

\$100 for every man, woman and child in the county.

Where can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?

Mr. Chairman, the success of the land we love, as pictured by the gentleman's description of conditions in his home county to-day, cannot be duplicated, so far as I know, in any other country in the world. I congratulate him upon the prosperity of the community in which he lives, and for that prosperity, due almost solely to the fact that Providence assisted that county to raise a very large crop of wheat and other cereals during late years, he and every other man who shared in that prosperity ought to spend less of their time in praising Dingley schedules and more of their time in thanking Almighty God. (Applause on the Democratic side.)

I despise his suggestion that these conditions exist there because of our protective tariff. It is a small reason for a big man to advance for the grand position to-day of the greatest land on earth. We have the conditions suggested by the gentleman, not because of the tariff, but rather in spite of it, or at least a part of it; not because the people at present favor his party or mine; not because of this law or that law, but because this is the United States of America, a country without parallel since time began. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Has the gentleman ever stopped to consider the land we live in and compare it with other lands less favored? Does he recall that our country from the time of its first settlement until now has been the one place on earth to which was attracted the best blood and sinew of all the countries of the world? Does he not know that such blood and sinew, intermingling here and fostered under the freedom of our Stars and Stripes, has produced a race of men whose equal never lived before, and will he not now, in due humility, admit that this superior race of men in this beloved land has been signally favored by an all-wise Providence?

Does it count for nothing in the world's competition of nations that the American people have a land so large, so fertile, so favored by God's sun and rain in just the proper proportion, so abundantly provided with inventive geniuses, so situated as to climate and temperature, so rich in minerals and in everything else that goes to make a country so great, so well equipped with seacoast and natural inland waterways as to facilitate commercial intercourse among ourselves and with foreign countries, and

so placed with reference to other countries as to make us practically secure forever against any method of foreign attack, thus permitting our people to devote more of their energies to peaceful pursuits; so placed and so favored, in fact, as to constitute a marvel to every foreigner who visits our shores?

Why, sir, a people placed in these surroundings and with these advantages, who are not one whit better equipped personally than the people of other countries, ought still, by reason of the surroundings and advantages mentioned, lead all other people in every line of endeavor, but when we find this favored land and this superior people in combination, what is there on the earth to-day that can stand in opposition to it?

"Where," says the gentleman from Iowa, pointing to one of the evidences of our splendid success, "can you find anything like that anywhere in the world outside of the influence of our protective tariff?" etc.

If the protective tariff is responsible for the prosperity pictured by the gentleman, then our people and our country are not. If it is a question of tariff and not people and country, then it is quite evident that all countries should prosper in proportion to the height of their tariff schedules. Why, then, I wonder, does not the Republican party double the tariff rates, and thus increase twofold the wages and the general prosperity?

WHY "COMPENSATING" WAGES ARE NOT PAID.

Portions of the speech of Hon. Robert Baker, of New York, in the House of Representatives, on Monday, December 14, in reply to the Hon. Wm. P. Hepburn, of Iowa, as reported in the Congressional Record.

Mr. Chairman: I had not expected to take up the time of the House so early in the session. I had thought of exercising that modesty which is becoming in a new Member; but there have been two statements made upon the floor recently, by men conspicuous in leadership on the other side—one economic and the other political—which, it seems to me, demand a reply, even if it be by a new Member.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Hepburn), in his speech on the 19th of November, said:

There is labor in every part of this country for every man who wants a place to work.

And that sentiment found, as it necessarily and properly would, applause upon the Republican side. There was no reason why there should not be applause

upon the Democratic side, if it were true! And then the gentleman from Iowa proceeded:

And there is a compensating wage for every man who will perform a day's labor.

It is because my views are so entirely at variance with what the gentleman evidently regards as a "compensating" wage that I have asked for the privilege here now of making some comments upon what in my estimation is a most extraordinary statement.

What constitutes a compensating wage? In my humble judgment, a compensating wage means the entire product which any laborer gives to an article by his toil, and if any part of the value of that labor which he has implanted upon that article is subtracted or taken away by some other power, then to that extent that labor does not obtain a compensating wage.

Is there any man, even upon the Republican side, who will claim to-day that, as we see growing up on the one hand gigantic fortunes almost beyond calculation, and as we see in our great cities especially hundreds of thousands of individuals who scarcely know where their breakfast is coming from in the morning, who will pretend that these men, these hundreds of thousands of individuals, having none of the wealth of the world, have received compensating wages for their past toil? . . .

