

NATIONAL SINGLE TAXER

Vo. 6 #46.

A MAGNIFICENT PROPAGANDA SPEECH

HENRY GEORGE'S GREAT ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF
ST. LOUIS AT ENTERTAINMENT HALL,

NOV. 22, 1887.

A Large Crowd Listens for Two Hours and Urges Him
to Continue His Prophecy of the Coming
Brotherhood of Man.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am to talk to you for a while tonight on the land question. A friend of mine, a man who has been very earnest and active in this movement for years, was talking to another friend about the importance of the land question. "Yes", finally said the second man; "yes, the land question is an important one, there is no mistake about that; but there are many other important questions; there is the tariff question, and the railroad question, and the money question. Now, in my opinion, the money question is the most important of all questions. You give me all the money and I can do what I please; you give me all the money and I will control everything else." "Well," said my friend to him, "supposing you had all the money in the world and I had all the land in the world, what would you do if I gave you notice to quit?" (Laughter and applause.) He scratched his head a moment and, as our friend Judge Maguire would say, "he saw the cat." (Applause.) And from that day to this he has been an anti-poverty man.

But I know of nothing better to illustrate what the land question really is. It is not, as people, until they think of it, are apt to imagine, one of a number of important questions - it is the im-

portant question. (Applause.) It is the question that lies at the bottom of all social and political questions. In talking about the land question we are simply talking about the great labor question. (Applause.) All over the world there is dissatisfaction among the working masses - discontent and disquiet. This great free Republic of the West is no more exempt from that discontent and that disquiet and from the difficulties that grow out of the feeling that labor does not get its fair opportunities and its full earnings than are what we used to call "the effete monarchies of the Old World."

And yet labor in this country is certainly free. A man is free to work if he pleases, or not to work. No one puts any stress or strain upon him in that regard. We have abolished chattel slavery years ago. All American citizens are equal before the law, and all native born male American citizens may hope to be president. But, nevertheless, there is a feeling, and it is a truthful feeling - it has a ground - that, while men are nominally free, in reality they are not free; that there is something that oppresses them, something that deprives them of their natural right, something that takes away from their full earnings, something that frequently denies them the opportunity to work at all. What is it? Labor is free; but land, it is not free. (Applause.) And of what use is labor without land? (Continued applause.) Think of it for a moment. Some people when we talk of the land question, have a notion that we are talking of something that has reference to only farmers. They really talk, and I am inclined to think that many of them really think, that farmers are the only people that make any use of land, yet how preposterous that is.

Man's Need of Land.

Any denizen of a city, how could he live, how could he work without land? We are all land dwellers, we are all land-users. We can only live on the land and through the land and all our products consist in the land, or of the union of human labor with land. We always speak of labor as the creator of wealth. When we speak thus we speak metaphorically. Labor creates nothing. The whole human race, it is labored to infinity could not create the tiniest mote that floats in the sunbeam. Man is not the creator, he is only the producer. God alone creates. (Applause.)

All man's making of things consists in altering, either in place or form, the raw materials that he finds already here. He produces coal by digging it from the vein and moving it on the surface of the earth. He produces grain by opening the ground, putting in his seed, and leaving it to the germinating influences of nature. He produces cloth by taking animal or vegetable fibers and putting them together in certain relations. He produces a house by taking the stones, the trees, the clay, the iron and so on, changing their form somewhat and bringing them together in the shape and form of a house. He creates nothing; he must have something before he can make anything. He is a producer, a bringer forth, a changer of shape or place; that is all. Without land, labor is practically useless; it can produce nothing. Man himself is merely a land animal. (A voice: He is no fish.) His very body is drawn from the surface of the earth, and to it he returns again.

No, as my friend says, he is no fish. The thing he reminds me of in many respects is a crab. (Laughter.) Did you ever see a great

aquarium? I have seen two - one in San Francisco and the other in London. But if you ever get an opportunity to go into a great aquarium, where the fish or marine animals are confined in great tanks with glass fronts and the light is let in from the outside, so that it would seem as though you were standing in the water and seeing their natural movements there, you find the crab, that looks so clumsy on land, so hard to move around, in that dense fluid which is its natural atmosphere, a light and agile creature, walking about in the bottom - the bottom that supports that ocean of liquid; confined to that bottom. So are men. We tenant the bottom of that ocean of air which involves this circling globe. We cannot go much below it, though we can dig into the surface of the earth a few thousand feet - nothing like as deep as the rind of an orange, as compared with its bulk. And we can, in vessels constructed for that purpose, go a few thousand feet into the air above its surface; but it can only be done by the use of materials taken from that surface. And even though he be up in a balloon or down in the bottom of a mine, a man must be supported by materials taken by him from the surface of the earth. And if he navigates that heavier body that we call the ocean, he still can do so only in vessels constructed by materials taken from the dry land, and must return to it again.

Land, in the full sense, includes the whole material universe outside of man himself, so far as he has access to it. Labor, human exertion, is the active factor of production, but it is only the active factor; land is the passive factor. Until those two unite there can be no production. Therefore, to say that a man is free while he is not free

to the use of land is merely a mockery. A man without the right to use land is like a fish without a right to the use of water or a bird without a right to the use of air. Labor of itself is absolutely helpless; it cannot even employ itself; it can produce nothing; and in that simple relation, that self-evident relation, is the explanation of the great labor question with all its paradoxes. (Applause.)

Appropriation of Labor.

Chattel slavery is only the coarse and rude way of enabling some men to appropriate the labor of others. Where a man makes property of another person, where he can compel him to work and can take the proceeds of that work, he can take to himself all the labor of that other, save enough to enable him to live. The master must afford the slave food and clothing and shelter, at least enough to maintain life; if he did not, the slave would die and that would put an end to it. But if you will look back over the history of the world, you will find it was only over a comparatively small area and in rude times that men sought to appropriate the labor of others by getting possession of their bodies. In the days of the African slave trade, African slaves were brought to this country; they were not taken to England, and not taken to Ireland. Why? Because in this country land was plentiful and people were sparse. But where it was possible not to make property of the man himself, but to make property of) the land, of which and from which he lives, from which he must live if he has to live at all, then the owner had all the advantages of slavery without many of its disadvantages. The English Conquerors from the time of Strongbow down, went over into Ireland to pillage and to rob; they wanted to get the labor of the Irishman; they wanted to make the Irishmen work for them and support them in idleness and in luxury out

of the proceeds of their toil; but they did not go and enslave the Irish; what they did was to get possession of the Irish lands; then, when they had possession of the land, they had the people. (Applause.) They did not have to tie them, to put chains on their legs, to prevent them from running away; they did not have to send bloodhounds after them if they escaped; they did not have to whip them if they did not work; they did not have to bother with the little children or the old people; they simply got the land, and then the poor Irish had to come with their hats in their hands and ask permission to work, agreeing to give up to the "master," calling himself the land owner, all that their labor would enable them to produce from the land, save just enough to keep body and soul together. (Applause.)

