

a skating rink and probably other places laid off for pleasure and recreation. The building itself, if I formed an adequate idea, would perhaps cover the space of two ordinary city squares. You perhaps have heard that this house contains a private theater, replete with the fittings of the largest public theaters; and that it has a gymnasium and swimming pool. Perhaps a most fitting idea of its size may be obtained from the fact that it has 36 separate sleeping suites, and that 80 more are shortly to be added.

"Mr. and Mrs. Gould were away, and the house was supposed to be closed. Nevertheless, an army of servants, high and low, were in the mansion and about the grounds. The whole interior seemed to be enveloped in upholsterers' coverings for protection against light and dust—pictures, walls, statuary, brasses, bronzes and glasses—the very woodwork, as well as the furniture and floor. Little of the real magnificence shone forth. But when some of the coverings were removed, then it seemed as if nothing but the treasures of an oriental monarch of the 'Arabian Nights' tales could possibly pay for them.

"What more impressed me in that house than all else was the woodwork. I believe I have seen much very fine woodwork in interior fittings, and paint that rivaled ebony and ivory. But I never before beheld such gilding of wood. A spacious passageway is there called, if I remember correctly, 'the Golden Corridor.' It is one blaze of gold. I should say that \$500 worth of heavy gold leaf must have been laid on one door alone.

"I stood gazing in amazement at this exhibition of magnificence, and was beginning scarcely to believe my senses, when I was shown the same gilding in various places and was told that it ran throughout the main part of the house. It seemed to me to denote a fortune behind it all of a proportion to exceed the dream of avarice. I was endeavoring to conceive some measure of this, when suddenly some one entered the apartment where we of the working craft were gathered, and said that the proprietor of the mansion had come to the house, and was coming to that apartment, so that we must instantly withdraw. Off we packed without ceremony, until the proprietor had made his progress through that part of the mansion. When he was gone we were told to return to work."

This little story, told me by my paperhanger friend, started a long line of thought after I parted from him

and was left to quiet reflections. I thought of times in Italy 1,800 years ago so much like our own—of the villas of the wealthy, which, if the indications we have are reliable, were puny and cheap as measured by the scale of the wealthy of our time. And then, when I recalled that the Gould fortune is based chiefly upon two forms of privilege—railroads and telegraphs—the parallel grew the more striking.

Another thing. While a vast system of chattel slavery existed in the Roman world, what was the status of the common citizens? To a very large extent it was that of dependents. They were free only in name. The emperor and nobles supplied "bread and the circus," and with them bought the suffrage of the Roman citizens whenever they deigned to take the trouble of going through the form of observing the old usages of the republic which were supposed yet to exist.

Coming to our own day one is led to wonder how soon a similar state of dependence on the part of many of our citizens may come, when the official record shows the masses of the population compelled to live in such circumstances that 700 babies died in the city of Brooklyn alone during last week.—Henry George, Jr., in Philadelphia North American of July 23.

"THOU SHALT NOT STEAL."

A greater portion of the speech delivered by William Jennings Bryan in Kent theater at the University of Chicago, in the afternoon of September 10, as reported in the Chicago American.

I like to talk to students, because students have ideas. I like to talk to students because they build their lives upon great fundamental principles. When a man gets old and absorbed in business and is tempted to make money by illegitimate means he may forget the commandment "Thou shalt not steal," but the student does not. When a man wants to steal on a large scale he may be willing to make an amendment so as to make it read: "Thou shalt not steal on a small scale," but the student does not so amend it.

The student bases his life upon an ideal. And I want to set before the student an ideal that I believe to be an American ideal. If I can succeed in placing before one student a high ideal of American life, that student goes out equipped with his college education to battle for that ideal, and he will make my work easier. It will make it necessary for me to make fewer speeches, if I can have more

going out and fighting the same battle.

I want to take as a text this afternoon the commandment: "Thou shalt not steal." I need not tell you that you must not go out on the highway and steal, for your own caution will tell you that that is not safe. I want to tell you that you can no more afford to steal when stealing is respectable than you can when it is dishonorable. You can no more afford to steal indirectly than you can afford to steal directly. You can no more afford to steal through legislation than you can in spite of legislation.