[Mr. Baker then cited at length facts showing the lack of a "compensating" wage to the laborers of this country. Upon being asked during this portion of his speech, by Mr. Olmsted, of Pennsylvania (Rep.), if he would yield the floor for an interruption, Mr. Baker replied: "I want to say, this being the first time I have spoken upon this floor, that I shall maintain the invariable rule I have followed outside this House, to answer every question that may be addressed to me, no matter who the gentleman may be." This statement was received with applause.]

WHY A "COMPENSATING" WAGE IS NOT PAID.

Why is it that a "compensating" wage is not paid to the coal miner; to the worker in the clothing sweat shop; to the farm laborer; to the factory operative, whether in cotton, worsted, woolen, and paper goods, boots and shoes, or other industries; to the sales girl of our city department stores; even to the clerks and bookkeepers—most of whom regard themselves as superior to factory operatives—thousands of whom, even in New York, with its high cost of living, receive less than \$12 a week? Why is it that despite the manifold inventions which more than anything else mark the latter

half of the nineteenth century, inventions which in some instances have increased the power of labor to produce ten, twenty, and in some few instances, forty fold—why is it that capital even (capital not engaged in monopolistic enterprises or having some monopoly privilege) finds its return steadily diminishing, except, maybe, during a few years of particularly flush times? The answer to one is the answer to all of these queries—monopoly! I am well aware that in the public mind the word monopoly is associated almost exclusively with what has become known as the "trusts," but these combinations are merely the more glorious illustrations of the effects of monopoly. The ownership of valuable lands in our large cities, of water powers and water privileges—wharves, etc.—of mineral and timber lands, constitute monopoly privileges, and their ownership confers a power quite distinct from the possession of capital by the same individuals.

The exclusive franchises to perform certain public functions in our cities, such as the supplying of gas, water and electricity, street car and elevated railroad service, as well as inter-State transportation, are monopoly privileges of the highest value, the possession of which gives the power to continuously tax the people. Colossal fortunes have been secured ("earned" is the mistaken term generally used) by the few men controlling these enormously valuable privileges, which have been used to lay the whole people under tribute. The factory girl and the saleslady of our great stores, many of whom receive as little as from \$3.50 to \$5 per week, have their scanty earnings reduced by the extortionate toll which the street-car monopolies exact. A service which it requires a stretch of the mind to figure as costing one-half of the five cents collected (even if seats were provided for all), and for which a three-cent fare would yield a generous dividend on the actual capital invested in the lines and their equipment. This two-cent excess collected twice a day constitutes during the week a serious depletion of the meager wages which these girls receive, and has, undoubtedly, been the means of driving many of them to the streets.

How is this condition to be altered? By what means can we prevent the further appropriation by monopoly of an ever-increasing proportion of the wealth which labor and capital produces?

The answer is simple. Complex as our present civilization appears to those who have not studied economic principles, it is complex only in the subdivision of labor. The effects of monopoly

are as clearly apparent to those who will study the matter as though primitive civilization existed and all wealth was produced directly from the land. To secure a "compensating" wage to labor, to secure a just and full return to capital, we must strike at the causes which produce monopoly. We must strike at the roots. We can do this by substituting in place of the cumbersome, unintelligent, discordant, complex system—or lack of system—which taxes production and accumulation, which says, in effect, to every individual that the more industrious and more effective your methods of production, the greater judgment and skill displayed therein, the greater burden of taxes shall you bear; while it says to monopolists in effect, the more you monopolize natural opportunities (thereby depriving labor and capital of the means of production) the greater the extent and scope of your monopoly, and the less use you permit these opportunities to be put to, the less burden of taxation shall you bear. To secure a "compensating" wage to every toiler it is but necessary to restore natural law, to institute the "natural" system of taxation—the single tax. No words that I can use can so clearly and graphically portray the benefits that would follow if this were done as those contained in "Ethics of Democracy," by Louis F. Post, who in this book has illumined fundamental Democratic principles, and who, week by week, in the columns of the Public, comments upon current events of the day from the standpoint of real Democracy in a manner that cannot fail to clarify the thought of those who read his paper, and I therefore commend it to my Republican friends on the other side, who stand so much in need of it. He says on page 141:

By means of the single-tax principle the abolition of land monopoly can be fully accomplished. By means of the single-tax method it can be far advanced. Under this simple land reform, sound in economics and unassailable in morals, no one could hold any kind of land out of use without suffering serious and continual loss. Land would have to be used, and be well used, or be abandoned. There would be no profit in mere ownership. That goal being reached—indeed, long before it had been fully reached—trade having meanwhile and by the same method been freed by the abolition of commercial and industrial taxes and of highway obstacles, the benefits of economic improvement would be generally diffused and the evil spirit of the trust would be exorcised.

