

To that great anthem, calm and low,
Which God repeats.

Now is it not apparent that faith in Liberty is but a corollary of this faith in God?

Suppose one believes that the foundations of the universe have been laid in equity and truth; that error needs but to be known to be discredited; that truth needs but to be tried to be proven. Suppose one has the faith that in this world of truth falsehood must stumble at every step, while reason and experience must continually admonish us of the righteous way. He who has this faith in the weakness of error and the might of truth will have faith in liberty. He will prize liberty as the guarantee of progress, the salvation of the world.

Among the greatest words of Scripture are those of Gamaliel, who advised against the persecution of the disciples of Jesus, because he believed that if they had the truth, opposition would be hopeless; and if they did not have it, it would be needless. Gamaliel had faith in the universe, therefore he had faith in Liberty.

Recently I saw a book which had been blue-pencilled by the censor of a certain ecclesiastical institution. I do not mention the name of the church, because bigotry is not the fault of one church more than another. This was a book on social problems written by an earnest and thoughtful man. But it taught a "strange doctrine" and was considered "unsafe." Its publication was prohibited, save the expurgated edition which I saw. The ugly blotches seemed to me like the shadows of the dark ages projected across the pathway of the twentieth century. Out of those mutilated pages there seemed to rise the image of truth, with blood-smeared face, and wounds which told of the assassin's cowardly work. As I turned the leaves of that book I marveled at the pygmy faith of the man who fancies that God's universe needs to be defended by his blue pencil.

Faith in God involves the faith that whatever is just must be accomplished in due time. Here, for instance, is a test of faith. We know now what the mere land is worth on which Boston stands. We know what it was worth 15 years ago. We know that in the last 15 years land values in that city have risen \$245,000,000, an average of over \$16,000,000 a year. We know that the average tax in Boston for the same length of time has been less than \$13,500,000.

This is to say that if Boston in the last 15 years had raised all her public revenue by means of a land value tax,

she would have exempted her industries from the burden of taxation, and she would have taken from the landlords only that unearned increment of land value due to the growth of the population and industry of the city.

That would take a great weight from the back of labor. It would take nothing from the landlords which properly belongs to them. The Springfield Republican, in commenting on these facts, seems to recognize the equity of this plan of raising public revenue. Then this journal, which on most public questions has shown so much faith in the right, calmly states that "apart from a question of right and justice" this plan can never be carried out because the selfishness of the landlord will oppose it. That is what I call an example of practical atheism. To concede that a thing is right, and then to give up all hope of bringing it about because there are evil forces which oppose it, that is faith in the devil; it is faith in the power of evil. It is not faith in the sovereign truth.

Faith in God implies faith in man. The tendency of the race is upward. Let unbelieving men repeal their meddling laws. Give the world a chance. Liberty is the only safety. Try to make good men, and you will only make them weak. Give them freedom, and the good in them will assert itself. Trust freedom as you trust God. Love freedom as you love men. If ever the words of a prophet were inspired it was when Isaiah boldly stated that to worship God truly is to serve the cause of Liberty, "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke."

HON. THOS. E. WATSON ON CHILD LABOR.

The legislature of Georgia has been considering a bill to prohibit the employment of children under 12 years of age in the mills and factories of that State. On the evening of July 6 a meeting was held in the capitol building at Atlanta in the interest of the bill. The special correspondent of the Augusta Weekly Chronicle states that it "was one of the greatest demonstrations ever seen in the hall of the house of representatives. The capitol was a blaze of light, and the audience was packed to the ceiling. The aisles were so jammed with people, both on the floor and in the galleries, that those who got into the push could not go in or out. Hundreds were turned away and the corridors were filled with people. They kept coming and trying to gain admission to the hall long after nine o'clock." The Hon. Thomas E. Watson was the chief speaker of the evening. We reproduce a portion of Mr. Watson's speech from the columns of the Augusta Chronicle of July 8.

THE BILL.

What does the Houston bill seek to

do, and what are the arguments in its favor?

(1) It proposes to have the sovereign State give its protection to those who sorely need protection and who otherwise are helpers.