The moral character of an act is not determined by the number of people engaged in it; the moral character of an act is not determined by the method by which it is done. The moral character of an act is found in the intention of one man to take what belongs to another man. Whether he takes it on the highway or from the house, whether he takes it in the day time or in the night time, whether he takes it in violation of human laws or under the guise of legislation, it makes no difference. If I can leave upon the mind of every student here to-day that ideal I will not have talked in vain. And as I have studied the public question, I have become amazed at the amount of stealing that is done indirectly, and I state it as my solemn conviction that the amount of stealing done by law is infinitely greater in this country than all the stealing done in violation of the law; that the stealing done by those who are not in the penitentiary is infinitely greater than the stealing done by those who are in the penitentiary.

You take the subject of taxation. Is there any just rule for the collecting of taxes? I believe there is. What is the rule? That every citizen should contribute to the support of his government in exact proportion to the benefits he receives from his government. No man should be unwilling to contribute his just share to the expenses of the government. And no man should be willing to contribute more than his just share. And we ought to exercise ourselves to find out what that share is, and to collect that share, as nearly as human wisdom can enable us to do it.

Suppose a man who ought to pay ten dollars to the support of his government only pays five dollars; suppose another man who ought to pay only five dollars pays ten dollars. What is the result of the system which creates this inequality? The

result is simply this: That the government takes five dollars from the man who pays ten dollars when he ought only to pay five dollars, and gives that five dollars to the man who only pays five dollars when he ought to pay ten dollars. That is the result; no one can dispute it. And yet you go through society and see whether these taxes are levied in proportion to the benefits which each man enjoys. I am not to-day going to discuss particular systems of taxation or particular systems of money or particular systems of anything else; only to deal with certain general principles, and I want to leave you to apply those principles. I want you to take up the systems of taxation and ask yourself whether these systems bear equitably upon the people.

A tax upon consumption is a tax upon what men want, not upon what they have. And men's wants are more nearly equal than their possessions. You tax men upon what they need, rather than upon what they possess, and you make the poor man pay more than his share and the rich man less. You ask me what difference that makes to me, provided I am not the one who is overburdened.

I tell you that no citizen can afford to support a bad law because he gets the benefit of it. And if he gets the benefit of it to-day, who knows now but his children may be robbed tomorrow through the same law, by the children of those whom he robs to-day? You cannot tell, and if there were no moral question involved, merely as a question of expediency, no man can afford to support an unjust law of any kind for a temporary advantage he may get out of it.

I want to ask you whether you have considered the various forms of taxation, whether you believe it is wise to collect your taxes all or in large part from consumption? At the time the Spanish war broke out, we collected almost our entire federal revenue from taxes on consumption. We lay a tax on sugar, for instance: Do men use sugar in proportion to their incomes? No. The widow who sews to make enough money to support her family may contribute more to the government through that tax than the millionaire with a small family. Is it just? No. Why is it permitted? Because the men who escape taxation make the laws. That is the reason it is permitted.

People discuss various systems of finance and quarrel over what kind of a dollar we should have. Is there

any rule to govern us in the selection of our dollar? Is there any great principle which will enable us to measure the relative justice of the standards? I say there is, and that rule is this: That that dollar is the best dollar, no matter on what it is based, no matter who supports it—that dollar is the best dollar which more nearly preserves its average purchasing power from generation to generation.

I believe that is a principle that can be applied to the money question. People talk about honest money. Now what would be an honest dollar? It would be a dollar which would buy, from year to year, as nearly as possible, absolutely the same amount of other things. I do not mean that the price of a particular thing would not change; I mean that the average of all things will not change, if you had an absolutely honest dollar. But the trouble is to find such a dollar.

A dollar is the work of human hands. It is the work of human wisdom. And human hands never make perfect things; human wisdom never devises a perfect thing. But we must be contented to take that which makes the nearest possible approach to perfection, and keep it until we can get something that makes a nearer approach than that.

