

FROM: Speeches and Writings of William H. Wallace

ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SINGLETAX

(From campaign speech in 1912.)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It seems that I am now the victim of a storm of calumny and misrepresentation. I face it everywhere I go. The Single Taxers have mailed tens of thousands of bulletins throughout the State attacking me. The funds of millionaire Fels and others are being lavishly expended. Thousands of these bulletins, freighted with falsehoods, are anonymous. They are the nameless messengers of cowards. I see an attempted description of my farm-bought and paid for with hard-earned money—tacked up all over the State, accompanied with malicious and anonymous falsehoods. The Single Taxers are desperate, and I seem to be the special object of their fury. A gentleman told me just before I left home on this trip that he heard eight of them make short speeches in the open air the other night at Kansas City, and I was the object of the denunciation of them all. I am told they have over fifty speakers going over the State, all of them abusing me. But I am not losing any sleep. I am making two full speeches every day, and have about covered the whole State. These anonymous falsehoods all relate to the SingleTax fight, and of themselves show from whence they come. But I have positive proof that they have been mailed out by SingleTax leaders. I could cause arrests and secure convictions if I were willing to swear that I thought these falsehoods had injured my personal character, but I do not believe they have.

A few weeks ago these Single Taxers were very happy.

Everything in the fight was going to suit them. They thought their prospects were splendid. The battle was joined. The "issues were made up," as we lawyers put it. It was agreed, they said, that it was simply a question as to whether their propaganda would advance or lower taxes, and they were showing, they said, that to collect all taxes from real estate would lessen the burden. Lawyers, they said, were debating this question with them. Men of letters and college professors and learned theorists were writing articles on their side. Anti-SingleTax orators were delighting them by debating with them the question of "unearned increments," "land values," "land sites," "unimproved lots in cities" and the like. But deep down in their hearts they were holding their secret purpose. As they passed this farm or that one, their mouths were watering as they dreamed of the time when the State would own it and they would have exactly the same right to occupy and enjoy it as the old pioneer, who by honest toil dug it from the forest. They were indeed happy. With the booty, as they thought, almost in sight, they were as happy as Byron's pirates in his Corsair as they dipped their oars in the waves and sang:

"O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea.

Our thoughts as boundless and our souls as free.
Far as the breeze can reach the billows foam,
Survey our empire and behold our home.
O, who can tell save he whose heart has tried
And danced in triumph o'er the billows wide
The exulting sense the pulses maddening play,
That thrills the wanderer o'er this trackless way
That of itself can woo the approaching fight
And turn what some deem danger to delight
Let him who crawls enamored of decay,
Cling to his couch and sicken years away.
Ours the brief epitaph in dangers day
When those who win at last divide the prey."

Ah, my friends, there are land pirates as well as pirates on the high seas, and those magic words of Byron in the above lines, "divide the prey," are the same words that were enthusing and delighting the Single Taxers as they looked toward the future a few weeks ago.

But these Single Taxers are mad now. They are furious-furious at me, hence all this turning of their guns from others and leveling them upon me. They say I have "changed the issue on them." They say that "like a firebrand" I have gone over the State, telling audiences of excited men that the issue is not merely as to taxation or "land sites" or "land values" or "unearned increments," but that the question is as to whether or not their lands and houses are to be "confiscated," as Henry George expresses it—stolen from them—as I have put it. The people now believe this. Whether or not I am the man who convinced them of it I do not know. I certainly hope I am.

I now propose to show you by overwhelming, indisputable testimony that what I have said on the stump all over this State is true, namely, that the purpose of these Single Taxers is to "confiscate" your homes and your lands; to place the titles to them in the State, and then have the State rent them out to the highest bidder.

Henry George is the prophet of the Bugle Taxers. They follow him as the Mohammedans follow Mohammed. His book, "Progress and Poverty," is their Bible, their Koran. Joseph Fels, the London millionaire, is now the leader of these misguided enthusiasts. I received a letter from him a few days ago written in London, and asking me to desist in my opposition to the Single Tax. and urging me to read Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." I wrote him that I had known this book for a number of years and had read it more than once.

