

has strengthened my faith by showing me that were it not for our ignorance of natural law we should find the bounty of nature sufficient for all her children. He has given me a purpose in life, something to work for which is eminently practicable, capable of immediate and progressive application, yet fundamental in its character, appealing to the loftiest patriotism and the purest religion.

"There are enough to rear monuments to the heroes of causes long since won. Let us raise a monument of high endeavor to the prophet of this new cause, until the truth he brought shall remold public opinion, send Presidents to the White House, teach wisdom to the law maker, humanity to the priest, and lay the foundations of a truly democratic state in which it shall be possible for every honest and industrious citizen at least to dwell in security beneath his own vine or fig tree.

"Such a state, founded on a knowledge of natural law and a respect for human rights, is a monument which we shall yet build to the memory of Henry George."

Among other speakers were Dean Williams, who acted as chairman of the meeting, Louis F. Post, and Rev. Chas. E. A. Eaton, recently called to fill one of the largest churches in Cleveland. He admitted at the outset that he didn't know anything about single tax, but he said he revered the memory of Henry George because he was so much a man.

Dr. Eaton was billed to speak of Henry George, the prophet, and he declared emphatically that the spirit of the prophet was in Henry George as it had been in no other man during the last century. "Possessed of great moral quality, Henry George was a teacher of morals. He told men that they could not run the government without moral laws, nor could they run society or politics without morals."

Dr. Eaton referred to Mayor Johnson as a man with an ideal, and he said that the one greatest characteristic of Henry George was the fact that he was a man with a high ideal, an ideal that he lived, fought and died for.

"The prime need of to-day is public men with ideals," declared Dr. Eaton. "Thank God that in 100 years there was one man brave enough to offer up his life in behalf of humanity and an ideal. Henry George sealed his ideals with his blood."

AT SEATTLE.

The dinner at Seattle was addressed by a number of new comers into the single tax ranks. The banquet hall was decorated with a life-like crayon portrait of the man whose birthday was the occasion of the presence of the guests, and was hung with national flags. During the banquet stringed instruments contributed to the enjoyment of those present. Rev. Dr. L. L. Woods was asked to invoke a blessing, and for an hour thought was given to nothing else but the good things on the tables.

Afterward O. T. Erickson, as toastmaster, opened the serious ceremonies of the evening by reading letters from the following invited

but absent guests: Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, O.; Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati; Louis F. Post, editor of the *Chicago Public*; Joseph W. Bucklin, of Grand Junction, Colo.; a telegram from John S. Crosby, of New York, and an editorial from the *Boston Post* sent by W. L. Crossman.

Tom L. Johnson wrote as follows

EXECUTIVE OFFICES, Cleveland.

TOM L. JOHNSON, Mayor.

August 27, 1901.

Mr. Lee Melleur, 2017 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash:

DEAR SIR—Your favor of the 20th inst. received, and I appreciate very much your kind invitation, which, however, it is impossible for me to accept for a number of reasons, among which is the fact that we are to hold a memorial meeting here the same evening, program of which I enclose.

Single taxers have every reason to feel encouraged, for on all sides evidences are springing up which reveal that the leaven of this great truth has been working in places least suspected, and the time is much nearer at hand than perhaps we realize, when the first fruits of Henry George's faithful sowing shall appear.

Again thanking you for your favor, I am, with best wishes, sincerely yours,

The first speaker introduced was Dr. David De Beck, whose toast, "Personal Recollections of Henry George," was listened to with marked attention. Dr. De Beck told his listeners how in his youth a copy of George's first pamphlet fell into his hands and how he sat down one evening to read it and was called to breakfast from the closing chapters. "And," he added, "it was there under that student's lamp that I verily believe was born the first single taxer in the Ohio Valley. Five years later I met Mr. George in person, and upon asking him about the results of his work was told that my own letter to him was one of but thirteen commendatory communications he had received regarding the ideas he had so ably advanced. And it is a proof of the man's optimism that he was very much encouraged that he had made even that impression. In matters of expediency Mr. George was always ready to seek and accept advice, but in matters of principle nobody could swerve him. And when his stern political principles called him into active warfare which he was at that time too enfeebled to endure, the result was his martyrdom, the one event in a decade to add dignity to New York politics."

New York single taxers will remember A. J. Wolf, who never wearied in well doing. Mr. Wolf is now in Seattle, and his speech was a splendid presentation of the facts that illustrate the remarkable growth of the single tax movement.

SPEECH OF ALFRED J. WOLF.