Possession of Land Means Possession of Men.

So it is in all well-settled countries. Conquerors have never bothered themselves with making slaves of the inhabitants. They merely get possession of the land, and getting possession of the land gives possession of the men. If I own the land on which and from which another man must live, if he lives at all, I am his master and he is my servant (applause), and that mere power of putting him off the land gives me the power to compel him, even to life and to death. (Applause.) We did not abolish slavery when we struck the shackles off the chattel slave; we abolished only the coarse and rude form of slavery; we simply brought out the negro and put him on the level with the poor white. That is all. (Applause.) And today you may see that power that comes from owning the land on which those people lived, in a dispatch to the evening papers, illustrated by those sugar planters in Louisiana when

they had a strike among their workingmen, their negro workingmen, who wanted a little more money. They simply refused to give them the money and called on the police, the sheriff's posse and militia to eject them from their cabins. The darkies had to give in. (Applause.) They treated them just as the coal barons of Pennsylvania are today treating those free citizens of Pennsylvania. (Loud applause.) The freedom to work without anything to work on; the freedom to live without anything to live on; what does it mean but the freedom to starve?

Who Enjoy the Product of Labor?

Labor is not the creator of wealth, but labor is the producer of wealth. No wealth exists but that labor had to strain to bring it into being. The fine house, the rich clothing, beautiful equipage, nice furniture, or even the rudest and coarsest of those things, everything that we call wealth, that is properly called wealth in political economy, the things that men strive for, the things that minister to their wants and their desires - their material wants and desires at least - are all produced by labor.

Now, that being the case, what is the inference from that alone? What would any greenhorn from the South Sea Islands, some child of nature, think if he came into a city like St. Louis, or New York, or Edinburgh, or Dublin, or London? Knowing that houses, and clothes, and carriages and domestic animals, and pictures and books, and fruits, are all the products of labor; and, going through some of the avenues of any one of those cities and seeing the magnificent mansions replete with all forms of wealth, and then going into another quarter where

the houses were small and mean and squalid; and you were to tell him that one of those quarters was working peoples' quarters; which do you think he would think the working people lived in - the laboring people? (Laughter.) Naturally he would think that the people who had the most of all the things that labor produced must be the laboring class, and the people that lived in the small and poor houses and had so little of all that labor produced must be the idle class. (Applause.) How green to our notions he would be indeed, to go up the steps of one of those fine mansions and ask if a laboring man lived there! (Laughter.)

Take that city, the metropolis of the world, the greatest of all the world's cities, the type of what, in the next century, this city of St. Louis, as that city of Chicago and many other of our American cities will be - that great monster city of London, where the extremes of wealth and want can be seen as, perhaps, nowhere else in the world, - let such a greenhorn go up the steps of one of those magnificent palaces and meet the gorgeously attired flunkys he would meet there, and ask if a laboring man lived there - why, he would be locked out. The men who live in those palaces not only pride themselves on never having done a day's work in their lives, but on the fact that their fathers never did any work and their grandfathers never did any work. (Applause.) And the longer they can go back through a line of ancestors who enjoyed all that labor produces without ever having done any labor, why, the prouder they are. (Applause.)

And yet, is it not true, as an English philosopher has said, that all mankind may be divided into three categories - workingmen,

beggarmen and thieves. (Laughter.) Is not ^{that} all the inevitable deduction from the proposition that all wealth is produced by labor? If all wealth is produced by labor, then the only way to get wealthy is by working for it, by begging it or by stealing it. (Laughter.) And the man who does not belong to one of those classes must belong to one of the two others. (Laughter.) And, therefore, is it not clear if there are classes who, without doing work can enjoy what work produces, that they can only get it by beggary or robbery, and the more they have, the less can the laborer get? When a man or a class of men enjoy wealth, the product of labor, without doing any labor, the men who do labor must be robbed; and there is the deep injustice which lies at the basis of our social system. It is founded and based on the robbery of labor. (Applause.)

We are all here evidently with the equal permission of Him who made this world. We are here equal children of His goodness; equal guests at the bountiful table He has spread. If there be among us a class who have no right to avail themselves of that bounty unless they buy permission from some other human creature like themselves, that class is robbed. There is the fundamental injustice which lies at the bottom of this labor question, the fundamental injustice which gives rise to these vague perceptions that there is and there must be a wrong somewhere. It is in that the element necessary to life and labor, the element not made by man but created by the Almighty, is in all our modern civilized countries denied to a great proportion of the people.

"Our Land and Our Country."

We talk, and on the other side of the water they, the majority

of the people, poor fools that they are, they talk of their "native land!" "their country!" We are accustomed to talk about "our native land!" "our country!" (Laughter), and, when the city that we live in grows, we swell with pride - "our city!" "our city is growing bigger!" and "our city is having grand mansions built and great factories!" "our city!" "our land!" (Laughter.) Why, in such cities as this, and in a still greater degree in such cities as New York, the vast majority of the American people are simply tenants at will. It isn't "their city;" it isn't "their country." There are lots of you, no doubt, in this audience, tonight who have no more legal right in "our country" than I have (laughter and applause), and I can only live here by paying some owner of this country every month for permission to live here.

Why any Englishman or any Scotchman or any Italian or any Chinaman can do as much. "O," you tell me, "but you have a right to work and save, and you can buy a piece of land in 'your country.'" So can the Englishman and so can the Chinaman. What good does it do me to be a native American citizen if I have to buy a piece of my country, if I have to pay rent for the privilege of living in it? Why should you, men and women of St. Louis, feel proud because St. Louis goes ahead of Chicago in enterprise or population? To most of you what difference does it make? Simply this difference; That you will have to pay more rent for living in St. Louis. (Applause.)