I now hold in my hand a copy of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." It is beautifully written—almost as beautiful in diction and metaphor as Rousseau's "Social Contract" or Thos. Paine's "Age of Reason," and more dishonest and wicked than either of them. Mr. George proposes in his book the most gigantic

scheme of dishonesty ever devised by human greed. He proposes to wrest homes and lands from honest owners, place the title in the State and then have the State rent these homes and lands to the highest bidder. Listen as I read from his pen. On page 326 he says: "This then is the remedy for the unjust and unequal distribution of wealth apparent in modern civilization and for all the evils which flow from it. We must make land common property." How could the intent to rob the honest owner of his home or his land and place the title in the community be more clearly expressed?

Listen to him again. On page 401 he says: "We have weighed every objection, and seen that neither on the ground of equity or expediency is there anything to deter us from making land common property by confiscating rent." What a compliment to "expediency!" What a crime against "equity!" But justice is more outraged when we consider this last declaration of Mr. George's from another viewpoint. It is here proposed to rob the mechanic of his home or the farmer of his land, and make them common property, not by, force and violence—as the highwayman obtains his booty—which is less diabolical, but it is proposed to make them common property by stealth and indirection, by "confiscating rent."

But harken to dishonesty in the superlative degree. On page 403 he says: "I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call their land; let them continue to call it their land; let them buy and sell and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell if we take the kernel. It is not necessary to confiscate land. It is only necessary to confiscate rent." Was there ever put on a printed page a proposition more abhorrent to justice and humanity? Mr. George proposes here to take land from the owner without paying for it. He says specifically that to purchase it would be unjust. Our constitution, which it is believed comports with the genius of justice and civilization, provides that private property shall not be taken without just compensation. Whatever tyrants may have done unrestrained by constitutions, the assertion is here ventured that no civilization, possibly no race of barbarians, has ever enacted Mr. George's rule into law. Jezebel obtained Naboth's vineyard without compensation, but God in His divine Providence saw to it that she was thrown out of a window and the dogs ate her flesh. It will be noticed that Mr. George changes his nefarious scheme at this point, though the change is purely technical, and the same dishonest end is reached. He is charitable enough at this point, though not elsewhere, to let the title stand technically in the name of the owner, but wants all the proceeds. He will leave the honest farmer or mechanic the "shell," but he wants the "kernel." He would take all of the rent—he specifically advocates this all through his book as a part of his scheme of "confiscation"—and leave the hapless farmer, as heartless landlords usually leave the unfortunate tiller of the soil in Ireland, with scarcely enough potatoes to keep alive his half-starving children. He and his followers would bring Missouri farmers to the low level of the Surfs of Russia, or the Peons of Old Mexico.

That I am not misrepresenting Mr. George in saying that he proposes to take all of the rent, listen to what he says on page 403: "We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our mode of taxation to take it all."

But mark how he explains and illustrates his scheme. On page 398 he says: "There is a lot in the center of San Francisco to which the common rights of the people of that city are yet legally recognized. This lot is not cut up into infinitesimal pieces, nor yet is it unused waste. It is covered with fine buildings, the property of private individuals, that stand there in perfect security. The only difference between this lot and those around it is that the rent of the one goes into the common school fund, the rent of the others into private pockets. What is to prevent the land of a whole country being held by the people of the country in the same way?"

Let me read you again from page 326: "We have reached this conclusion by an examination in which every step has been proven and secured. In the chain of reasoning no link is wanting and no link is weak. Deduction and induction have brought us to the same truth—that the unequal ownership of land necessitates the unequal distribution of wealth. And as in the nature of things unequal ownership of land is inseparable from the recognition of individual property in land, it necessarily follows that the only remedy for the unjust distribution of wealth is, in making land common property."

Let me read you again from page 361, where he says: "If the land of any country belongs to the people of that country what right, in morality and justice, have the individuals called land owners to the rent?"

Again on page 363 in speaking of the present system of permitting individuals to own land, he says: "It is not merely a robbery in the past, it is a robbery in the present—a robbery that deprives of their birthright the infants that are now coming into the world! Why should we hesitate about making short work of such a system?"

Again at page 368 he says: "Historically as ethically, private property in land is robbery."

Again at page 382 he says: "Turning back, wherever there is light to guide us, we may everywhere see that in their first perception all people have recognized the common ownership in land and that private property is an usurpation, a creation of force and fraud."

At page 401 he says: "But a question of method remains.