Despite the apparent abandonment by a majority of the people of North America and the British Islands of their faith in the natural rights of man, as outlined in our Declaration of Independence, believers in that doctrine may take heart and rejoice

when they become aware of the rapid strides of a movement which, when it gains full headway, must, merely through the irresistible operation of economic law, reinstate Democracy and make the freed people of these United States again the guiding star and hope of the oppressed throughout the world.

In order that it may gain a permanent place in the institutions of a people, any movement which proposes to better social conditions must appeal to the moral sense of mankind, and its foundations must be laid in justice and righteousness. It must, moreover, be demonstrated to be practical in operation and uniformly beneficial wheresoever put in practice. Because all this can be affirmed of the single tax, it has, without the aid of a political party or a daily press, without resorting to any of the methods which tend towards political and commercial success, with the possessors of wealth and the power in control of government hostile to its principles and aims,—without the assistance of these, and indeed in spite of their opposition, it has achieved a progress which seems little less than marvellous. It is not easy to realize that less than twenty-five years have elapsed since an obscure man, who had followed the humble occupations of a common sailor and compositor, declared at the conclusion of an address on the land question to a dimittive audience, that he had that night raised a standard that, whatever its vicissitudes, would never be lowered. Well indeed has our preceptor and leader, Henry George, proved himself to be worthy of the title of the Prophet of San Francisco, which was bestowed upon him in derision by his Grace the Duke of Argyll. Those among us who first "saw the cat" as recently as fifteen years ago vividly remember the disgust and ridicule which one invited by advocating the doctrine of the single tax, and how few and far between were its adherents. And yet, to-day, friends of land value taxation are to be reckoned by the hundreds of thousands, and, possibly, the majority of the people of the United States are unconscious single taxers, requiring but a full acquaintance with its philosophy and advantages to become avowed supporters.

Wherever the English tongue is spoken the fiscal phase of the single tax is entering the stage of practical politics, not, it is true, under the name of the single tax, but in policies that, when developed, must logically and inevitably lead towards that goal. In some countries, it has indeed passed through the political and experimental stages and has become a permanent branch of the public revenue system. In every instance it has belied and put to shame the doleful predictions of disaster and failure exploited by prejudiced and interested opponents, and, however slight or partial its application, the beneficial results have invariably justified the faith and vindicated the claims of its founder.

Every reader of the letters of Frank G. Carpenter from New Zealand, published weekly in the *Post-Intelligencer* of this city,

must have remarked that at the outset he was far from favorable to the system of taxing land values and exempting improvements in vogue there. But, after interviewing the premier, Mr. Seddons, and conversing with many who had at first opposed the innovation, and after noting the healthy condition of trade, the rapid, solid growth of the country and the contentment of the people, he confessed that he was compelled to admit its success and the disappearance of active opposition. New Zealand has more laws on her statute books designed to specially help the wage earner than any other country in the world, but Mr. Carpenter acknowledged that it was not to this labor legislation, but to the land laws, that the great prosperity of New Zealand was due. These laws have broken up the large landed estates held for speculation, forced their owners to divide them up into small tracts and offer them for sale; they have encouraged the use of land, increased the number of owners, freed industry and stimulated enterprise, besides placing the credit of the country on a higher level.

Those of us who keep in touch with the movement by reading single tax publications are familiar with the fact not as yet made known by the daily press, which "publishes all the news which is fit to print," that in 1899 the Senate of Colorado appointed a revenue commission to study the tax laws of New Zealand, and the other countries of Australasia. During the winter and spring of 1899 and 1900, Hon. James W. Bucklin, chairman of the commission, sojourned in those countries and made an exhaustive examination of their tax systems and their effect upon public revenues, industry, and the condition of the masses, for which he was afforded every facility by the authorities. His report, now published, which amply confirms the observations and conclusions of Mr. Carpenter, but in greater detail, was accepted and signed by his fellow-members of the commission, who, in pursuance thereof, introduced in the Senate a bill to submit to a vote of the people in 1902 an amendment to the State constitution giving the Legislature "power by law to exempt any or all personal property and improvements on land from any and all taxation." It further provided that "once in three years, but not oftener, the voters of any county in the State may, by vote, at any general election, exempt or refuse to exempt from all taxation for county, city, town, school, road, and other local purposes, any or all personal property and improvements on land; but neither the whole nor any part of the full cash value of any rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, exclusive of the improvements thereon, shall be exempted." This bill passed the Legislature by more than two-thirds majority in each House, and as it has been endorsed by the leading newspapers of the State, by organized labor, and by many of the leading lawyers, business men and citizens of Colorado, the probability is that it will receive an affirmative popular majority in 1902. In that event Colorado will enjoy the proud and

unique distinction of being the pioneer American commonwealth to adopt the only just and truly democratic system of raising public revenue. It may be safely predicted that when its successful working and the resulting benefits become known other States will not be slow to follow the example of Colorado. An instance in point is the rapidity with which Massachusetts found imitators when she had put the Australian ballot law into successful and satisfactory operation.