And yet, is it not a natural perception, firm and clear and true, that every man ought to have a country, that every family ought to have a home, that every child, even the child of the poorest and humblest that comes wailing into this world, ought to find in that world

and in that land in which it is born some foot-hold that is his by right, some share in this great heritage? Yet, the vast majority of the children that are born today have no natural rights whatever in their native land. They have the right to live if they can find any place to live on; and it is a matter of fact that thousands and tens of thousands of the little children who are coming day by day and week by week and month by month into this land of ours, are crowded out because of their natural rights to room enough to live, to air enough, to light enough, is denied them. (Applause.) In those tenement districts of New York, and measurably in all our great cities throughout the country, thousands and thousands of little children die every year before their time - children who ought to live long and happy lives - crowded out because the conditions into which they are born are not fit for the maintenance of life; crowded out because their fathers and mothers are crowded together in the squalid rooms of the great tenement houses; because they cannot find the very necessities that human life must have or the flame cannot be preserved - going out by thousands. And that slaughter of the innocents is recognized by such great papers as the Tribune and the Times, and they propose to stop it by raising contributions from the charitable and building hospitals for babies. (Laughter.)

Why is Labor Unemployed?

Is this that kind of world? Is that what the Maker and Father of us all intended? Has he not given room enough for all, raw material to furnish food and clothing and shelter for all? If there is any want of these things, is it because He has not furnished enough of the raw material, or is it because there is not labor enough to work

the raw material? Why, we, sixty millions of people, scattered over this vast continent, that would easily maintain a thousand million, we are only beginning to scratch its surface. Labor? Why, everywhere, even in what we call good times, there are millions of men, ready to work, willing to work and anxious to work, and yet they cannot find the opportunity to work. (Applause.) What is the reason? What can it be but the passive factor necessary to production - that the natural elements without which labor is useless are shut out from labor. Labor is free but land is monopolized. (Applause.)

Here is the bottom, the heart of the labor question, and that is the reason why, all over this country, that great movement going on with disquiet, called the labor movement, is beginning to operate and taking definite shape, and to aim at this one thing, the freedom of the land. No man has any natural right to in any way attempt to coerce an employer as to what wages he shall pay, or as to how he shall manage his business; but every man has a natural right to demand liberty to employ his own labor. And it is only because that obvious and natural right is denied, that then, in their desperation, in their want, in their determination to prevent themselves being utterly crowded to the wall, men must attempt to fight and coerce in order to push wages up, or to coerce a little of this precious thing, employment, for themselves, more than they would otherwise get.

What is the reason of this constant tendency that presses wages down to the minimum; that will only give a bare living to the laborer - what the Germans call the "iron law" of wages? It is not, as the Socialists foolishly imagine, a natural law; it only arises from the

fact that land, the primary opportunity of all employment, the primary essential for all production, is monopolized and shut up; that there is in the community a class of men who, having no right to the use of land, are utterly unable to employ their own labor, and hence can only get the opportunity to labor by obtaining permission from some employer. The source of this competition is the unemployed men - that surplus that even in good times exists, of men who for longer or shorter periods, cannot get employment, and which, in hard times, runs up in numbers to the millions. They crowd everywhere for employment and bring about that cut-throat competition which we see in all branches of manual labor - unless they require very special skill - constantly tending to crowd wages down and to bring about that bitter competition which is seen in trade - seen in the professions, not less than in the manual occupations, and which make life today for the great body of American people, as of all civilized people, a bitter struggle merely to make both ends meet, to keep the wolf away from the door.

Pauperism Increasing With Inventions.

We have all this century gone on inventing and inventing, and today inventing is going on faster than ever. In all departments of human industry the power of human hands to minister to human wants has been multiplied and multiplied, and yet has it become any easier to live? Do we hear less of the tramp and the pauper than we did thirty years ago? Is insanity decreasing, or is it increasing? We all know the answer to these questions. Wealth has been increasing; productive power has been multiplied and multiplied, but pauperism all

over this great land has been developing from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We hear of the tramp; of men who, tired of the hard struggle to maintain life, throw themselves out of existence; of men and women who, going insane in the bitter struggle, are every year becoming of larger proportion. What is the reason of that? Seek the reason and you find it in this land question. It is in the natural tendency of improvement in productive power to increase the earnings of labor, but where the laborers have merely the power of laboring without the right of access to the raw material necessary to labor, then by a natural law the landowners must get all the advantage; and if there be here and there monopolies, other monopolies which take a part of that advantage, it only lessens what the landowner would otherwise get. (Applause.) You see that wherever you look.

What is the one thing that with all our advance and improvement goes up in value? Not clothes, not food, not houses, not any manufactured article; but there is one thing that, as population increases and improvement, goes on, does increase in value; that thing is land.

land
Where Increase of Value Goes.
A

Now, what does the increased value of land mean? When a man buys a piece of land for a few thousands of dollars and it goes up to hundreds of thousands of dollars, what does it mean? It means simply that he can get the produce of labor without doing any labor. Land itself yields nothing. It takes the labor of a man to make land yield anything, and, when land increases in value, the man who gets rich on that account gets rich because his ownership of the land increases his power of appropriating the fruits of labor. (Applause.) There is

the explanation.

Here today some of my friends took me out and showed me a beautiful driving park, and a fine botanical garden, erected by one of your citizens named Shaw, and turned over, I believe, to the city. What is the effect of these things? Well, one very obvious effect is, they increase the value of the land in that locality. And if more railroads were to come here, what would be the effect? It would also increase the value of land. If here under your city, great gas wells were discovered that would save you the burning of the dark, nasty bituminous coal, it would add enormously to the ease with which you could obtain fuel and power, heat and light; but what would be the consequence to the laborer? Would wages be any higher? Would land be any higher? You would find land go up; you would find that St. Louis would have a real estate boom. (Laughter.) And so it is that land being owned by one class, there being another class with no right but the right to labor when they can get a chance to labor, then no improvement can add to wages - no improvement.

The English and English Landlords.