How shall we do it? We should satisfy the law of justice. We should meet all

economic requirements by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements." I call attention to the words, "under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements." Now, in the name of justice and fairness, I would like to know how private rights to improvements can be guarded when the land on which the improvements are placed is public property, and it will be noticed that Mr. George here distinctly says that he favors, "by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property." If the renter of the land who owns the improvements fails to pay the taxes on the land and the State lets some other man have the land, what would become of the improvements? How could one man, for instance, rent a fifty foot lot from the State and use and enjoy it, while another man owned and used and enjoyed the building that was on the lot? The man who rented the ground from the State could not use it while the man who was in the house that sat on the ground was using the house and refusing to give it up. It thus appears how ridiculous and illogical this heresy of Mr. George is. It will also be seen here that there is but one step between Mr. George and the out-and-out socialist. The socialist would take away from the individual all property, personal and real, and place the title to it in the public. It is worthy of note as we pass that most of Mr. George's followers are now socialists. They believe in taking everything.

Indeed, at other places in his book Mr. George evinces the very highest admiration for socialism, and even for anarchy. Probably the worst anarchists the world has known were the Russian Nihilists. Listen to the language of Mr. George at page 319, where he says: "The ideal of socialism is grand and noble; and it is, I am convinced, possible of realization; but such a state of society cannot be manufactured—it must grow. Society is an organism, not a machine. It can live only by the individual life of its parts. And in the free and natural development of all the parts will be secured the harmony of the whole. All that is necessary to social regeneration is included in the motto of those Russian patriots, sometimes called 'Nihilists'—'Land and Liberty!'" Surely the illogical arguments of a man like this will not have much weight with law-abiding Americans—a man who coolly eulogizes as "patriots" these Russian Nihilists who went about with pistol and dagger and bomb perpetrating as deliberate murders and assassinations as have reddened the pages of history. But let's consult another SingleTax authority. One of the present day leaders of the SingleTax propaganda is Mr. Lee Francis Lybarger, a Philadelphia lawyer. He also has written a book on the SingleTax, which I have purchased. In this book he says: "For centuries the principle of private ownership in land—the principle of absolute ownership—has been the basis of all civilized nations, including our own." Here then is the printed admission of one of the great leaders of the Single Taxers that no civilized nation has ever adopted the SingleTax propaganda.

As Mr. Lybarger puts it, "the principle of absolute ownership has been the basis of all civilized nations, including our own," and yet Mr. Lybarger, in his book,

proposes to change all this. He advises that we overrule all the civilization in history. He deliberately proposes that private ownership of land be prohibited by law.

In other words, he endorses and adopts the theory of Henry George. A few nights ago I was one of a great audience, in Kansas City, listening to an address on the SingleTax by one of its vaunted leaders, Mr. Francis Neilson, a member of Parliament, from London, England. The Single Taxers have imported this gentleman to the United States and Canada to teach the people of this continent the doctrine of the SingleTax. The leading Single Taxers of Kansas City were all present to hear Mr. Neilson, a number of them being on the rostrum with him. At one point in his speech Mr. Neilson exclaimed, "We hold that no man has a right to own ground." This declaration was greeted with vociferous applause, which lasted for some time, the leading Single Taxers on the rostrum joining most heartily in the applause.

As further proof I desire to say that I have talked to a large number of the leaders of the Single Taxers recently. In private conversation they do not hesitate to declare that they are opposed to the private ownership of land. They say that God intended that land should be used by His creatures as freely as air or water. They say that no man has a right to own 160 acres of the ocean; he has no right to own a large section of the atmosphere, and so he has no greater right to own 160 acres of land or any piece of ground whatever.