Last spring our hearts were cheered and our enthusiasm stimulated by the election of that exceptional millionaire, Tom L. Johnson, to the Mayoralty of the City of Cleveland, Ohio. That city is in the heart of a district which is supposed to be more thoroughly saturated with the protective tariff delusion than any other part of the State. And yet, in the face of Johnson's well known and repeatedly announced declarations in favor of absolute free trade, and his unreserved statement that, if elected, he would enforce the laws as they stood but would do all in his power to secure such changes in the system of taxation as would eventuate in the single tax, he was elected by an unusually large majority. Of course it goes without saying that the large corporations, and particularly those which enjoy the possession of public franchises without any adequate return in taxation to the public, were opposed to him, and are still bitterly hostile. The wealthy tax shirker and dodger has no use for him; neither has the machine politician of either of the great parties. He has, however, already furnished a demonstration that the business of a great city corporation in which every resident is a stockholder can be conducted precisely like any private enterprise in the interest and for the sole benefit of the people who own it. Not only has he disarmed the sneers and misrepresentations of his detractors, but he has gained the confidence of the masses and to-day the attention of every municipality on the continent is turned toward Cleveland, Ohio watching Johnson's "experiment in honest government."

Disregarding the offices and the mere office-seekers, he secured the adoption by the Ohio State Democratic Convention of a platform the leading planks of which are directed to a reform in the abominable and discriminating tax methods of the State and especially insisting that railroads and other corporations possessing valuable privileges granted by the community should be assessed for taxation precisely like the farmers and other private persons. To us, the question of Democratic success or failure in Ohio is of secondary importance to the introduction of the vital issues of local taxation into a political campaign. We may rest assured that at last the incidence of taxation will receive the attention which it demands and that this and succeeding campaigns will serve to educate the people in correct principles.

At every session of the State legislatures the tax laws are up for their periodical tinkering and patching, for they are so defectively constructed that they always leak. Representa-

tives from country districts are eager to devise new schemes to increase taxes on personal property for the purpose of catching the rich city man. They persistently disregard the fact that such attempts have always failed and that they always result in letting the intended victim go free, while an additional premium is put upon perjury and the tax burden on the easily-caught farmer is increased. Thus city and country lock horns and no progress can be made towards improving the antiquated, crooked, and discredited systems of taxation in common use. To end these ignorant and harmful experiments in tax law repairing, some of the cities are endeavoring to secure a law for local option in taxation similar to the one to be voted upon in Colorado next year. Single taxers, very naturally, are peculiarly interested in local option, for it opens the field of discussion and they have the only just, economical and scientific system to propose. It is indeed a hopeful sign that such bills have been under consideration by States so widely separated and with such diverse interests as New York, New Jersey, and Maryland, Missouri, Texas, and Colorado. A bill of that character has been repeatedly defeated in the New York Legislature, by representatives from farming districts. A most encouraging indication in that State is the endorsement of such a bill by a unanimous vote of such an old, conservative, and highly influential body as the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Not the least in the order of importance and significance is the extraordinary growth of our ideas in Great Britain since Henry George's first visit to that realm less than twenty-five years since. In that stronghold of landlordism more than three hundred towns and cities, including London, Liverpool, and Glasgow, have petitioned Parliament for a grant of power to tax land values. In 1896, in compliance with the petition of that most democratic representative body in the world, the London County Council, a royal commission of eighteen members, mostly from among the aristocracy, was appointed to examine the existing systems of taxation and to suggest needed changes. This commission has recently filed its final report. The question

of taxing land, or site, values was given special consideration, and while twelve members, constituting a majority, reported adversely, only seven of these, a minority of the whole, signed the report adversely. Five members of the commission, viz., Lord Balfour of Burleigh, (Chairman of the Commission), Lord Blair Balfour (Lord Justice General of Scotland), Sir Edward Hamilton (Assistant Secretary of the Treasury), Sir George Murray (Secretary to the Post Master General), Mr. James Stuart, filed a minority report in which, after a lengthy discussion of the principles of land value taxation, they admitted that the logic of facts compelled them to recommend the moderate taxation of site values. One other member of the commission, Judge Arthur O'Connor, carrying out the arguments and reasons of these five gentle-