With the annual value of special landed advantages applied to common use and no longer retained by private owners; with taxes on industry thus made unnecessary, and consequently abolished; with highways freed from special privilege; with unused land everywhere made freely accessi-

ble, and the barriers of the industrial corral thus broken down; with demand for productive work thereby made to exceed supply, and through the free interplay of all the economic forces of consumption and production perpetually to maintain that excess—with these demonstrable effects of the single tax realized, there would be no more possibility of subjugating labor and monopolizing business with paper agreements than of holding back the waters of Niagara with a paper dam.

GOD HELP RHODE ISLAND!

I now come to the political matter that I expressed a desire to discuss at the opening of my remarks. A few days ago I was impelled to ask the member from Ohio this question on the occasion of his annual antelection prophecy: "Does the gentleman know that the reelected governor of Rhode Island is the same kind of a man as Tom L. Johnson—a Single-Tax Democrat?" and as the only reply he made was: "God help Rhode Island!" and as I now learn that that portion of his remarks wherein he spoke of the recent election in that State does not conform to the facts, I take this, the earliest opportunity, to state just what the facts are, and also why I, a resident of another State, deem it of importance that the country and also the prophet of the Republican party should know for what these men stand.

It will not do for my Republican friends to insinuate that the people of Rhode Island do not know for what Gov. Garvin stands. They know he stands for—

EQUAL ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION.

So that 200 votes in a Republican rural community shall not have equal political representation with 10,000 Democratic votes in Providence.

THE INITIATIVE.

So that not more than 5,000 voters shall be required to initiate amendments to the Constitution, to be submitted directly to the people.

TAXATION OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.

So that the exploiters of special privileges shall not escape taxation—the farmer and workingman now bearing nearly all the burden of taxation.

THREE-CENT RAILWAY FARES IN PROVIDENCE.

So that shop girls shall not be forced to give quite so large a proportion of their scanty earnings to monopoly.

TEN HOURS' LABOR IN TWELVE HOURS FOR MOTORMEN AND CONDUCTORS.

So that these men can occasionally see their children during daylight.

THE REFERENDUM.

So that no franchise shall be valid until approved by a majority vote of the electors.

He has been several times a member of the State Senate as well as of the

Lower House, having been elected some thirteen times, as well as having been a candidate for Congress at four successive Congressional elections, while as the Democratic candidate for Governor in 1902 and 1903 he polled on each occasion from 2,000 to 5,000 more votes than the other Democratic candidates for State offices.

Gen. Grosvenor, among other things, said that the Republicans last year elected the Lieutenant Governor by 700 or 800 and this year by some 8,000. I have here a letter from Gov. Garvin's secretary, in which he gives the figures which show that the Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor was elected in 1902 by 2,164, and that so far from the Republicans electing their candidate in 1903 by 7,000 to 8,000 he only had a plurality of 381, sufficient, it is true, to elect him, but indicating no such change of political sentiment in Rhode Island as the gentleman would have the country believe.

"God help Rhode Island!" It would seem that this appeal is unnecessary, as the people of that State at the last two elections have given the best evidence of their ability to help themselves. For years that little State has been the happy hunting grounds of the boodler and corruptionist. Immense sums have been annually spent to make certain that the State would remain in the "right" column, the column which the gentleman from Ohio states is to aggregate some 260 votes in the electoral college.

Like Tom L. Johnson in Ohio, Gov. Garvin is one of those few men in public life who will not spend one illegal or corrupt dollar to influence political results, not even to secure his own election. As he is by repute a poor man, it is very doubtful whether, even if he had the disposition, he could raise pennies where the Republicans raise dollars. The beneficiaries of "protection" are not contributing to the support of real Democrats—those who oppose every form of special privilege. But the gentleman from Ohio says: "We have not only both branches of the Legislature, but we have them by a larger majority than we elected them by one year ago." What does the gentleman mean by a larger majority? Does he mean to imply that a majority or even plurality of the voters in Rhode Island last year, or even this year, voted for the Republican candidates for the Senate and the Assembly? I imagine not. Yet I cannot see how the uninitiated could draw any other inference from his language.