It is useless for the recent converts to the SingleTax scheme of "confiscation" to try to get away from the teachings of their great leaders as well as the teachings of their present leaders in Missouri, when they express their honest convictions. The scheme is one of downright robbery, and the only alternative for those of its friends who are ashamed of it, is to abandon it. Take away the idea of "the confiscation of rent," as Henry George terms it; take your eye from the ultimate purpose, of placing the ownership of all lands in the public, and the SingleTax theory is gone. We had as well go ahead with the present just system of compelling all kinds of property, personal and real, to bear its proportion of the public burden. If the only purpose is to raise revenue then stand by the present system, for the more property we tax the easier it will be to raise the enormous sums required for governmental purposes. If the purpose is to place the titles to all lands in the government as Caesar obtained title to Gaul, or as Titus obtained title for the Romans to Jerusalem, as the Pirates of Tariffs obtained their title to their booty on the high seas, then stand by Henry George and all the other writers on this subject. Most of the SingleTax orators talk one way in private conversation and another way on the stump. In private conversation they frankly admit that according to their doctrine no individual has a right to own ground. When on the stump they talk all around the subject. Not long ago I heard four of them make speeches to a great audience of farmers. A number of the farmers told me that they did not understand what these men were trying to get at. The truth is these speakers were ashamed to tell exactly what they were after. Their plan itself is a

shameless one. It proposes to take the land of the farmer by placing such an enormous burden of taxation upon it that he can not afford to hold it, and it will then go to the State. But these SingleTax orators are ashamed to say that in their speeches. They constantly talk about "unearned increments," "land values," "land sites," "unimproved town lots" and the like, while their real purpose is to carry their amendment and "confiscate" the homes and lands of the people. Single Taxers, if you wish to appropriate the property of others, then come out into the open. Resort to force. It is more manly than intrigue. Loot the home as pirates scuttle and loot the ship. Arm yourselves from "tip to toe." Dangle your revolvers from your sides. Strap your bowie knives to your belts. Beat into insensibility the young man who resists you at the threshold. Drive out the aged father leaning upon his staff from the home he has carved from the forest. Turn the widow and her children into the storm, homeless and friendless. This would be horrible, but it would be far more manly than to scheme and intrigue and "confiscate" and finally eject the land owner and home owner under a sheriffs deed for unpaid taxes. The amendment you are trying to carry makes no exceptions whatever, and it would be better to kill the aged, the infirm, the sick, the widow and the orphan than to eject them from their homes and turn them out to starve.

I submit an argument just here which must appeal to every sensible man at all acquainted with human nature. A large number of farmers over the State have asked me the question, "What are these Single Taxers after?" "What is in it for them?" Let us look into this question a little. It will be noticed that two classes of men are supporting the SingleTax propoganda. First, millionaires whose possessions are largely in personal property. Second, men who have not succeeded very well in the world and are trying to inaugurate some new plan by which they may profit.

It is easy to see the motive of the millionaire owner of personal property. Of course if this amendment is adopted and all taxes are put on real estate he will have no taxes to pay. Men having large sums of money or owning banks or manufacturies or immense stocks of goods or skyscrapers in our cities would have nothing to pay in the way of taxes. Hence it is that we have quite a large number of millionaires who favor the SingleTax.

I have talked to several big bankers who now, since it appears that a large proportion of their depositors are against the Single Tax. say that they themselves will vote against the SingleTax.

But a majority of these big bankers have stated that the Single Tax had some very good features about it. At the outset of the campaign a good many millionaire owners of personal property in Missouri were favorable to the SingleTax. but now that they see that it would hurt their business to openly favor it they say that they will vote against the SingleTax. Undoubtedly, if in the future the SingleTax should secure more friends, many of these men would vote for it.

But the serious inquiry is, what will these men with little business and little

success in life get out of the SingleTax propaganda if the people adopt it at the polls? In their speeches they are claiming that all they desire is to place taxes on real estate, and thus prevent money lenders from making false returns and causing vacant lots in cities to be at once improved by placing a big tax on them—such a tax that the owner must improve the lot. But what good would that do these gentlemen? They would get nothing out of it. They would have nothing for all their worry and agitation and writing and speech making. We find no adequate motive for the conduct of these men here. But men are always influenced by a motive, and these men are so influenced. Beyond cavil, they have in their minds the materializing of the theory of Henry George, when the titles of all lands shall be vested in the State and the homes and lands of our people rented out by the State. To use an expression much used in my home city at the mouth of the Kaw, this would put these men "on the ground floor." When the lands of the farmer were put up for rent they could bid just as much as he could, and, being a little reckless, probably bid more. In a word, so far as real estate is concerned, we would have a new order of things, and all men would be equally wealthy. If this could be accomplished it would be but a short time until socialism in its entirety would be adopted, and every kind of property, real and personal, would be owned in common.

THE SINGLETAX AND THE FARMER.