men to their inevitable and logical conclusion, submitted that "Land and land only should be rated for public purposes," thereby urging the full single tax scheme. No more fitting commentary need be made upon this remarkable and opportune series of reports than the simple statement that since their publication the Urban District Councils of Great Britain, representing more than four hundred towns, have decided to petition Parliament for local option in taxation along the line of Judge O'Connor's recommendations.

A few more words in conclusion. The question may be asked why do not single taxers endeavor to secure at once their proposed reform in its entirety instead of by the roundabout way of local option. My reply is that fundamental changes of so large a scope as contemplated by the single tax are not likely to be accepted at once because of the reluctance of property owners and the business community to adopt a measure the disturbing influence of which they fear, and because it is safest and wisest to permit the full results to develop naturally from a partial trial of the system, in order that people may become familiar with its theory and practical effects. Our cause is so firmly based on justice, and, when comprehended, it appeals so strongly to common sense and the love of fairness, that when the faces of a community are set in the direction of the single tax they cannot and will not wish to stop until the whole wasteful, clumsy, and demoralizing method of raising public revenues in common use is obliterated from the statute books and a simple, scientific, honest system, readily understood and easily applied, is substituted. Not that a mere reform in the method of levying and collecting taxes was the object for which our beloved master, Henry George, lived and died, and for which we are now striving and hoping; that, of itself, would be a lofty endeavor, but to us single taxers the fulfillment of our scheme of taxation will only serve as the opened portals to the path which would lead to a happier and nobler humanity. By the mere operation of economic laws left free to act by the single tax, trusts and other combinations in restraint of trade and the liberty of the individual would disappear and become impossible without the need of restrictive legislation. The Augean stable of American politics would be cleansed and purified. The frightful struggle for existence, the strenuous life of the worker, would cease and the rich man's demoralizing and degrading fear of poverty would vanish.

Charles G. Heifner, whose name occurs in another column and who is a recent disciple, made an address which the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* said was one of the most cultivated and well-thought-out speeches of the evening.

SPEECH OF CHAS. G. HEIFNER.

This gathering is only one of many held to-night throughout the United States to pay tribute to the name and fame of Henry George—a man who thought and dared to speak. Upon this sixty-second anni-

versary of his birth it is eminently fit and proper that students of political economy and sociology should seek to hold firm faith and awaken new interest in the teachings of one of the greatest and noblest men that the nineteenth century produced.

Henry George did not write for one only people, nor for any particular time; he wrote for all men for all time. Truth is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, and Henry George spoke no word, no line, that he did not believe to be the truth. No Spencerian recantations are found in his writings.

He was brave. It requires a high degree of moral courage to speak the truth always. He formulated his own motto when he said "I propose to take nothing for granted, but to bring even accepted theories to the test of first principles. I propose to beg no question, to shrink from no conclusion, but to follow truth wherever it may lead. If the conclusions that we reach run counter to our prejudices, let us not flinch; if they challenge institutions that have long been deemed wise and natural, let us not turn back." If, during his eventful life, he ever deviated in the least from the high course thus marked out, even his opponents have not remarked it. And the best test of his fidelity to truth is found in the fact that the book from which I have quoted has been translated and published in the French, German, Italian, Dutch, Swedish, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese languages. Few American authors have been thus honored or so widely read.

It is the more to be regretted, therefore, that so many of his countrymen are so jealously ignorant concerning one of our greatest men and know so little of the mighty truths which he uttered.

I think I do not do my fellow-citizens an injustice when I say that a majority of them have no true conception of his purposes and teachings. The popular estimate of him, both as a man and an author, is erroneous. He is frequently unjustly regarded as having been simply an agitator, as a man with only one idea, who sought to revolutionize society and existing property rights by urging the enactment of some impracticable, hair-splitting theory termed the "single tax," and the enforcement of which would result in absolutely destroying title to land, and in compelling those who have to divide with those who have not. This estimate, which, I submit, I have not overdrawn, could not be farther from the truth. He did, indeed, attack existing social and economic theories and conditions, but the remedy he offered took from no man what he had earned, deprived no man of the fruits of his efforts and labors, and prevented no man from accumulating wealth or achieving fame. Is there a man who wants more than he earns, who wants the results of other men's endeavors, who wants the wealth created by others or the community? If there be, him only has he offended. He held that the present system of taxation was unjust, that the lowliest child born into this world has an equal right wit