If child bondage be wrong, it is obvious that unless the State acts, the bondage will continue. The same conditions which caused it will perpetuate it unless the higher power steps in.

(2) It proposes that modern commercialism shall be told in language it must obey that our twentieth century civilization will not allow the children of the land to be thrown into its hopper and ground out into dividends.

It proposes to declare that modern religious sentiment and the enlightened convictions of leading men and women will not allow built up amongst us a system whereby our Christian civilization, like Saturn of old, devours its own children.

(3) It proposes to rectify and make safe the foundations upon which our future civilization depends. The children of to-day are those in whose hands will be borne the standards of our future progress. To the extent that we enslave and stunt and debase the child of to-day we damn in advance the civilization of to-morrow.

(4) It proposes to restore the order of nature—declared everywhere by the God of nature—a law to which all brute creation conforms, that the parent shall support the tender-aged offspring and not the tender-aged support the parent.

To allow idle, dissipated, unnatural parents to live in ease at the expense of little children of tender age is to reverse the order of nature and set at naught the law of God. Who objects to the Houston bill, and upon what grounds?

ITS OPPONENTS.

The associated cotton mills, through their Republican representative, H. C. Hanson, appear before the Georgia legislature. And at the very outset he exposes the weakness of his cause by abusing his opponents. In effect, he classes the advocates of the bill under the three heads of Fools, Fanatics and Demagogues.

This was a fine display of insolence made by a Republican to the Democratic legislature of Georgia!

In whose behalf did Hanson appear?

In that of capital? Oh, no. Associated capital never asks anything for itself.

Wearing the same old hypocritical

mask which protected capital has worn for a hundred years, Hanson came up here to speak in behalf of labor!

Hanson would have us down right in calling us fools if we were capable of believing that in fighting the Houston bill the motive of the associated manufacturers is to protect labor.

Away with the silly subterfuge! Hanson was here in the interest of dividends, not children, and he ought to have been brave enough and honest enough to say it.

What objections are made by Hanson to the Houston bill?

He says it would be class legislation!

My God, think of that! The associated factory owners send Hanson here to implore the legislature of Georgia not to be guilty of the crime of enacting class legislation!

Of all the impudence that ever I saw in all my life, this caps the climax.

It not only beats Bob-tail who beats the devil, but takes the rag off the bush and the bush up by the roots.

Who was it that went to the very first congress which ever convened, and demanded class legislation in his own behalf?

The manufacturer.

Who is it that for 100 years has never let a single congress meet and adjourn without demanding and getting something more in his favor as class legislation?

The manufacturer.

Who is it that now declares through his national organization that the American market belongs to him and he must be protected in his monopoly of it?

The manufacturer.

And yet Hanson, the handsome Hanson, the wealthy Hanson, the Republican mill-owner Hanson, dares to exhibit an unblushing front to the Georgia legislature and to protest against legislation in favor of the helpless children of Georgia, on the ground that such law would be class legislation.

Confound his infernal impudence!

OBJECTIONS URGED.

What other objections does he urge? He says that it would be an interference with private business.

The answer is short, sharp and final.

Whenever the management of private business results in a public injury the sovereign power of the State must, in the interest of the public, redress that wrong.

No man, rich or poor, has got a vested right to so conduct his business as to inflict permanent injury upon the society in which he lives.

What else?

They say that farm laborers are having a harder time than factory laborers.

If that be true it does not prove that reformers have gone too far—it would prove, rather, that they had not gone far enough.

Hanson says that the farming class in Georgia are so pitifully poor that they flee to factory serfdom to escape the harsher slavery of the farm.

Is that true?

If so, it were high time that the Georgia legislature and other legislative bodies were directing their attention to the farms as well as to the factories.

I am not here to discuss the agricultural system and situation myself. I will take what the agent of the mill-owners says of it. Their Republican spokesman, Hanson, says that the farming population is reduced to a pitiable condition of hardship and suffering.

If this situation be a general one, there must be some deep-rooted general cause.

What is the cause?

Is it laziness, as Hanson would seem to indicate?