Why, five centuries ago among our Anglo-Saxon ancestors the arts of production were of the rudest kind. Not one of our great modern inventions had been dreamed of; the breeds of cattle were small and poor; the most prolific grains and vegetables were not known; with few exceptions, roads were hardly known, or were little better than foot-paths; and yet such men as Professor Thorold Rogers, who has made a study of the subject, such men as the historian Hallam, tell us that as much as five centuries ago in England there was no class so low and

so degraded, no class who got so hard and poor a living as do millions and millions of Englishmen to-day in this nineteenth century. In those rude times there was famine, sometimes, because when scarcity, by reason of failure of the crops, came upon one district, it could not be relieved, as now, from the plenty of other districts. There was famine, but in any normal time, any/ time of ordinary plenty, need any man, even the poorest, fear that he could not maintain himself and family from the proceeds of his labor? And today there are millions in that country, the richest country in the world, who are haunted constantly by that terrible fear of want. Millions who cannot maintain themselves even in good times. And in that country that can draw at will upon the harvest of the globe, that country where warehouses are always overflowing, there is all the time an agricultural famine, and men and women and little children die in the richest city in the world because they cannot get enough to eat. (Applause.)

The reason is simply in the monopolization of land that has gone on from that day to this. In that day, in a rude way, the right of every man to a foothold in his native soil was acknowledged. There was no such thing then as individual property in land; there is no such thing theoretically in England today; all landholders are merely tenants of the Crown; centuries ago they were actual tenants. The owners, the holders of the church lands had to provide for the maintenance of public worship, for the care of the sick and for education. The Crown lands bore the burdens now borne by the civil list. The holders of the military tenures had to do the fighting for their land; and, during the long wars waged there, England had no such thing as a

national debt. And there were the old parks and commons, traces of which may be found today, free to the people for pasturage - a place to cut wood and a place to build a little cottage on. But the Crown lands were gradually given away to the nobles; the reformation came; church lands, instead of being used, as John Knox wanted them to be used, for public purposes, were made the private property of greedy courtiers. After the restoration the nobles holding lands by military tenures gradually, by act of parliament, grabbed the church lands even, and today, had that fragment of the old Religieuse been preserved, it would more than have sufficed to pay all the expenses of Great Britain, municipal, county, and imperial. They were replaced by indirect taxation upon the body of the people, and then the commons were fenced in just as great speculators are fencing in what we call our public domain today.

Our Native land.

You talk of a free born Englishman. Why, he has no more right to his native land - well, than has a free born American citizen; just about as much and no more. And that is the reason why, as John Stuart Mill has said, all this marvelous advance in the productive power of labor has not resulted in lessening the toil of those compelled to toil; that wherever any improvement in wages or in comfort can be shown, it can be traced to the work of the labor association, in fact, of men banding themselves together and fighting - for it is nothing more nor less than passive fighting, even at the best - for an advance or to prevent a reduction.

And this is in the nature of things. So long as land, the nat-

ural element on which we are all dependent, is made the private property of some, no possible advance in invention, no possible discovery can improve the condition of the working masses, no matter what it may be. Imagine invention to go on so far that labor could be entirely saved, what would be the result? We possibly can imagine how we can get things without labor - we, who have seen what marvelous things have been accomplished by invention, can imagine nothing that would enable us to make something out of nothin, and the most that invention could do would be to enable the owners of the land to get all the wealth they wanted without calling on labor at all. They could get all the wealth that the land could produce, but as for labor, mere labor, there would be no use for it, and, if the mere laborer continued to live, it would only be as a pauper. It, of course, is impossible, that invention should go so far as that; but it is in that direction, in the direction of saving labor that invention constantly goes, and we may see in the phenomena that this advance presents to us today, something like an indication of what would be the ultimate result if labor-saving invention went to the point of dispensing with labor in a country or a world where land was made the private property of some. And I say with all reverence, but it is an absolute deduction from His laws, that so long as His laws are what they are, the Creator himself, the Almighty power, could not relieve poverty or abolish want in this world.

Why, if in response to the prayers sometimes made to Him in a country where land was all owned by a class of the people, as it is fully owned in the old countries and is fast being owned in this, - what would be the result if He showered wealth down from heaven or

Cause
it to gush up from the bowels of the earth - who would it belong to?
(Laughter.)

Over-production of Manna.

You know how in the Good Book we are told that the Israelites journeyed through the desert, and when they were famishing manna was sent down at the prayer of Moses, enough for every one of them, and they ate and were filled. Supposing that desert had been private property and supposing one Israelite owned a big piece and another Israelite owned another big piece, and the majority didn't own any, and the manna came down all the same, who would it belong to? Under our laws it would have belonged to the desert owner, and all that the poorer common children of Israel could have got would have been by offering their services to the landowners to scrape it together for them. They might have scraped it together, you know, and thus obtained a portion of the proceeds of their labor, a part of the manna for getting it in piles so the owners could sell it. (Laughter.) And they would have sold it and would have waxed rich, and got, probably, all the jewelry that had been brought from Egypt. By and by that would have given out and there would have been great piles of manna and a lot of hungry Israelites, and then the cry would have gone up that there was an over-production of manna (laughter), just as that cry goes up, even today, every few years. People hungry, people wanting, warehouses glutted, and the cry of over-production. So many shoes that children must go barefoot. Over-production! So many good things, people must go without them. As I said before, it is a manifest truth that all men are equally entitled to ~~the~~ the use of the land of

their native country, or, to put it in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "I hold this truth to be self-evident, that the land belongs in usufruct to the living and that the dead have no power or claim over it."

An Inalienable Right.

It is self-evident that a right to the use of land attaches to every child at its birth and remains with it till its death; that it is, in the words of our Declaration of Independence, an inalienable right, a right, as it comes direct from the Creator, a right no king, no parliament, no congress, no legislature, can take away. It is manifest that, under any pretense, that they have got the right from dead men to allow some portion of our people to treat the land, on which and through which the whole people must live, as their land, is just as preposterous as to allow them to treat the air as their air (laughter), or the light of the sun as their sunlight. This gross injustice must be abolished; the natural right, the inalienable right of every child that enters life amongst us must be secured, if we would emancipate labor, if we would solve those dark social problems that are confronting us, if we would have a republic worthy of the name. (Applause.) The only question is how to do it.

Now, there is one thing of which we may be certain, that there is a way to do every right thing. (Applause.) And there is another thing we may be certain of, that the way to do the right thing is an easy and simple way. And there is no great difficulty in securing to all men their natural and equal rights to the land. That we propose; that is the object we propose to engage in American politics to carry out. (Applause and cheers.) It was to show their adherence to that principl-

ple that nearly 80,000 men in New York state, the other day, as politicians may say, threw away their votes. (Applause.) It is to accomplish that that Anti-Poverty societies are forming in all parts of the country. (Applause.) And we propose to do it by the simple method of abolishing all taxes upon industry or the product of industry and taking for public purposes that value which attaches to the land by the growth and improvement of the community. (Applause.)