With your kind indulgence, your attention is asked for a moment while we consider what effect the adoption of the Single Tax would have on the farmer. As it has happened in every illogical, wicked revolution in the world's history, the farmer would be the first man to suffer. Of course, when the scheme of Mr. George's was adopted and the whole burden was placed on land for the purpose of ultimately rendering it impossible for him to pay, he would work within an inch of his life for a while. He would be compelled to exercise the very strictest economy. But public burdens have grown to enormous proportions now. The cost of government is very great. The adoption of the SingleTax propaganda would of necessity create a horde of officials to look after the management and renting of all the lands. Taxes would become so enormous that the farmer's doom would not be far away.

I do not know exactly how it would affect the farmer in many of the counties of the State, but I have figured out carefully how it would affect the farmers of Jackson County—one of the largest agricultural counties in Missouri. I agree in my figures exactly with a leading Single Taxer who, a short time ago, published his figures in a metropolitan paper in Kansas City. He said he figured that if the SingleTax was adopted the rate on land and lots in Jackson County would be eight per cent. After a careful examination at the court house in Kansas City, I have arrived at exactly the same conclusion. If you take all taxes off the millions of dollars worth of personal property in Kansas City and Jackson County it would require a levy of eight per cent on real estate to pay the expenses of the government. Now every

farmer who is listening to me will bear me out in the statement that, taken one year with another, the farmer can not make eight per cent on his land. You will remember that the Single Taxers propose to assess all lands at their actual value. The valuations would necessarily have to be very large in order to obtain enough money to pay the enormous expenses of the government. The lands in Jackson County are now on an average worth more than \$100 an acre. This would require the farmer to pay a tax of \$8 an acre per year. He could not do it. In less than ten years the dream of Henry George would be realized and the Jackson County farmers' land would belong to the State. If you farmers in other counties in the State will figure a moment I expect that you will find that your situation, upon the adoption of the Single Tax would be even worse. You must remember that St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Joseph and the other large cities of the State would pay no taxes then whatever upon their buildings and upon the enormous amounts of personal property owned by their citizens. The value of these buildings and this personal property runs up into hundreds of millions. When all this was exempt the expenses of the State would remain the same. In fact, they would be increased by the necessary increase in the number of officers. And the farmers on their lands would be compelled to pay nearly the whole of this tremendous expense. How any man can advocate such a monstrosity as this is beyond human comprehension.

THE SINGLE TAX AND THE DAY LABORER.

I make an appeal here to the day laborer. Everything ultimately depends upon land. If all taxes are put upon land, land values would of necessity decrease. Sales in lands would almost be at an end, and hard times would necessarily ensue. When hard times come work is scarce, and then it is that the laborer suffers.

Our manufactories would at once suffer, for farmers would be slow to buy new machinery and new productions of any kind beyond the actual necessities of life. Then would come the discharge of thousands of laborers from our factories. I plead with working men to think before they take this foolish leap in the dark. I ask them to read history a little before they decide to go with Mr. George and Mr. Lybarger and overturn the economic policy of every civilized nation the world has known.

THE SINGLE TAX AND THE FARM HAND.

From nine to twenty-five years of age, when not at college, I worked on a farm. I had much to do with farm hands. I know much of the hopes and aspirations of farm hands. Most farm hands hope some day to own at least a small farm of their own.

Of course, according to Mr. George's scheme, they can never own a farm. The lands will all belong to the State. I know men who started as farm hands who now

own splendid farms. This could never come under the plan of the Single Taxers. No man, if this were adopted, could own a farm at all. But there is another consideration which should press itself upon the farm hand. As soon as the men who now have farms are compelled to pay all of the taxes from their lands they will begin to economize. About the first act of economizing would be to dispense with the labor of the farm hands. The farmer would as far as possible do all of his own work, of course pressing into service the members of his family. I sincerely believe we would see what I frequently saw in Europe, where wives and little children and old men and old women were at work in the fields. I now pay my farm hands the year round \$25 a month and board them, which is somewhat above the usual price paid in my neighborhood, but I could not do this if I were compelled to pay \$8 an acre in taxes on my land. And no other man who owns a farm in the State could afford to do it.

THE SINGLETAX AND THE RENTER.