You condemn a dollar which I like; it is not sufficient to say that that dollar is not honest; you have to show me that you have a dollar more nearly honest than that.

It is not sufficient to say that my system is not perfect. You must show me a system which more nearly approaches perfection than mine.

Now, how can you have a dollar absolutely honest? By having enough dollars to keep pace exactly with the demand for money. You say that is impossible. That is true; it has been impossible thus far, and I am not sanguine enough to believe that we shall ever have absolutely an honest dollar. But what provokes me is to hear men talking about their love of an honest dollar, when they are contending for a dollar which they know is not honest and never can be honest.

Whether a single standard or a double standard will give the closest approach to an honest dollar is a matter for discussion; but that we should accept that system which comes the nearest, on an average, is not a matter of discussion. No man who believes that the people are the source of power, and that governments spring from them and are administered for them, can defend any dol-

lar except upon the theory that it is the best attainable dollar, not for a few people, but for all the people.

Now, I believe that the double standard presents the best dollar. Why? Because with all the gold and silver I do not believe that the world will have too much standard money.

When people tell you that the discovery of gold in the Klondike relieves us of the necessity of using silver, just remind that person that since '96 India has been brought to the gold standard. I say brought—she did not come. She was brought. The Indian people did not ask for it. It was put upon them. And yet in India they have practically as many people as were using gold in all Europe four years ago. Would the increase in the production of gold in America, or anywhere else supply the amount of money needed for this new area and that covered by the people who must have the money?

When a man tells you that we are going to have money enough to furnish the people of India with gold, and the still greater population of China with gold, you ask him where he is going to get the gold. Where is it? It is not in the earth. We are exporting gold now. They say lending gold to Europe.

Europe would not borrow our gold if she had the gold there herself; and we would not lend our gold in Europe if business was not so dull in this country that you cannot find a place to invest the money in this country.

What man would send money abroad unless he could get more for it there than here? I can conceive of only one other reason that might influence a man to send money abroad. There are just two reasons which actuate the man—the looking out for his own business and his own welfare, and there is the unselfish love that he may have.

And if you say that we do not lend money to Europe because Europe will take our money and invest it at a better rate than we in the United States will, take the other: that the men who lend money abroad think more of the people over there than they do of the people here, and send it abroad as a mere matter of affection. There is no supply of gold sufficient to furnish a basis for the world's financial transactions.

During my very brief career in the army and in camp I learned that the mosquito question was the same in principle whether there was one mosquito or whether there were a million; but I learned that the mosquito question grew in importance with the number of mosquitoes. And so the trust

question grows in importance with the number of trusts.

You can stand one trust, you can stand a dozen trusts, but trusts may get so numerous that you cannot stand them.

Put one leech on the body of a man and let it draw all the blood it wants, and the man will still live; but cover the man with leeches from head to foot and let them all draw blood, and he will want to do something for the leech habit.

Now, the trust question must be discussed from the standpoint of the principle involved. Do not say there are good trusts and bad trusts. You might as well say that there are good kings and bad kings, and thus defend a monarchy.

I care not whether a king be good or bad, I hate a king.

I care not whether those who stand at the head of trusts be personally lovable or personally detestable. I hate the system of private monopoly, no matter where I find it.

And if you are going to fight a monopoly you have got to strike at the principle of monopoly. You cannot simply try to keep the bad ones from being worse than they might be. If you are going to stop monopoly you have got to strike at the root of it. You have got to take the stand that any monopoly is intolerable.

Why is our nation the greatest nation in the world? It is because there opens out before the American a greater hope than opens before any other people in the world. It is because the American has a stimulus such as no other citizen has. It is because here we have civil liberty and religious liberty. It is because here the humblest man may aspire to the highest reward in business and in politics; because our men are not born into any class or condition, but more easily than anywhere else in the world can they have what they earn and enjoy what they achieve. That is what makes this nation great.

"Thou shalt not steal" is a command that is directed as much against the trust that plunders by the national highway as against the insignificant robber who plunders by the wayside. "Thou shalt not steal" is a command that is as binding upon those who rob by making the people tributaries and collecting from them such tolls as they, the monopolists, please—that command comes to them as well as to those who are guilty of petty larceny.

