say may be true, for I know that in this great city, even in what we are accustomed to call good times, there are men harried to death; there are women and little children ^{suffering} ~~starving~~ from actual starvation.

A lady who has devoted her time for years to charitable work said to me last week, "I have grown to sometimes wish that the charitable organizations of this city were stopped for forty-eight hours." I said, "Why?" She said, "Because so many people would starve to death that it would awaken the community to a knowledge of the misery that lies in it."

Any man who has or gets anything beyond the barest living is constantly accosted; constantly having appeals made to him from peo-

ple he knows; appeals for necessities; appeals for that which every man ought to have for the mere asking, for his mere willingness to do it - work! What can he do? He is absolutely helpless. Here and there he may do a little for an individual, but in most cases he knows that he has done nothing to lessen the sum of misery.

I believe that the only remedy for this misery lies in politics. I believe that it is not the fault of the Creator that there is suffering among us to-day. The Creator has done his part. All over this country the bounties of the Creator are in abundance; the natural resources by which man shall satisfy his needs are in abundance; everywhere the powers of production are so great that the people even talk of the misery - and many people believe it - of all the misery and starvation being caused by over-production!

There is positively no remedy to my mind save in intelligent thought and in action through the ballot. And unless in some way or other, directly or indirectly, there is something in our politics that touches this greatest of all questions, the great social question. I can take no interest in it; I do take an interest, a deep interest in this election; yet it is a negative interest. I am to-night a man without a party. I do not come here to-night to ask you to vote for my friend, Everett P. Wheeler. I shall vote for him myself, but I do not come upon the stump for him. I will not ask anyone else to vote for him. Everett P. Wheeler is a good, clean man; and at least a good deal of a free trader, but the platform upon which he stands, to my mind, means nothing that is real. It is a tariff-reform platform, and I for one am tired of tariff reform. It

declares for cutting down duties on raw material. I want all duties cut down; I want all duties abolished, and I see in a demand for free raw material merely a species of protection. I am tired of that sort of Democracy. Not that I will not support any party that does not go to the full length my way. I supported - supported with energy and with all the force I could exert, Grover Cleveland. (Cheers) You cheer him, I would not! (More cheers.) I supported him for a good and sufficient reason. He was the man who went farthest my way, and I think I was only reasonable in supposing that he would go a good deal farther in that way than he has gone. I am not inclined to put the whole responsibility for the miserable fiasco of the Democratic party in the last Congress merely upon some weak Senators. I think that the administration was also responsible. I think the Democratic party generally was responsible. (A voice "The leaders!") Yes, the leaders were responsible. There was too much tariff reform and not enough free trade.

But I have certainly a negative interest in this campaign. I have hopes of the Democratic party. I believe in the Democratic principle. I believe in that adherence to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson lies the only hope of the Democratic party; the only solution of the labor question; the only way of preventing social conditions in this country sinking to the conditions of what, when a boy, we were accustomed to call the "Effete monarchies of the Old World." For that reason; because I am in that sense a Democrat; Hill to the ^{or} Governorship of this state would be the worst disaster that could befall the Democratic party. And for this reason I can vote with all my heart for Everett P. Wheeler, Though they do put him on what I

consider a miserable platform, he had the courage to come forward and take the chances of almost certain defeat, to help beat Hill.

"I am a Democrat," says Mr. Hill. What kind of a Democrat? David B. Hill stands for this and nothing else; For the machine; for a sort of Democracy that cares nothing whatever for the Democratic principle; a sort of Democracy that buys votes and sells them; a sort of Democracy that really makes a nonpartisan machine, bent on nothing, but private profit. He is today the typical machine Democrat, and the quicker that sort of Democrat is cleaned out the sooner will the Democratic principle come to the front. David B. Hill, with an audacity that excites a certain kind of admiration, is making his fight in the interests of such machines as Tammany. On what plea? (A voice, "Good government.") Good government! He has persistently opposed everything that would tend to bring good government.

The speakers who will follow me will tell you of that more in detail than it is necessary for me to occupy time with. But there is one thing most clear that David B. Hill is responsible for, and that is the sort of ballots that we will be forced to vote next Tuesday. There was presented for his signature the clear, straight Australian ballot. His persistent opposition was made in the interest of the men and organizations who have been buying, selling, counting out votes. And it is by his opposition that we must next Tuesday vote that most ridiculous of all travesties on the Australian ballot. In everything, as governor of this state, he has sided against every good law. As a Senator, what has he done? (A voice, "Nothing.") You are wrong. He has done a great deal. He is one of the Senators who are responsible for that miserable abortion, the Gorman surrender bill. And what he

really tried to do was to keep in force the McKinley bill.