What are the facts? We find that in 1902, 20 towns—with a total population

of 36,672 and but 8,994 voters, and in which the aggregate vote cast for all these 20 Republican Senators was but 3,855, or 43 per cent. of the vote of those towns—elected a majority of the Senate, which consists of 38 members. While 3,855 Republican voters were able, under the grossly unfair apportionment existing in Rhode Island, to elect 20 Senators, it took 22,579 Democratic votes to elect ten—not 20—Senators in Democratic districts. We thus get a glimpse of what the Democrats, under the leadership of Gov. Garvin, have been "up against" in that State. Under the law there, as amended in 1901, these 20 Senators, a majority of the Senate, in effect, constitute the Government of the State of Rhode Island, as the Senate is really the executive power. All that these 20 men have to do is to refuse to confirm any appointment by Gov. Garvin, and then, under this strange law, they can in the course of a stated number of days (very few) proceed to nominate and confirm whoever they may select.

Incidentally, and for the information of the gentleman from Ohio, I wish to call attention to the fact that it took 10,997 Democratic votes in the city of Providence to elect the one Senator which this Republican apportionment permits that city to have.

The marvel is, not that the Republicans have a majority of both Houses of the Legislature, but that the Democratic representation is half as large as it is where such gross inequality prevails.

It is entirely true that, as the general says, they—the Republicans—have the Legislature, and that is what they wanted. Of course they wanted the Legislature. Without it "oil and philanthropy" would be deprived of their most skillful leader and strongest supporter at the other end of the Capitol. But the Rockefellerers do not boast of the methods employed to retain control of "their" Legislature, while I notice that the gentleman from Ohio is content to let that phase of the subject severely alone. Even he will not boast of the saturnalia of corruption and political debauchery which the Republicans have resorted to to retain control of the Legislature of that State, for without wholesale corruption, without the expenditure of an immense boodle fund—the extent and persistent use of which one would think should make even Republicans blush with shame—they could not, even with their shockingly indecent apportionment, elect a majority of the Legislature.

WHAT JOHNSON AND GARVIN STAND FOR.

But why is it that I am so interested in

the Governor of Rhode Island, and what induced me to call attention to the fact that he is the same kind of a Democrat as the last Democratic candidate for Governor of Ohio? It is because these two men represent the highest ideals of Democracy, because they stand for its noblest aspirations, because of all the candidates of the Democratic party in the United States at the last election, who were known outside of their own districts, these two men alone stand unreservedly, unequivocally and unqualifiedly for that fundamental Democratic principle—"equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

It is because the United States has strayed far from this principle; it is because the people have not been alert to the insidious attacks that have from time to time been made upon that principle; it is because as a whole they have never yet fully realized its great import; it is because they have listened to the siren song of those who wished to emasculate it; it is because the people have permitted this and other legislative bodies to nullify it by granting special privileges to this and to that special interest, until they become drunk with the power and immense wealth which the possession of special privileges has enabled them to wring from the people; that monopolists have become so insolent and domineering that they have come to regard these special privileges as their inherent and inalienable rights, threatening with annihilation, political and commercial, any who may have the temerity to challenge their right to continue to oppress the people.

It is because these two men, Tom L. Johnson and Lucius C. F. Garvin, are devoting their lives to the endeavor of educating the people to see the causes which produce monopoly, well knowing that, once its primal cause is understood, the people will make short work of the whole system of special privilege, that I hope the public will know more of them.

It has been said that the recent election in Ohio means the political death of Tom L. Johnson. Those who thus prophesy do not know the man nor the power of the truths for which he stands. To such men, imbued with a great moral purpose, the determination to devote their lives to the uplifting of humanity in the only effective way that mankind can be permanently benefited, by abolishing monopoly, defeat is nothing more than a temporary obstacle.

Johnson and Garvin, as well as less conspicuous workers in the cause for which Henry George gave his life, know full well the forces massed against them.

They well know that every artifice of which shrewd, able, unscrupulous and extremely wealthy men are capable are and will be exerted to deceive the people as to the principles for which they contend. They know that all the power that monopolistic wealth can control—financial, commercial and social—is being organized and marshaled against them. That the great daily and weekly newspapers with few exceptions are likewise so controlled and are used to misrepresent them and their cause. But even this combination does not appall them. No temporary defeat will deter them from continuing the battle against every form of special privilege, against every law which gives one man an advantage over his fellow, and for the establishment upon this earth here and now of an order of universal justice which shall secure to even the weakest and poorest the full value of his toil.

The leading monopolists of this country, the men who during recent years have piled up fortunes of scores and hundreds of millions of dollars, know them, whether the members of this House do or not, and they also know that the principles for which Gov. Garvin and Tom L. Johnson contend, and of which they are the most conspicuous advocates in the United States, would, if applied, solve the anthracite-coal problem as well as any and all other monopoly problems. It is because of this knowledge that these two men were especially singled out for attack in the last campaign by all the great exploiters of special privileges, whether Republicans or whether masquerading as Democrats, whether residents of New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago, or residents of Ohio and Rhode Island.

