

I will state in brief my point,
A Democracy is the expression of our
modern theory of life in Government
In a Democracy the individual should
pay for the support of the Gov. in proportion
to the benefits he receives and his ability
to pay. At present he does not do so, our
income tax law will make him do
so.

Our present system of taxes is
making the poor poorer and allowing
the rich to grow richer. It is not a
just system. Hear what Mr. Hoffman
says "The present distress of the farm-
ing portions of the community is largely
due to onerous and unjust taxation.

But they will never be relieved of this inequity
till the State abandons the mediæval system
of a general property tax. It has been abandoned
by all great States of modern times except
America. And it will be abandoned here also as
soon as the people once get acquainted with its
gross inequities." Hoffman says it is
onerous and unjust, a mediæval sys.
And we all know the final result of the
mediæval system of taxation. All who
have read history know the amount of blood that
was shed before the money lord could be

made to admit that justice was right.
But hear John Sherman on this (Speech
in Senate Mar. 11, '82) "As Wealth accum-
ulates this injustice in the funda-
mental basis of our system will be felt
and forced upon the attention of Congress."
Wealth has accumulated, the injustice
has been felt and a law passed to remedy
the evil, yet our wise men said the
people did not know what they wanted.
Your father and my father do not know
what they want? They have not patriot-
ism enough to pay anything for the
support of our Gov. if they know it.
We will continue to pick the goose
unaware. An income tax law says let
us know when and how you are going to pick
us. Now here is a man with lots of
money, he pays say \$75.00 tax for the support of
the government, but his neighbor has his
money in Gold certificates - not taxable - he
has a handsome income from them.
An income tax says tax his income, if
you can't reach his capital, but it is declar-
ed not constitutional so he goes free.
Just one man paying \$75.00 for the
support of the Gov. another with the same
Amt. going free!

\$75.00 *
= income
no tax.

3
Well say they, a tax on consumption will
fall equally on all, and thus we will have our
system of taxation. Again I will refer you
to Sherman in the same speech. Says he
"A system of national taxes, which rests the
whole burden of taxation on Consumption and not a
cent on profit & income is intrinsically
unjust. While the expenses of the national
Gov. are largely caused by the protection of property,
it is but right to call property to contribute
to its payment." The consumption of the rich
does not bear the same ratio to the consumption
of the poor, that the income of the rich equals the wages
of the poor, therefore a system based on Consumption
is not just, for man does not pay in proportion to
their ability. If every force has its equal &
opposite force, then every favor done should
receive an equal favor back, and we have
great incomes which are protected and no
remuneration back to the Gov. ^{from them} for this
protection than no one other class of
citizens must meet their deficiency. You
say they must pay my taxes, and yet the
expenses of the Gov. are largely caused by the
protection of my property.

~~No system of taxation that burdens up~~
~~one class of people at the expense of~~
~~another is just.~~ And No one can deny

that the ^{in our country} money is flowing from the people to a favored few. Where in the history of the world have millionaires ever flourished as they have in our own beloved America. Even the titled lords of Eng. are continually coming here for air & exercise.

No system of taxation that builds up one class at the expense of another is just. Hear what Justice Miller says of our system on this "To lay with one hand the power of the Gov. upon the property of the citizen and with the other to straw it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise & build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of the Law & called taxation."

What else
does "Protection"
mean?

Here stands our Gov. as a dispenser of justice, and rests ^{with one hand} the entire burden of support on those who have stood foremost in her battles, and in time of peace given her her daily bread, who have for her spilt their blood in battle fields and sweat in corn and cotton fields, while with the other hand she bestows her good upon the rich. She takes from the toiling masses & gives to the rolling classes.
Now let me answer up the objection to our system. It is overans, unjust,

and iniquitous, making the poor poorer and the rich richer, paupers in one place and millionaires in another. It does not make those who are protected the most pay the most, but builds up one class at the expense of another.

Then why should we have an income-tax law? Just as a Democracy is the expression of our modern theory of life, just as an income-tax law is the expression of a Democracy. The Logic of the thing goes just so, Modern theory of life, Democracy, income-tax.

All other great modern governments have adopted it but America. Eng. has an income-tax and collects \$7 1/2 % of it just as our law provided for its collection. It is no L. Q. Whiskey law experiment, it is a tried and proven law. It is a success and in general use. We only are lagging in the back grounds of Medieval civilization. Let us rise up and come forth and show to the world that we are what we are.

Let us see what some wise & some rich men say of our income-tax.