Vote for David B. Hill, as a Democrat? I would rather vote for Gorman as a Democrat! I would much rather vote for Morton, or McKinley himself! From first to last; from his first proposition that nothing but the money question should be considered in the extra session, down to the very last, when under pretense of opposing the income tax, he stood in the way of the bill repealing the tax on sugar and the other repeal bills which the House sent to the Senate, he did the very last and final service for those trusts. He to claim the credit of any little reduction that this little bill makes! He stood in reality for the continuance of the McKinley bill. And in his latest utterances, he occupies the protectionist ground - as much as a protectionist as McKinley himself. Vote for Hill as a Democrat? If I must have a protectionist, give me every time a Republican protectionist. I am more than sick and tired of your Democratic variety. If I must have an enemy, I want him to be open and above board; I do not want him in the house of my friends.

David B. Hill is now posing as a power of labor; as a man who has the interests of labor at heart. What has he ever done for labor? Possibly some little things called for by organized labor, and he has appointed a lot of labor leaders to little positions, earning their support. But Labor - Labor is the creator of all wealth! Labor is the one thing that has no little favors to ask; It is monopoly that wants protection; but labor wants only fair play; labor wants only justice. What we want for labor is not inspectors, and such miserable and shameful laws as those which meet men seeking our shores and turn ~~them~~ back again; men who come to this country to work, as our fathers came.

The great movement for labor is along the line of taxation. David B. Hill has persistently opposed every movement of that kind, and today, in his opposition to the income tax, he asserts that the national revenues should be raised by a tax on commodities, of which this sugar tax that he helped to put in, and prevented the repeal of, is an example; a tax that falls on the poor sewing girl as heavily almost as it falls on the richest hundred-millionaire in the land.

Mr. Hill is posing as a defender of liberty of opinion! He raised the cry against the A.P.A. I do not need to tell anyone here that I do not belong to the A.P.A. I do not have to tell anyone here that I am not a bigot in religion. For, seek, where you please, there is one place where you will not find them and that is in the ranks of the single-tax men. As for this A.P.A. I have seen the thing where it began; I have heard the beat of the Orange drums, on the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne of Belfast, and a very funny thing it is. Wherever that bigotry exists, it is simply an importation from the other side of the water; something that grew up there. It was a device of the landlords to split the Irish people. But it will die out here. It cannot live at this time and in this country.

David B. Hill is posing as the defender of the right of belief and opinion! He is a nice man to pose as a defender of that right. Here is something that there has been very little said about. I would like to occupy a little time in speaking of it.

Here is a copy of Senate bill No. 2,314. Since the first Congress met; aye, since the first Colonial Legislature was formed, there never has been so wanton, so flagrant an attack upon the principle of liberty of thought as this bill, and David B. Hill is its author.

This is the bill popularly known as the anti-Anarchistic bill; the bill introduced into the Senate of the United States in its closing days by David B. Hill. I am not an anarchist; it is also needless for me to say that; but I am far from sharing in that opinion that anarchists are merely men who want to use dynamite. The anarchists have not a monopoly of physical forces. That has been used over and over again; by trades' unions, by the American patriots, by people of all kinds, Anarchy, that is, its true meaning, is a belief; it is a political philosophy; it is an extension to its ultimate of the old Democratic belief that the best governments was the government that governed the least. The anarchists would abolish government. In that I think they are mistaken. I think they go too far on one side, just as the socialists go too far on the other side. But every anarchist has a right to his opinion.