Surely laziness is not general in Georgia, else we should never have so marvelously increased our crops and our wealth.

What, then, is the cause?

May it not be the class legislation of our Federal government which for a hundred years has been building up manufactures at the expense of commerce and agriculture?

May it not be the system which protects our manufacturer from foreign competition while it compels our farmers and wage-earners to compete with all the world?

May it not be that system of Federal taxation which puts the taxes mainly on the necessities of life, and thus compels a one-horse tenant of the farm, or the common day laborer in the city, to pay as much Federal tax as Carnegie, or Rockefeller, or Morgan, or Vanderbilt, or Gould?

May it not be that system of class legislation which compels the poorest wage-earner in the republic to pay Federal taxes upon his food and clothing, his household furnishings, his tools and implements of work, when the vastly wealthy insurance companies, express companies, telegraph companies, national banking companies, railroad companies pay practically no Federal tax at all?

If our farmers and wage earners are in such pitiable plight, may it not be

on account of this very protective system which the manufacturers have for a hundred years been building up—a system under which the American manufacturer will now sell his products to foreign people cheaper than our homefolks can get them? A system under which competition has been destroyed by the trust; a system in which the cost of living on every farm and in every wage earner's hut depends absolutely upon the greedy demands of the managers of the despotic trusts?

CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY.

My own convictions are clear. I repeat what I have so often said in years-gone by—this building up of one man's industry at the expense of another is a crime against humanity and a menace to the true prosperity of the republic. Believing that the protective system has brought us to this pass, I would, if I could, reform the entire situation, as Great Britain reformed it—by removing every tariff on luxuries and establish free trade.

Manufacturers should not be permitted to take advantage of their own wrong. They have impoverished the farm—for God's sake let them spare the little children of the farm. They have blighted the prosperity of the farmer—don't allow them to blight the youth of the farmer's child.

But while I admit the hardship of farm life, I deny that it is, or ever can be, as hurtful to the child as life in the mill.

Even when children under 12 work on the farm, they can only labor for a part of the year. As a rule the child works in the spring, summer and fall. There are healthy, expansive surroundings. There is much rest and recreation. The weather and the crop-conditions do not admit of constant drudgery. There is no deadly grind of tread-mill even at its worst. And I will prove the nature of the tree by the fruit it has borne.

Where are your great and good men whose tender years were spent in the factory?

Where are they?

If life at the loom is so good a thing for the boy of 10 and 11 and 12, where are some of the ripened products? What products would you expect from labor, day in and day out in the narrow limits of the building, in an atmosphere heavy with the germs of disease and death, in a deafening roar of machinery all day long, and under conditions which stunt the child's development, physically, mentally and, perhaps, morally?

No, farm life is not like that. If your tree of child labor be so good a tree, show me some of the fruits!

You cannot do it, and you know you can't.

Now look to the farm. Look upon that tree, and gaze upon its fruits. Who built up Atlanta and made it the pride of the South?

Boys who had slaved in the factories at ten years of age? No! a thousand times no. The men who have crowned themselves kings of success, and have made Atlanta's name a synonym of pluck and strength and victory, drank in the health and the inspiration and the courage which made them great, at the pure fountain of farm life.

I instance also: Ben Hill, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Andrew Jackson.

What would have become of Alex. Stephens had he been placed at ten years in the poisoned atmosphere of a factory?

ALL ARGUED BEFORE.

Every argument urged against the bill was urged in 1833 in England, when the reformers first interfered in behalf of the men, the women and the children of the coal mines and the factories.

Human greed made the same plea in its own defense that it makes now. The arguments which Hanson makes against Houston are precisely the same as those which British capitalists made against Lord Ashley. As those arguments were swept aside then by a parliament dominated to a large extent by hereditary aristocrats, it is to be devoutly hoped that the same arguments will be swept aside now by a Georgia legislature not dominated by corporations or hereditary aristocrats, but actuated solely by the desire to so legislate as to protect the best interests of the commonwealth.

Maj. Hanson stated repeatedly in his speech that the mill owners did not favor child labor as an "original proposition."