The Remedy.

We do not propose to take the land and divide it up; we know perfectly well that if we pass back land and divide it up into equal possessions we would have to have a new division every year; we are perfectly conscious of that. We do not propose, mark you, even to tax land; we propose a different thing, that is, to tax land values. To tax land would mean to tax all land; to tax land values means to tax only valuable land and only valuable in proportion to its value. (Applause.) To the minds of many people, when they think of this first, it seems preposterous; it seems too small a thing to accomplish great objects, and all sorts of objections arise in their minds to it, but without going to what its ultimate end is, the great recommendation, the principle thing we expect from it - just see if incidentally and measured in other ways, this is not right. Now, so far from being deniers of the rights of property, we are sticklers for the rights of property. We believe that there is such a thing as a sacred right to property, a right upon the observance of which civilization rests. What a man makes is and ought to be his as against all the world; his to use, his to give away, his to sell, his to bequeath after he dies,

his to put to any purpose that he pleases, so long as he does not interfere with the rights of any other. That is the foundation of the right of property; the making or producing of a thing or the getting of a thing from some one who can trace title to the producer. Now, we arraign our present system to-day for denying and impairing the sacred right of property. (Applause.) If a man cultivates a field, we contend that all its produce ought to be his, and that not only should no other individual come and take away from him any part of what he has produced, but that society should not. We say if a man builds a house that the house belongs to him, that he ought to have its full enjoyment; if a man raises a domestic animal, if he erects a factory, if he writes a book or does any thing to increase the sum of wealth, that all that belongs to him. If a man is industrious he ought to have the fruits of his industry; if he saves he ought to enjoy.

The Present System Arraigned.

And we arraign our present system of taxation in this; that it comes down and fines and punishes men for being industrious; fines and punishes men for being thrifty and saving. (Applause.) If one man today is idle and produces nothing, and another man works hard and saves, builds himself a little house, gets a sum of money against hard times, the one man escapes taxation and the other man is taxed just in proportion to what he has produced. The farmer who goes out in the wilderness and makes it bloom, who plows and sows and plants and fences and builds and makes a good farm where before was only a prairie or a sage brush desert, - society comes down on him and says, because you have done these things, therefore you have got to pay so

much every year. (Applause.) That is a violation of the command, "Thou shalt not steal." (Laughter.)

We say, whatever a man's toil produces, whatever his thrift saves, ought to be his, and society ought not to take from him one penny. We furthermore say, it is not only wrong but it is unwise, as everything that is wrong is in the end unwise. We say it is stupid; we want more wealth; the man who makes two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, he is not a public enemy to be fined for it, as we are now. He is a public benefactor. The man who builds a house does not only something for himself but something for somebody else, for he may be certain that somebody else will enjoy that house. The man who builds a ship or a factory, who raises grain, or does anything to increase the stock of wealth, is doing something for the whole community as well as himself. We call that country prosperous that increases in all these things; therefore, is it not stupid that we tax and fine a man who produces these things. A man cannot bring a good thing into the country without having a custom house officer to make him take an oath and search him and fine him for it. A man cannot bring a good thing into the country or acquire it here without the tax gatherer coming down on him and fining him for it. The more you tax things the less of them there will be in the country. Tax houses, and certainly you will have fewer houses; tax horses, and you will have fewer horses; tax clothing and clothing will be dearer and people will wear less and less, there will be less and less made and sold, but you tax land values what you please and there will not be an inch the less land. (Applause.)

A Tax On Truth.

And look, moreover, the system of taxation by which we raise our present revenue bears not only enormously and with great weight upon production, but bears with great weight upon the conscience. (Laughter.) They tax those things which we ought to treasure the most - truth and honesty and respect for the law. Why, look at the whole tariff system, and the custom house oath which has become notorious. You sail in today under the statue of Liberty; if you are a passenger on an ocean steamer you sail in under that statue, and the moment the custom house officer comes on board you have to hold up your hand, and call God, the Father Almighty, to witness that you have not anything dutiable in your carpet bag, in your trunk or about your person. You go a little further, and you land in this land of the free and home of the brave, and another custom house officer comes up and wants to go into your trunk to see if you have told the truth. (Laughter.) I am free to say that a majority of the people do not, but they very often put a greenback in such a position that the inspector doesn't see that they do not. (Continued laughter.) All read these items of our sea ports; the great American republic making a poor woman take an oath calling God Almighty to witness that she has nothing dutiable about her, and then searching her, even to her bustle. Those are only little things, you know, but by them you see that the whole system is one constant provocation of perjury and bribery; that gigantic frauds are constantly carried on, and that the system gives the unscrupulous an advantage over the scrupulous and conscientious. So it is in a large measure with all our taxes that bear upon personal property; they fall upon the scrupulous, and in most cases they soon teach them not to be

so scrupulous. They lead to evasion, to bribery, to political corruption of all kinds.

Advantages of the Remedy.

Now, there is one enormous advantage in a tax on land values; land cannot run away; you can't cover it up; it is, so to speak, out of doors all the time, and its value can be ascertained with more certainty than any other value, and a tax on it can be collected to the last penny without any chance of evasion. In that simple tax we would do away with all these incentives to evasion, corruption, bribery and perjury. We would get rid of the whole horde of tax gatherers. We could enormously simplify all our governments. Now, all these, if there were no others, would be enormous advantages. Now, consider as a matter of justice the tax upon things that human labor produces, which is in its nature unjust; it is taking away from a man that which belongs to him, taking away from the producer that which belongs to the producer. But who produces the value of land? The farmer when he plants and sows and builds, the man in the city when he erects a house, he creates a value, it is true, but the value, which resides in the improvement, not in the land.

Let the farmer go out in the wilderness and make as fine a farm as he pleases, he will create a value, but the land will have no value; let a fire sweep over it and the value is gone. Value only comes when other people settle around him, and the bare land is demanded and has a value. Let a fire sweep over this building we are in tonight, and this lot will have a great value. Why? Not because of what was done in the erection of this building, but because of what the whole people of St. Louis have done; because the people of St. Louis are here. Here

in St. Louis a gentleman showed me today a lot not far from here where they were digging a foundation for a splendid building, a lot that forty years ago was bought for \$750.; and that lot was bought recently for some hundreds of thousands. It had been lying vacant all that time. What has produced that value? It is not what the owners have done, but what has been done by the whole community of St. Louis. Every child that is born, every immigrant that comes here and settles, every one that does anything for the improvement of the city, adds a value to the land. It is the whole population, the whole community that makes the value that attaches to the land, and therefore, as a matter of justice, just what is produced by the labor of the individual should belong to the individual, and ought not be taken from him; so, that which is produced by the growth and improvement of the whole community belongs to the whole community, and ought to be taken for public purposes. (Applause.) Now, to take that value which attaches to the land by reason of the growth and improvement of the whole community would be to put all members of that community on a level with regard to natural opportunities.