As I go over the State farmers are saying to me, "Say something to the renter." The Single Taxers are trying to get him. When I made a speech at Pleasant Hill a few days ago a gentleman told me that he sat by a renter; when I stated that the Single Taxers proposed to place all the taxes on lands, the renter said: "Well, I am for that. I will let the owner of the land pay all the taxes." But when the matter was explained to this renter he changed his mind. I do not know what ground rents for in the county where I am speaking, but in my county lands as far away from Kansas City as twenty miles—and the lands in this county, where we are now assembled, are farther away—rent on an average of about \$4 per acre. Now how can the renter expect the land owner to rent him land for \$4 an acre after the SingleTax is adopted and he is compelled to pay \$8 an acre in taxes? The logic is resistless, and any man of common sense must at once see it. If the SingleTax is adopted the renter would be compelled to pay at least double the rent for land that he pays now.

THE SINGLETAX AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF LAND.

While waiting for a train at Nevada a few days ago I again read the argument of Henry George's as to the improvement of land under his system. To my astonishment, he contended in a long discussion that lands would be better improved and kept in a better state of improvement when rented out than when owned by individuals. This argument is so contrary to all human experience that it is astonishing that any sensible man would ever make it. Every person of observation knows that rented farms are not kept up like farms on which the owners live. It is not meant that the renter would be dishonest in the matter, but there is little incentive for him to improve a farm which he is merely renting. If the SingleTax were adopted, beyond cavil renters would go from farm to farm, and, all farms being then rented out, the day would soon come when all of them would be in a dilapidated condition. We hear much now of changing crops and conserving the qualities of the soil. How little inducement there would be for

renters when they did not know how long they would be permitted to stay to arrange for changing crops and conserving the richness of the soil or building it up.

I may notice in passing another consideration. When the State owned the lands and rented them out, politics would of necessity have much to do with the matter. When this party was in power its friends would have the first show at renting the lands, and when it was hurled from power, the friends of the other party would then be the favored ones.

But it is useless for me to particularize farther. It is impossible to subject the theory of Mr. George and his followers to a close analysis without seeing that on every hand disaster would ensue. It is impossible but that a system so illogical and dishonest should lead to ruin. The SingleTax propaganda is a branch of socialism in its worst form. Some of the schools of socialism are not dishonest, but not the one to which the Single Tax belongs. Socialism as it is now understood in America means the upturning of our economic institutions and a long step towards barbarism.

The SingleTax, taken in and of itself, is popular with some classes of men, and therefore all the more dangerous. It appeals to covetousness in its lowest form. It is dishonesty personified. It engenders laziness and discourages industry. It produces class hatred by arraying the man who has nothing against the man who has something. It is the enemy of the farmer and the business man, and the friend of the idler and the tramp. It is the enemy of the laboring man. It puts the toiler on a par with the drone.

It breeds sluggards by telling men they can live in idleness and yet have the same right to the use of improved farms as the pioneers who have digged them from the prairies or the forest. It appeals to thousands of millionaires whose vast wealth is in personal property, by exempting personal property from taxation.

It is larceny in that it teaches that one man may take and use the land of another without his consent and without compensation.

It is a species of thievery never permitted by any civilization in the history of the world. It destroys the family—God's first institution—for it denies to husband and wife the right to possess a permanent place in which to rear their offspring, a right for which the fowls of the air and the wild beasts of the field will give up their lives. It destroys the Christian home, the nearest place on earth to Heaven.

Note: The apostrophe to the home with which this speech closes is found in the front part of this book.

==

APOSTROPHE TO THE HOME.

(From campaign speech against the SingleTax in 1912.)

Sacred, time-honored, divinely-appointed home. The dwelling place of the family. God's greatest institution among men.