But, my friends, there is another question which I want to refer to briefly; a question that has not been considered in this country until recently;

and that is, the size of our standing army. Until recently, people of all parties have rejoiced that in this land we do not need a large army. Until recently, people of all parties have pointed to the burdens borne by the toilers of the old world, and have congratulated our people that these burdens were not imposed here.

Why do we need a large army in this country? Let this nation be what it has been, let this government derive its just powers from the consent of the governed; let our government be servant and not master of the people, and then every citizen will die if need be to preserve that government. But base your government upon force, and you will have to have force present all the time.

Rule men by love and you do not need a large army. Rule them by fear and it will have to grow stronger and more powerful with the years.

Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the gods—that they admired them for their wisdom; feared them because of their power, and loved them for their justice.

What is to be this nation's position? Is this nation to be admired simply for the wisdom of its great men? Is it to be feared merely because of the greatness of its fleet and its army? Oh, young men, there is a higher ideal: Let this nation be loved because of its justice, and you will make it a force that the world cannot prevail against.

It may be that we have run our race; it may be that we have reached a turning point in our career. It may be that destiny—destiny that is never known until it is past—it may be that destiny has determined that this nation, like so many other nations in the past, is to prove again the old truth that the wages of sin is death.

It may be that it is destiny for this nation to show once more that when the dollar becomes greater than the man the government must decline. It may be that the love of money has so taken possession of the American people that they are willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage.

That may be destiny. No one has authority to declare what destiny is. That may be destiny; but what is our duty? Lincoln says that it is our duty to do right, what we believe to be right, and then to risk the consequences, and find our consolation in the consciousness that we have done what we believed to be our duty.

It may be destiny for this nation to go down. It may be that we shall speak in vain against the adoption of the doc-

trine of force. It may be, but speaking for myself, if I were the only one to protest, I would a thousand times rather be overwhelmed by this destiny and let history say in ages to come that one man fought against it rather than submit to it—I would rather do that than go and accomplish this destiny, if it is destiny.

As I look at it, destiny is a thing which we accomplish for ourselves. It is not a matter of chance; it is a matter of choice. It is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved, and we can make this nation's destiny what we want it to be, if we are in the majority. The people of this nation can determine this nation's destiny.

A TRIBUTE OF CONFIDENCE.

These trustful and touching lines, written by an honest farmer who doesn't take a newspaper himself, but occasionally borrows one, were rejected by 67 of the most prominent republican papers in the country before their disappointed and discouraged author, in a fit of desperation, added the last three words and offered them to The Public.

Bryan can't deceive us with fine speeches; The man doesn't mean them at all.

Their're only intended to capture The votes of the suckers this fall. Alas, for the truth-telling statesman,

A hard one to find, east or west; We will stick to brave William McKinley, His metal we've put to the test.

Annexation by force, we remember, 'Twas not to be thought of, said he. By our morals, an act of aggression

Nothing short of a crime, it would be. Our plain duty to poor Puerto Rico, Who welcomed our army with joy, Was to give her free trade in our markets, Spain's ruinous work to destroy.

And we mind how he stood by those doctrines,

Those sentiments grand that he wrote; O, freemen, indeed 'tis an honor To give such a hero our vote.

And now when we have his assurance That Columbia no empire shall be, But shall always remain, while she trusts him,

The glorious home of the free; When he says that above our new islands Our flag but in blessing shall wave, That he'll give to their people good government

Or give them the peace of the grave; Away with all doubt and misgiving! Boy orators vainly will warn; For we'll stand by brave William McKinley

And trust him again, sure's you're born— In a horn. J. HAWKINS.

Haskell Flats, N. Y.

BOOK NOTICES.

The National Single Taxer (New York: George P. Hampton, 62-64 Trinity place), edited by George P. Hampton and John J. Murphy, as the American organ of the single tax movement, offers an excellent number for September. It is a fine example of what the organ of a movement