Now, what is this bill - "A bill to provide for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists." It provides that every alien seeking admission into the United States is to be examined, if he is suspected of being an anarchist. Examined as to what? As to whether he ever blew up a house? ever killed an emperor? ever murdered a brutal and oppressive governor, whom human laws could not reach? No, nothing of that kind. He is to be examined by pertinent questions as to his antecedents, as to his opinions of government! As to his opinions of government! Is there any difference in examining a man as to his opinions of government and if you don't like him sending him back again, than in examining him as to his opinions as to God, and if you do not like it sending him back? He is also to be examined as to whether he belongs to any society or association of known anarchistic

tendencies, and this board may examine the person of such alien for marks indicative of such membership." What does that mean? It means to strip him naked and examine him from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet for marks - what marks? Do you suppose that men watched for by all the police of the monarchies of Europe make marks on themselves, so that they can be known by them when caught? No. But in some of those countries political prisoners are marked. This precious bill made that a way of finding out whether any man coming to this country in search of liberty had been under the ban of the despotic police of Europe. And more: This board may accept evidence of an immigrant's common reputation as an anarchist, and "the orders, decrees or judgments of foreign governments and police investigations may be taken as prima facie evidence, to be deemed sufficient, unless successfully controverted!

What is this bill? It is an attempt to make this great republic of the west one of the partners, and the most efficient partner, in the league of European despots to put down freedom of thought. It goes on to provide that in case these precious examiners think there is evidence of the alien holding such opinions, he is to be sent back from this country. And, further, the bill goes on to appropriate \$60,000 of American money - \$60,000 of money wrung from labor by the most atrocious taxation - to send agents, that are virtually to be police spies, to Europe, there to confer with the political police of European countries, and to give information of passengers to this country suspected of being anarchists.

Why, under this bill such ^aman as Prince Kropotkin, a man who enjoys the hospitality of England today; a man who as an investigator

has rendered the greatest scientific service; or such a man as Elisee Reclus, who enjoys the freedom of free Switzerland; a man who stands to-day as the most eminent of living geographers; under that bill if these men came to this country they could be detained at the dock, examined on their opinions as to government, stripped to their skins and searched for marks, and then sent back to Europe! The man who introduced that bill was David B. Hill; a man posing as a Democrat; posing today as a lover of labor; posing today as a defender of free thought. There never was such an atrocious bill introduced into the Congress of the United States.

And in that senate that has become an American house of millionaires; that senate that was only anxious to serve the sugar trust for good and sufficient reasons; in that senate this atrocious bill passed without opposition, and it might have been today the law of the land, just as that atrocious Russian treaty, that binds us to send back political offenders to Russia, is the law of the land. It might have been the law of the land, but, thank God, there was one real Democrat in his place in the house; a New York democrat; a single-tax Democrat - John DeWitt Warner - who stood up and protested and killed that bill there and then. No man who ever introduced such a bill as that into the Senate of the United States, whatever else he may have done, no man who ever fathered such a bill as that can have my vote at any time or for anything! (Great cheers.) And John DeWitt Warner, the man who stood up and saved the honor of the American name; the man who has been true to all his pledges; he has been turned down by Tammany. You cannot vote for him this year. Tammany and Hill!

They are simply parts of the same thing. I shall vote against Tammany and I shall vote against Hill! (Cheers.)

I am hopeless of any reform that is to be real and permanent that goes no farther than electing good men to office. I do not belong to the Seventy. I have never joined any good government club. I refused four years ago to speak for, although I voted for, the very excellent gentleman that was put up by the Municipal League, for it seemed to me that he represented nothing but a mere change, I do not care much for mere changes. But after what has been shown of the corruptions of this city - shown openly and publicly - (a voice, "We knew them before!") Yes, we knew them before! we who fought Tammany eight years ago, when on this platform, in accepting the nomination of the United Labor party, I declared that if elected Mayor I would see to it that the policeman should cease to sit as censor upon what was said at public meetings, and should cease to act as judge, jury and executioner at once, all over this country it was heralded that I was a disturber of order; that I wanted anarchy! Now, thanks to Goff, thanks to Dr. Parkhurst; thanks to ^{that} Lexow commission, whom David B. Hill's successor and representative, Roswell P. Flower, refused to sign a bill making an appropriation for; thanks to them, the corruptions festering in this city have been brought to light - have been made plain even to those who then deemed me a menace to society. To again bring Tammany into power would mean a public condonation of this organized brigandage and oppression, that stoops to rob the apples from the poor apple woman, levies hundreds of thousands on the men of millions who want legislative acts passed! Now, no matter how little is to be looked for in the future, the first thing is

to beat Tammany.

I have faith in the people. Over and over they make mistakes; often they do not know their friends from their enemies, but I do not believe that at this election they are so stupid and so sodden as to return a success to Tammany and to David B. Hill. (Applause.)

Nov. 22, 1894.