the child born in a palace to have air to breathe, water to drink, and land to live on without paying tribute therefor, and that governments had no right in the sight of God or in the light of the teachings of Christ to give the control of those rights, advantages, or privileges, which nature or the community has created, into the hands of the influential few as against the claims of the undesigning many. Hence it was to overthrow entrenched wrong and unjust precedent, which he saw everywhere around him, that he devoted the best years of his life; and he died as he had lived, clad in the armor of truth, his face toward the foes of justice, fighting "for the cause that lacks assistance, 'gainst the wrongs that need resistance."

He was a man of exceptional mental power, a careful observer, a close reasoner, cautious in arriving at conclusions on anything less than overwhelming evidence. He had traveled far and observed much, and from observations and study he concluded that the chief cause of poverty was to be found in the unjust and inequitable system of taxation prevailing not only in this country but in almost all others. Now the power to tax is one of the most far-reaching prerogatives of governments. It carries with it the power and evils of confiscation. It is as old as government itself, and in its various applications it has attached not only to man in his own person, but has claimed and collected tribute from every form of human industry, toil, accumulation and possession. The evils and inequalities growing out of the exercises of this power have been as numerous as the capabilities of the human mind to conceive. Driven to desperation by the extravagance of dissolute monarchs and rulers, official treasurers, almost from time immemorial, have exacted contributions from every person and valuable thing within the inexorable arm of the law. With the military to exact compliance, resistance on the part of the subject has usually been futile, while alleged necessities from within and dangers from without have been the ever-ready excuses to justify, placate, and appease. The longer an injustice exists the stronger, and, to some minds, more sacred it becomes, and thus methods of taxation, defensible in the beginning on no grounds of equity or morality, have been re-enacted by parliaments and congresses, and tolerated, sustained, and upheld by the masses. Indeed, it would seem that for thousands of years governments have acted upon the theory of the French financier, Colbert, who somewhat cynically declared that "taxation was the art of so plucking the goose as to secure the largest amount of feathers with the least amount of squealing." In plain truth, I do not hesitate to say that every form of indirect taxation was designed to conceal theft, has been perpetuated to cover up extravagance, and is the legitimate outgrowth of Colbert's financial philosophy. With all our boasted intelligence, our people are the innocent instrumentalities in the hands of sentiment and tradition. Else where shall we account for the incongruous theories

concerning taxation which have grown up amongst us, and in one form or another have been enacted into statute laws?

More than one hundred years ago Adam Smith laid down four canons of taxation, the first of which is, "That the subjects of every state ought to contribute to the support of the government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities, that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy from the protection of the state." Instead, however, of acting upon that principle, it would seem that governments have sought rather to obscure and evade it. It would be difficult, indeed, to find much of the essence of that great canon in the taxation laws of this country. Syndicates, combinations, and trusts have been organized in every conceivable form and, ostensibly, for every conceivable purpose, to escape personal liability on the part of the promoters thereof, to smother competition, enhance prices, reduce wages, monopolize trade and to seal the evidences of wealth from the eye of the assessor or tax collector. Or, failing in this, flagrant and open bribery has been resorted to to accomplish the same result. Evasions of the law regarding the listing of personal property for taxation have become the rule rather than the exception. What in the early days would have been considered a crime has, in these later days, come to be looked upon as a virtue by men of large corporate wealth, holding extensive personal estates. Nor is this all. The most vicious teachings have been inculcated into the minds of the American people, especially regarding the effect of certain methods of taxation. A few years ago, back in Iowa, I heard political orators solemnly declare to the evident gratification of their audiences that a customs duty of twenty-five cents a bushel on corn, wheat, and oats resulted in an increase to just that extent in the prices of those cereals.

This was believed, notwithstanding we exported millions of bushels and imported none. Hence, a certain political party was to be eternally glorified because of its solicitous care of the farmer. Now that our manufacturers are successfully competing with those of other nations in the markets of the world, we are told by these same orators that this same customs duty, by some inscrutable process, has worked a reduction in prices. The gravity of the situation appears when we reflect that a majority of our people evidently believe both these absurd propositions.

Is it any wonder that we have been groping in a wilderness of economic doubt regarding taxation when such things are believed?