Of one thing the members of this House may be assured—that the big monopolists of this country have a keen perception of the danger to their monopolies that would follow the complete triumph of men like Tom L. Johnson and Gov. Garvin. The monopolists fully realize that these two men mean business, that no sneers or calumnies will deter them from their purpose to aid in overthrowing every monopoly in the country, and that the way to accomplish this is to deprive them of their special privileges, for it is through the possession of special privileges that men obtain the power to rob their fellow-men.

These men are two of the most conspicuous of those in the United States of whom Henry George, with that profound faith in man's inherent sense of justice which was his most marked characteristic, with a seer's vision, prophe-

sied in the closing chapter of "Progress and Poverty" when he said:

The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago; if that could be it would never have been obscured; but it will find friends, those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be die for it; for this is the power of truth.

MISS SHAW AND THE "DAUGHTER."

Rev. Anna H. Shaw, at the recent annual meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage association, told an amusing story of a woman who once urged her to leave the suffragists and join the D. A. R. "We are a better class of women, you know," said the Daughter.

"Unluckily, I am not eligible," said Miss Shaw, who is an Englishwoman. "Is it possible? Were not any of your ancestors in the war of the revolution?"

"Oh, yes, they were there, and they fought bravely, but they were all on the British side."

"Oh, what a pity! I am so sorry for you!"

"You needn't be," answered Miss Shaw. "I am not a bit sorry for myself. You stand to-day where my ancestors stood, advocating taxation without representation; and I stand where yours did. I would rather line up with your ancestors than with mine. I would rather be right myself than have my ancestors right."

"Well," said the Daughter, "I am glad that I have descended from a long line of revolutionary ancestors."

"Yes," answered Miss Shaw, "that is the trouble—you have descended from them. I would rather ascend than descend from my ancestors. There are no women more inconsistent than those who belong to those patriotic societies and boast of their ancestors, yet repudiate the principles for which those patriots fought!"—Woman's Journal.

Slumslopogas, the aboriginal convert, was sprinkled with water and became John. It being a high church community, the pastor impressed on his flock the necessity, if they would be saved, of eating fish and not meat on Friday. But, alas for the frailty of flesh, the pastor, passing John's wigwam on a meat-prohibited day, saw a savory beef-steak stewing. Said he: "Oh, John, this is indeed evil."

The backslider made answer: "It's like this, sir. You sprinkle Slumslopogas with water, he no more Slumslopogas, he John. Me sprinkle cow with water, he no more cow, but fish."—Sporting Times.

PANAMA, AND WHAT THE PEOPLE THINK OF IT.

For The Public.

We want a policy of pride,
From base contrivances exempt;
And not of diplomatic tricks,
A target for the world's contempt.
Let us be honest to the core;
We needn't steal because we're strong;
We'd rather pay ten millions more,
And take our self-respect along.

We see the end beyond the means;
We recognize the great intent,
To make two mighty oceans one,
And unify a continent;
But truth and honesty and right
Are greater far, and far more strong
Than all the victories of might,
And all the armaments of wrong.

'Tis grand to grapple such a task,
To gird the titan with a girth,
To send our navies beating through
The giant breast-bone of the earth;
We feel the full temptation; but
Our eighty million eyes are strong,
And, though we've tried to keep them shut,
The method's wrong—ignobly wrong.

Not crimson yet, like other wrongs,
(Those crimes which heaven can't forget);

It is not wet with women's tears,
Or red with blood of men as yet;
No burning homes blot out the sun;
But these will come, ere it be long;
The swift descent has just begun—
Down!—Down!—From wrong to deeper wrong.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

"What the boy needs," said the doctor, "is good red blood. We must—"

"Heavens!" exclaimed the aristocratic mother; "why, that's what the common people have."—Chicago Evening Post.

Hungry Mike—Any free lunches in Boston?

Wise William—Sure, dey is; but yer don't want ter look fer no signs readin': "Free lunch."

Hungry Mike—Gee! Don't they have no signs out?

Wise William—Sure, dey do; but in Boston dey read: "Luncheon Gratis."—Puck.

"After all, the old saying 'There's always room at the top' doesn't mean anything."

"Unless it means," replied the traveling man, "that the lower berths in a sleeper are usually taken before you get there."—Philadelphia Press.

"But—how can you sell this land so cheap," said the investor, "when you say there's a gold mine on it?"

"My dear sir," replied the agent, "it's a way we have down here—a gold mine goes with each purchase every Wednesday and Friday."—Atlanta Constitution.