Mr Carnegie said: "Of all forms of taxation this seems the wisest" "The love of money is the root of all evil" should men be allowed to hoard up money, pile up their millions, and never be made to feel that they are responsible to the Gov. under whose laws and protection they have accumulated it? Hear Mr. Carnegie further, "Men who continue hoarding great sums all their lives should be made to feel that the Community (Gov.) cannot be deprived of its just share" Yet they do feel so and would make us think the Gov. is indebted to them just because they are rich. They will not admit that because they are rich they are more protected & therefore should pay more to that which protects them. They deny the law of nature that for every force there must be an equal and opposite force. But what does

Rogers say of this. "Taxation in proportion to benefits received is sufficiently near the truth for the practical operations of Gov."

There is your income tax pure and simple, and it can't be denied. But Sismondi goes further even and says "Even tax should fall on

revenue not on capital." A farmer with an enormous capital in lands & property that he cannot make bring him an income should not be forced to pay more taxes than the man with Gov bonds who has an enormous income, yet the farmer pays the tax and the bond holder goes free. An income tax would right these wrongs. An income tax is the only just tax. It answers the demands of our modern civilization, for it falls equally on all, does not change industry, the distribution of capital, nor does it effect prices, and yet it is the cheapest assessed and collected.

Hear what R. E. Thompson says of it. "The most modern and - fairer form of taxation, is the income tax" - while falling equally on all, it occasions no change in the distribution of Capital or in the material direction of industry, and has no influence on prices. No other is so cheaply assessed or collected."

Do we not need some law that will make us more economical with public money? How common are the expressions "It is State property" Let it

8.
9. Uncle Sam is able to hear it &c.
We need something that will produce
economy with public money. Some-
thing that will make us feel that it is
our property, that we are in direct
touch with the Gov. An income
tax will do this, Thompson says
on this, "No other brings home to the
people so forcibly the fact that it
is to their interest to insist upon a
wise economy of national revenue."

Our present system does not meet
the needs of our age, an income tax
would, and the people demand it,
for they realize that it would be the
greatest of preventative possible to
anarchy ^{as it will help the agricultural classes} says one of our most prominent
financial heads, The greatest safe-

guard against anarchy in this
Country is the great agricultural class
and they have in nearly every one of
their national meetings asked for the
passage of an income tax law. Not as
a matter of spite or prejudice, nor
sectionalism but as one of justice and right.

And yet our wise men say the masses
are not ready for it. They demand it.
But it is the men of high estate who

do not want it. They wish to slip their
just part of the expenses of this Gov.
off on the shoulders of those who are not able to
bear it. Unless the burdens of
Gov. are borne by those most able to
bear them, can it be a success

It is in a sense like a game of foot ball.
What men are put in the line to bear the
burden of the game, the men with little or
much muscle, the men who are able to bear
the burden of the game or the weaklings of
college? Just so it should be with our
Gov. The men who are able should be forced to
bear the burden of taxation. There is a place on the
team for weak men, it is behind the line,
they have their duty to perform and must do so or
the game is a failure. They must contribute
in proportion to their ability and when that is
done we have a successful team just as with our
Gov. There is a place for those less able to pay. They
must contribute their part. They must help
support the Gov. but when the burden is
placed upon them they can't successfully carry
it. But I have shown you conclusively that
our present system does place the burden on
the poor and not the rich. Then our maxim
does not hold in our Gov. That the more a man
has the greater are his obligations" But this

holds "The more a man has the less are his obligations." The more he receives from the State the less he is due back to the state and the more the State is due to him." Now I have shown you that an income tax is the only remedy for this evil.

In conclusion,

A Democracy is the growth of a new modern theory of life. An income tax is the growth of a Democracy.

The more a man has the greater are his responsibilities. The more protection a Gov. gives a man the more he is indebted to that Gov.

Our present system of taxation does not carry out this principle, why? because it places the burden of taxation on that that brings to the owner the least profit and lets go that that brings in the greatest profit. It is a tax also on consumption, and the consumption of the rich is to the consumption of the poor not as the income of the rich is to the earnings of the poor. It is such that our great financial heads call it Onerous, unjust, and iniquitous. It is not a safe with an age of civilization. The people who have the spirit of Democracy demand another.

21.1
On the other hand, an income tax will carry out these principles, it places a tax on their income and makes the rich realize that they are part and parcel of this Gov. and that the Gov. is not for them alone. It produces economy in public affairs. It holds in a reasonable bounds wealth while at the same time it encourages the poor. It makes all classes feel that this is "Our Gov." At the same time it does not affect prices, or the material direction of wealth, but is easy to assess and cheaply collected. It is such that our great thinkers say of it, "It is the fairest system of taxation," "The only just system," "Sufficiently near the truth of working system," &c.

It was a step towards the attainment of John Stuart Mills' famous utterance "Equality of taxation, as a maxim of politics means equality of sacrifice" Let the day hasten when this shall be in practice.