There was work, indeed, for the great mind and heart of Henry George. He took this abstruse subject, and, having mastered it himself, proceeded to elucidate, illustrate, make plain. That he is misunderstood is due simply to the fact that he has not been read and studied. Throughout all his writings, whether considering taxation in the abstract, whether

demolishing the "manufactured to order" arguments of Herbert Spencer, whether replying to the Duke of Argyll or answering the far-reaching but untenable statements of Pope Leo, there was ever the broad, humanitarian spirit of fairness, of justice for all men, high and low, rich or poor. He blamed not men, but conditions and precedents; he attacked not men, but systems, and recognizing that selfishness is inherent in us all, he acknowledged an Astor or Vanderbilt to be as much a victim of circumstances as the poorest man in the land. He opposed war, stood for peace, and pleaded for liberty, freedom and opportunity for all men in all climes. Art and literature, science and invention, statesmanship, education and enlightenment—these were the heights toward which he would have led us all.

He hoped and prayed and pleaded and believed that—

There should come from out this noise of strife and groaning,

A broader and a juster brotherhood,  
A deep equality of aim, postponing  
All selfish seeking to the general good.

There shall come a time when each shall to another

Be as Christ would have him, brother unto brother.

There shall come a time when brotherhoods grow stronger

Than the narrow bounds which now distract the world;

When the cannons roar and trumpets blare no longer,

And ironclad rusts and battle-flags are furled;

When the bars of creed and speech and race, which sever,

Shall be fused in one humanity forever."

When the world once knows and comprehends the mighty purposes set in motion by Henry George, nations will cease to wage wars for conquest and subjection—they will be actuated by higher motives than the sale of rum and gunpowder and opium, and the conquering of continents for commerce and spoilation. The energies of men will be devoted to the amelioration of mankind, not its enslavement. For—

Were half the power that fills the earth with terror,

Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,

Given to redeem the human mind from error,  
There were no need for arsenals and forts.

The warrior's name would be a name abhorred,

And every nation that should lift again  
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead  
Would wear forever more the curse of Cain.

While the world pays homage and builds monuments to its conquering chieftains and war heroes, I prefer rather to treasure in the hearts of man the memory of one who had no ambition but to do good and be just; no aspiration but "to mark out the path and

clear the way up which all the nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time," and who "dared for a great cause to fight, to suffer, if need be to die."

Speak, History. Who are life's victors?

Unroll thy long annals and say,  
Are they those whom the world calls the victors,

Who won the success of the day?

The martyrs, or Nero? The Spartans

Who fell at Thermopyla's tryst,  
Or the Persians and Xerxes? His judges,  
Or Socrates? Pilate, or Christ?

Changing only the terms I make his own language at once the measure of his life's work and his epitaph.

"He sought the law and justice. And, his nobler nature developed, there arose the desire, higher yet, that even he might somehow aid in making life better and brighter, in destroying want and sin, sorrow and shame. He turned his back upon the feast and renounced the place of power; he left to others to accumulate wealth, to gratify pleasant tastes, to bask themselves in the warm sunshine of the brief day. He worked for those he never saw nor could see; for a fame, or maybe for a scant justice, that could only come long after the clods had rattled upon his coffin lid. He toiled in the advance, where it was cold, and there was little cheer from men, and the stones were sharp and the brambles thick. Amid the scoffs and sneers that stabbed like knives, he builded for the future; he cut the trail that progressive humanity might hereafter broaden into a high-road. Into higher and grander spheres his desire mounted and beckoned, and a star that rose in the east led him on."

This is the height and breadth and depth of his mighty purpose, which, let us hope, will grow and blossom till established justice and equality shall be the heritage of all men through all the lengthened years.

Among other speakers were Judge E. D. Benson, Geo. F. Cotterill, E. W. Way, Harry W. Stern, and Rev. Mr. Simmons. We regret that we have not space for these, since all of them are worthy of permanent preservation.

Large meetings were held in Philadelphia, in San Francisco, in Cincinnati, in New Orleans and other cities. Mention of these will be found in our News department. Wherever the faithful were gathered, there, if there were but two who could meet, the anniversary of the day which saw the birth of the prophet of a better time was not allowed to pass without some appropriate sign.

#### FRANK H. WARREN.

Frank H. Warren, whose portrait appears elsewhere, was born in Sarina, Ont., September 3, 1864, and five years later went with his parents to East Saginaw, Mich., where, for seven years, he received a common school education. He removed from here to Windsor, Ont., with his parents in 1876, and a year later went to live with a doctor in Reading,