Not Land But Land Values.

As I said before, we propose to tax land values. We would not tax all land, but only valuable land. Now, what does value mean as attaching to land? When a particular piece of land has value, what does it mean? It means that that particular piece of land is more desirable than ordinary land. Land has no value until two men at least want the same piece, and as more want it, as it is more desirable, its value mounts. So the value of land, therefore, is a premium attaching to the use of that land, and to take that premium for the use

if whole community would be to put all members of the community on an equal plane with regard to the use of land. (Applause.)

But, mark you further, what its most important effect would be today. We find today labor going to waste even in good times. There is no lack of natural opportunity. The man who comes into this country, in any part of it, let him go into the city of New York - is there no need there for work in the way of building houses, when people are crowded together as they are there? In some places there are 120 families under a single roof. Sixty-five per cent of all the people in that great city are living, two families or more, on the same floor, and only four per cent of the whole people live in separate houses. Is there no need there for labor in building more houses? There are all the natural opportunities for building houses; one-half the whole area of New York yet consists of vacant lots, perfectly accessible. Why? Simply because they are held by dogs-in-the-manger, who will not use them themselves and will not let anybody else use them, in the hope of getting a better price by and by. Just as it is with these vacant lots I saw today while traveling around St. Louis; they are dogs-in-the-manger. So all over the country with agricultural land; you will find it in plenty that is not used at all or only half used; the monopolists are holding it for a high price and shutting labor out. Go into the great coal fields in the Lehigh region today, and you will find 15,000 miners idle. Why? There is plenty of coal for them to mine, plenty of coal veins yet undeveloped, but they are held by men who will not use them themselves and will not let anybody else use them unless they pay them many thousands of dol-

lars an acre for them. There is the same thing all over the country; natural opportunities are monopolized, are taken by men who don't want to use them, and held in the expectation that they may appropriate all this value that the growth of population and improvement will attach to natural opportunities. (Applause.)

Effect of Monopoly of Land.

Now then, to abolish all other taxes and to put taxes on land values, as near as possible to take up the full value of the land, irrespective of the value of the improvements - what effect would it have on monopolization and speculation? It would everywhere make the monopolist let go his hold. The man who has a valuable vacant lot would have to build upon it or sell to somebody who would build upon it. (Applause.) And if he could not sell it, to give it away. The man who is holding coal veins unused while men around him are going hungry because they have no opportunity to dig coal out of the earth, and men in our great cities are shivering because coal is so dear, these dogs-in-the-manger under our present system of taxation, would have to go and work these coal veins or else give them up. The men who all over this country are holding agricultural land, holding without using it, until they can get an American citizen who wants it so bad that he will agree to give one-third or one-half of all his labors can produce for the privilege of working it, would have to go to work and cultivate that land or give it up. Land under that system would become of no value to any one except the man who wanted to put it to use (applause), and under that simple system monopolization would become impossible, for labor could employ itself; there would be no such thing as men who wanted work and could'nt find work. (Applause.)

How Employment Would Multiply.

It is not necessary to suppose that every man now unemployed would go and cultivate a farm or open a mine or build a house, but all the unemployed or the partially employed or the poorly employed, those not employed, enough could and would do these things, not only employing themselves, but, by producing wealth which they would offer in exchange for other products of labor, would create a demand for the labor of others. Enough could and would do so to give such an impulse to trade and production as would set every wheel of industry in rapid motion (applause), and in that way the very foundation of poverty would be abolished. There would be room for all, work for all, abundance for all, where every man could employ himself, This cut-throat competition that now presses men in competition with each other, a competition so fierce that their wages are forced down unless upheld by labor associations - forced down to a bare living; this keen competition that brings failure to 96 per cent of all the men who engage in business in this country would be gone. There would be a full, free competition that would oppress nobody, but which would really be the most comprehensive system of co-operation that man's wit could devise. (Applause.) And with the fair distribution that would result when labor got its full, true earnings, there would come new additions to our powers of production.

Looking into the Future.

What has been done gives us a glimpse - and only a glimpse - of what yet the human mind may do. The power that resides in the human muscles is one of the tiniest of forces; it is the power that re-

sides in his mind, the power of adapting himself to ends, that links man with God, that makes him the master of all other animals, the very director and user of all the forces that pulsate through nature. A state of society is possible in which we should all be rich; not in (other human creatures wear our liveries or wait upon us, but in the sense of having an abundance, not merely of all the necessities, but of the comforts and luxuries of life as well. Such a state of things is possible if we would do but justice, if we would found our institutions and laws upon that principle which is the heart of Christianity - to do to others as we would have them do to us. A state of things is possible in which we need no more worry ourselves about what we should eat, what we should drink or wherewithal we should be clothed than do the lilies of the fields. A state of things is possible in which not only a select few, but all men and women, may find full and ample opportunities for the development of all that is highest in them, and not have to pass their lives in a hard struggle for life, in a degrading grasp after what can not be carried away. A state of things is possible not merely in which we all might have all that we could reasonably ask, in which all our highest qualities could find use and development, but in which we would look at the man who passes the years of his life in struggling to pile up wealth that he can not take away, as the worst kind of a fool. (Applause.) And then - then, but not till then, will we truly found and safely base the American republic. (Applause.) A republic in any sense worthy of the name of republic can not exist among a people differentiated on the one side into the great millionaire, and on the other into the tramp. A republic worthy of the name can only exist among a people where every man who is willing to work can make a living for himself and those whom nature has made

sense of having)

dependent upon him, without crouching for the favor of employment, or bowing his head in degradation as the slave of any man. (Cheers and continued applause.)

Inquiries Answered.

I will stop for the purpose of giving any in the audience an opportunity to make any objection or to ask any question. I do that because some thought has been aroused already on this subject, and there are stumbling blocks and stopping places to many minds in what we advance, and what occurs to one mind may not occur to another. Therefore, I hope any one who has a question to ask will now ask it.