Then at some time or other the mill owners must have been opposed to child labor.

When was that time? Was it five years ago, or ten, or twenty, or fifty?

If they were opposed to child labor 20 years ago, what were their reasons?

The question is one of principle and principles do not change.

If the factory owners were opposed to child labor as an "original proposition," in God's name tell us why

a thing that was wrong in principle then is not wrong now.

JUSTICE MUST TRIUMPH.

Maj. Hanson said that the reformers had failed "in his time." Assuming that he must be some 60 or 70 years old, I must remind the Major that the despised reformer has almost changed the face of the world "in his time." To name the victories of the reformer in the nineteenth century is to give the history of human progress. And that march of the people toward higher standards and better conditions has but fairly begun. No Hanson can stop it. No manufacturers' association can stop it. To the extent that its cause is just, its final triumph is assured.

SAVE THE YOUNG.

If it be true that our economic conditions are so bad that we cannot rescue both the young and the old, but must sacrifice one to save the other, I would say:

"Save the young."

In the horrible "Passage of the Beresina" when the wreck of the grand army of Napoleon was madly crowding the bridges to escape the Russian and Cossack horses, when camp-followers and demoralized soldiers were desperately struggling for footing on the bridge, a mother was seen crowded off the bridge, sinking into the freezing waters of the river. In her arms, held on high—as she sank to her death—was her babe, and after she could no longer speak, those motherly arms, holding aloft her infant to the last, made mute appeal:

"Save my child. Let me die if you must, but save my child!"

Noble humanity speaks always and everywhere the same language.

If indeed we have come to such a pass as Hanson says, and cannot rescue both the mother and the child, I am quite certain that every true-hearted mother would do as the dying mother at the Beresina did, hold up her babe in her sinking arms and made the heart thrill at her cry: "Save my child!"

The Czar—You know that I cannot receive that petition.

The President—Why, I have seen nothing but newspaper reports on the subject.

The Czar—But what will you do if you are officially notified that my government cannot admit the petition?

The President—Oh, then we can say that our intention to send it was only a newspaper report.—New York Evening Post.

A CASUAL OBSERVATION.

Dar's nuffin hyar but vanity

An' riches an' insanity;

De dollah seems to be de people's god.

Dar's a heap too many 'Scariots

A-ridin' 'round in charlots,

While de po' man am a-carryin' de hod.

Dar's too much haste an' hurryin',

An' too much wealth at buryin'.

An' dis hyar t'ing am gittin' worse an' worse,

Hlt takes all ob de rakin's,

De scrimp'in's an' de scrapin's

To liquidate de 'spenses ob de hearse.

Dar's heaps of care an' worry;

Ebberbody's in a hurry,

An' de few am growin' richer ebbery day;

But de most of us must shovel

For de children in de hovel

An' silently await de judgment day.

—Ben King.

A BIT OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

John Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, related that at a dinner party in Washington, Bancroft stated in conversation that Calhoun was the original secessionist, and responsible for the civil war. To this statement Tucker took exception, and said that in the month of Calhoun's death he was invited to go and see the great statesman. To an inquiry whether anything could be done to save the union, and whether the Missouri compromise could not save it, Calhoun replied: "With my constitutional objections I could not vote for it, but I would acquiesce in it to save the union." He was again asked what he saw in the future of the country, and his reply was: "Dark forebodings, and I should die happy if I could see the union preserved." Bancroft inquired if Tucker had heard this reply of Calhoun, to which Tucker answered: "Yes," and then Bancroft stated: "I will never again repeat the charge I made against Mr. Calhoun here to-night."—Hon. J. L.M. Curry, LL.D.

A LITTLE POLITICAL FABLE.

Once upon a time a man invested \$350,000 in building a 15-story office building in a large city. He fitted up his office rooms in nice style and then went out to secure tenants.

"Where is your elevator?" queried the man who came to inspect the rooms.

"I have no elevator," replied the owner.

"But do you expect us to pay you a fair rent for your rooms and then climb these ladders to get to them?"

"Well I thought you might do it for awhile. Later I will give some man a franchise to operate an elevator in my building."