The sweet retreat where two lives are lived as one. Where eyes meet eyes that speak, and hearts meet hearts that thrill again. Where immortal souls first behold the blaze of day and anon, childhood's merry laughter makes music sweeter than songs of birds in Paradise. Where father, mother, sister, brother divide their joys and loves, and the fires go not out upon family altars, whereon Jehovah was worshipped before the Church was born. Legalized, enduring, permanent home! Owned not "by the State to be rented to the highest bidder," as this modern doctrine of the Single Taxers would have it, but owned by the individual, in fee as homes have been owned in every civilized nation since time began; owned as the old prophet possessed the abode to which the Syrian leper came; as Cincinnatus owned the field in which he plowed when the Romans called him to save again his country from the advancing foe; as Jefferson owned Monticello, where Americans come to pay their vows; as Washington possessed Mt. Vernon, where soldiers repair to fire afresh their valor; as the Greeks all down the centuries have owned their abodes beside the silvery lakes, or the Swiss, their cottages on the Alpine heights; as men have owned their homes in the valleys, on the hilltops and by the rivers in every clime beneath the stars; as Mary and Martha and Lazarus possessed their humble but permanent abode at Bethany, where the Son of God was always so welcome; as that abiding place was possessed described by Jesus in that most marvelous of all His parables, and to which the prodigal son returned after years of wandering, and his father ran to meet him; as that abode was owned which the Savior had in mind, when, hanging on the cross, He looked down and saw His mother and that disciple whom He loved standing by, and said to his mother: "Woman behold thy son!" and then to the disciple, "Behold thy mother!" "And from that hour that disciple took her to his own home."

Beauteous, happy, enchanting home! Where business din and strife and hurly-burly must not come. Where Eos, goddess of the morn, drives her horses by at break of day, strewing flowers as she goes, when the stars have gone out, the whip-poor-will has hushed, the sunbeams are dancing in the skies and the lark is singing in the meadow. Where the yellow light is streaming through the great elms and oaks and walnuts. Where the apple, the peach, and the pear hang in luscious beauty side by side, the dew is on the watermelon, and the aroma is coming from the pomegranate. Where, ere long, the sun in his fiery chariot is about to cross the horizon; father calls; prayers are over; breakfast is eaten, and the boys go whistling to the field; the bobwhite answers; the blackbirds follow in the furrow. Where the old white dwelling with its green window shutters nestles down 'midst the evergreens, the lilacs and the roses, while the ivy climbs up its sides, and the humming bird flutters in the honeysuckles. Where within is the clean swept floor, the bounteous table and the arched fireplace. Where rosy-

cheeked childhood is sleeping in the cradle, venerable age sits in the old armed chair, and "God bless our home" hangs over the mantle.

Quiet, peaceful, restful home! The day is done. The summer clouds are clustered in the west, and the sun has just lain him down in his golden couch. The cows come lowing homeward over the hill. Father and the boys have returned from the field. They drink from the gourd at the spring or the oaken bucket that hangs in the well. The evening meal is such as only mother can prepare. Night has come. The pale moon rises slowly and hangs silent in the sky. All nature is locked in the holy hush. Naught is heard save the notes of the nightingale or now and then the jingle of the sheep bell in the fold. It is autumn. The chill of night is on, and the family is assembled about the open fire with its dancing flames. Brightness is in every eye. Cheer is in every breast. Love is in every heart. Seriousness takes its turn with merry laughter. Ere long Morpheus calls to sleep. A chapter is read from the well-worn Bible. Hark! they are singing: the eldest daughter is leading---

"Mid pleasures and palaces although we may roam,
Be it ever so humble there's no place like home.
A charm from the skies seems to hallow us there,
Which seek through the world is ne'er met with elsewhere.
Home! Home! Sweet, Sweet Home!
There's no place like Home! There's no place like Home!"

Hush! they are on their knees in prayer. Silver-haired grandfather is leading: "O thou God of Abraham. Isaac and Jacob! Thou God of the family! We thank thee for this home, sweet reminder of our Eternal Home beyond the sides. In the strength of young manhood and under Thy protecting Providence, I carved it out of the wilderness. With my hands I built the house in which we kneel. Thou knowest that my companion who now sleeps in the churchyard, did her part, and sanctified it with her pure and lofty life. May this home long remain the inheritance of our children and our children's children. If any go out as thy servant who now speaks to Thee did, not knowing whither they go, may Thy hand lead them and bring them to a Christian home. And in the morning of the resurrection, through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, Thy divine Son, may we all without loss of one be reunited as a family in our Home on High—there, ever and anon, to join in the hallelujahs of Angels and of those "who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Amen.

Precious, hallowed, consecrated home! Blessed be the God who ordained it. And all the curses which the bard had Eve to shower upon Cain when he slew his brother, Abel, rest upon the head of him who would destroy it.