(The following questions were then asked by gentlemen in the audience, and the following answers given by the speaker.)

Question. Suppose the tax is raised on my house, the landlord raises the rent and I pay it. Now, suppose the tax is raised on the land that the house stands on, can't the landlord also raise the rent and make me pay it?

Answer. I am supposing that you are the tenant of the house; the landlord owns the house and the ground. If a tax be on the house he can make you pay more rent; for this reason: That a tax on houses has a tendency to check the erection of houses till rents rise high enough to compensate for the tax; but a tax upon the value of ground he can not add to his rent, because no tax upon the value of ground will check the production of ground. (Laughter and applause.)

Q. (By another.) I would like to know what you think should be done with the immense wealth that would be realized from the application of your plan - supposing a revenue of \$25,000,000 should be raised in St. Louis?

A. I think you might spend \$25,000,000 in a pinch.

Q. How would you spend it?

A. Part of it would go to pay the indirect taxes. If you would take me into your council I think I could devise ways and means of spending it. I think in the first place you might have a little better streets.

Q. But the question of abolishing poverty is the main thing. How will that abolish poverty?

A. It will abolish poverty. That very process of raising taxes in the way I have pointed out would open opportunities for labor in all directions. Many of those lots that are now vacant in St. Louis could be taken by men who wanted to build houses and who would build houses on them. All through the country farming land would be used that now is not used.

Q. You have not stated what you were going to do with this \$25,000,000?

A. - Well, if I could do nothing else with it, I would divide it equally among the heads of families.

Q. - Would that abolish poverty?

A. - I think poverty would be abolished before you got to that.

Q.-Well, let us go a little further; take St. Louis county, for instance. There the cost of administration would take one-seventh of the revenue - what are you going to do with the other six-sevenths, divide it in the same manner?

A. - If there were no better way I certainly should. I think, however, you would find plenty of opportunities for the spending of

all that money. You might give every girl, when she became of marriageable age, something to marry on; (applause and laughter); you might give every man, when he reaches a certain age, a pension; and if you could'nt spend all your money, after providing public buildings, fine streets, and heat, and light, and electricity - if you still had any left, you might give everybody a trip to Europe. (Laughter.)

Q. - (By another). Is it necessary to make the rate of taxation high enough to raise the six-sevenths more than you need?

A. - I think it is necessary to raise the rate of taxation high enough to take, as near as may be, the whole of that value that comes from the growth and improvements of the community. (Applause.) Every step you take in that direction will be a benefit, will make times better, will stimulate industry, and will tend to a fairer distribution of wealth. But unless you go on you will leave a margin for the owners of land, which will not only enable them to pocket something which belongs to the whole community, but will give a basis and an incentive to speculation that we want to do away with. (Applause.)

Q. - (By another.) After this system of taxation has been on a sufficient length of time, it stands to reason that the value of land would diminish altogether. Then how would you raise your taxes?

A. - No; the value of land would not diminish or pass out of existence altogether. The selling value of land would, but the using or annual value of land would remain. For instance, if here is a lot worth \$1,000 a year, it would have now, under present conditions, a selling value, perhaps, of \$20,000. As you increased the tax on that

land the selling value would diminish. If you taxed it a thousand dollars a year, the selling value would be gone. It would be worth nothing to own, but it would be worth just as much to use as before. (Applause.) That is to say, the man who wants to use that land today would give a thousand dollars a year for the use of it under present conditions, but the owner puts that in his pocket, and will not sell the privilege of appropriating that thousand dollars a year except for \$20,000. Now, if you were to take that thousand dollars a year for the use of the community, the selling value of the land would disappear; the owner would get nothing; the community would get the thousand dollars; the man who wants to use the land would as readily pay the thousand dollars to the community as he would ^{not} to the individual. This is a change that can ^{not} be Brought about at once. It must come gradually. Therefore it is best that we begin by placing a tax on the selling value of the land, for this reason; Speculation frequently gives to land a selling value much higher than the proportion of its annual or rental value. For instance, I saw today, in traveling around this city, blocks of land which probably could be rented now for only a few dollars a year, but you could not buy them for thousands of dollars. On the outskirts of New York city, as you pass along the Sixth Avenue Elevated Road, you will find ground rented for cabbage gardens for two, or three, or five dollars a year, that is worth many thousands of dollars a lot. Now, if you put a tax on the selling value of land, you drive the speculator out. As the tax is increased, the selling value constantly diminishes, and by and by you would get to the point where the land would have no

selling value. Then you would have to change the system, and instead of levying taxes on the selling value you would levy them on the annual value.

Q. (By another.) As you have told my German friend what he could do with his twenty-five millions surplus; I would like to know what you would do with the 2,000 dram-shops that are in St. Louis - would you close them up?

A. - Well, I certainly think 2,000 dram-shops is rather too much of an allowance for a healthy city. (Laughter.) But I am afraid that the mere attempt to close them up would be a good deal like an attempt to drive the small-pox in. I would, in the first place, improve the general condition of the people. I think the dram-shops is rather the result than the cause of poverty. (Applause.) In the quarters where you find those fine mansions, replete with all sorts of luxuries, you do not find any dram-shops; but where the people are very poor and crowded together you will find three or four dram-shops to every block. But at the same time, if the gentleman wants to know what my opinion is about liquor selling, I am utterly opposed to the license system. (Applause.) I am utterly opposed to taxing liquor. I think taxes on liquor are taxes in favor of adulteration; they do not make people drink less liquor, but they make him drink worse liquor. (Applause.) I am a free-trader first, last and all the time, and I should be in favor of absolute free trade in rum, or of making its sale a close government monopoly, such as it is made under the Swedish system, where the person who sold it would be under no temptation to increase its sale. It would not make any difference

to him whether he sold more or less, but he would have to sell pure liquor.

Q. (By another.) In "Progress and Poverty" we find some advantages in a country having free trade over a country having a high protective tariff. If that is the case, would free trade give us any relief?

A.- Free trade merely abolishes the custom houses. No. It would be a very great improvement; it would add to our productive wealth; it would, for a little while, increase the productions of labor - but only for a little while. It would be just like other improvements - it would redound to the benefit of the land owner. The mere sweeping away of our custom houses and opening of our ports to the world, would do but little and that but a temporary good, but it would have this effect; it would prevent such a great number of our people from barking up the wrong tree. (Applause.) We should get rid of the delusion entertained by so many workingmen, that they can be protected by the tariff.

Q.- (By another.) If free trade will not abolish this poverty, what is the use of discussing it and making it an issue?

A.- I have not been discussing it very much, but I would like to see it discussed far more than it is; that is to say, the delusion that labor is benefited by protection has turned a very great number of American workingmen from the only right path, and the only conditions by which labor can be improved. I want to get them out of the habit of looking for protection. Labor never can get protection from the tariff; that is the sort of protection the wolf gives the lamb.

What labor needs is not protection but justice (applause); and any discussion which will arouse the minds of the masses of our people to that fact must do good.

Q.(By another.) What is the necessity, if everybody is content, and everybody has plenty, what is the necessity of having anybody to rule over them or to have officers? (Cries of "anarchy" and "rats.") If Mr. George says I may ask a question, I want to do so.

A. Certainly. If everybody were happy and everybody were contented, or even if everybody were in such condition as I think would flow from the adoption of the grand reform for which we stand - the abolition of all monopoly, the doing of justice between man and man. I don't think people would need anybody to rule over them. I think government in all its repressive functions would disappear, that we should have no need for standing armies, ships of war or fortifications; in all our cities we might dispense with policemen, and raise the number and pay of the school teachers. (Applause.)

Q. - (By another.) You have'nt told us yet how you would ascertain the value of bare land?

A. - Would it not do to ascertain it as land values are now ascertained for public purposes, by the appraisement of some board of officers, aided, of course, by the judgment of the neighbors? I think if attention were concentrated upon the one subject of taxation, and that on something so obvious as land, you could arrive at the value with great certainty. If it is necessary you can easily call in public opinion by having every farm marked: This land is so long and so deep; it belongs to so and so, and is assessed at so much - for every-

body to see it, and so avoid any gross injustice.

The injustice of the present system is that the farmer is taxed more on the land he uses than on that which lays idle. A gentleman here today told me that his mother owned three lots; one lot was improved, and it was taxed very much more than the lots not improved. She ran a fence around the three lots, moving them inside the inclosure as one lot, and the taxes were doubled immediately. That is the case all over the country. You see, we are nothing but exported Europeans, and mainly exported from England. By acts of Parliament the land-owners have made laws in England for some centuries, and they have completely ground out of the minds of the common people the really obvious perceptions with regard to land, until they have not as clear perceptions of it as we may find among the Indian tribes, the Cherokees and Choctaws, who treat land more rationally. There are no paupers among the Cherokees. I went down to the Astor House in New York not long since, being down town late, and took a room for the night. I walked out in the morning and didn't pay for the room; that was all right - they knew me. I went back three or four days afterwards, and just remembered that I hadn't paid for my room, and found that they had charged me for three or four days. But I could not object; I had taken that room and there it lay; if I didn't use it it was my fault. (Laughter.) You go here to Hurst's Hotel, the Southern Hotel, the Planter's Hotel, and take a room, and when you go to pay for it tell them you have not slept in it, and see how much they will reduce the bill. So it is with this land that men are holding. They ought not to get any reduction because they have not improved it; they have been

keeping somebody else from improving it.

Q.- (By another.) Are you opposed to state cooperation, and if so, will you explain the reason why?

A. - I don't exactly understand what you mean, but I will tell you how far I am in favor of the state taking any part in production. When any business becomes in its nature a monopoly, then I think it ought to be managed by the state. For instance, the supplying of gas and water, which are in their nature monopolies, I think ought to be carried on by the municipality; so, too, the carrying of telegraphic messages is a monopoly. What do we find today? Virtually, one man owns the whole telegraphic facilities of the country - the same man who owns your bridge; he owns your railroads, and, as I was told today, he owns your legislature. (Laughter.) I think whatever is in the nature of a monopoly ought to be the business of the community, and the carrying of telegraphic messages ought to be added to the postoffice department. So, of railroads; the railroads is necessarily a monopoly, and therefore, I believe should be controlled and maintained by the people - at least the road-bed, and let the individuals and corporations run cars upon it. Where competition is possible, then everything should be left to the individual; where competition becomes impossible, and a monopoly is necessary, the monopolist should be the whole people.

Q. (By another.) A question I have been asking since I read your book was: Whether it is possible for those who want to monopolize wealth and escape taxation to get their property all into bonds, telegraph stock and such as that, not only using no land, but owning none of it, and thus escape taxation. I have been told that many could get their wealth into such shape as not to have any land, and so escape

taxation.

A. - In the first place, every man uses land. In the second place, bonds and stocks are worth nothing in themselves; they are mere pieces of paper; all their value comes from their representing real value, whatever that may be. In the third place, there is nothing for us to worry about if these people escape taxation. We need have no quarrel with any man for getting rich or being rich; what we quarrel with is the man who monopolizes, that is all (applause); the man who has what belongs to other people; the man who holds valuable land; that is to say, land to which a value attaches, irrespective of what he has done, from the growth of the whole community. Such things as money, such things as houses, such things as stocks or government bonds, the real tangible things they represent are individual property, and we can safely leave them to the individual. And do not be afraid that this is a system to tax the poor at the expense of the rich. (Applause.) If that were the case, you would find the rich men all over the country warmly in favor of it.

Q. (By another.) Do you think if your system or theory of applying taxes to rental values of land were adopted there would be any danger of people quitting the use of land?

A. - No, I don't think so. (Laughter.) Now, one word in conclusion. No man can hope to stand up and in the course of an hour, or two hours, explain a great question like this. All he can hope to do is to excite thought, to put people upon inquiry. And with that I am entirely content. This is a great movement, the great movement which aims at abolishing all taxes except taxes on land values. This great movement which aims at restoring to all people their natural

rights and thus securing the full emancipation of labor, has already begun in the United States; it is here, and it is here to stay. (loud and continued applause.) Its missionaries are not merely the men who stand on platforms, but the men who, through their friends and acquaintances, wherever they go, are preaching these doctrines and asking questions which are bringing out the truth. We men of New York have set our feet into American politics. We shall shortly ask you, men of Missouri, to come with us (applause and cheers), to join us in a great movement all over the country, a movement that will never stop until its full triumph is gained.

As the speaker bowed at the conclusion of his address, the applause was tremendous, cheer following cheer. There were loud cries of "Go on!" "Go on!" and a great part of the audience remained seated, evidently hoping the speaker would comply with the request. He had spoken for fully two hours.

Dec. 15, 1897.