Jamestown, that bell was calling the followers of Budda to worship. Four tri-centennials might have been celebrated in that temple.

Go to Benares, India, and you will find a pagoda. Two thousand five hundred years ago the foundation was laid. Eight tri-centennials have passed since then.

Go into Egypt and you will find a sphynx carved by one whose name has long since been forgotten. For something like forty centuries its sleepless eyes have looked out upon that verdant strip that forms the wondrous valley of the Nile. It was there before Columbus thought of the New Land; it was there before Cicero thundered against Cataline; it was there before Joseph was carried down into Egypt. Tri-centennials have passed since that silent sentinel began to guard the land of the Pharaohs. Measured by years, I repeat, this is not an old settlement; but measured by achievements, it has no equal in recorded history.

From this triple settlement along the shores of the Atlantic, the pioneers have gone out until they have given to the world a marvelous industrial development; made this the intellectual leader of the world; established here a moral center, from which good influences go out to every other nation; and converted this young nation into a political mecca to which the reformers of every land come to renew their inspiration.

I might, with profit to you and myself, dwell upon these phases of our nation's great development. I might speak of the wonderful industry of my countrymen; I might tell you how they have opened mines; how they have bridged rivers; how they have converted deserts into fertile farms. I might tell you how they have bound all parts of this country together with bands of steel and with copper wire; I might tell you of a people who produce and consume every year something like three times the amount produced and consumed by any equal population in the world or in history. I might tell you of the schools that bring to every child an opportunity to secure an education, a school system commencing with the kindergarten and ending with the great university. I might tell you of this nation's growth in altruism and of the speed of our ideas of government. There is not a land in the world that has not been illumined by the light that was kindled here three centuries ago.

But the proprieties of this occasion require that I confine myself to matters of government. It is fitting that Virginia should celebrate this day, for in matters of government Virginia has played a supreme part. During revolutionary days the Old Dominion furnished not only the first, but the greatest of our executives. During the revolutionary days Virginia furnished the greatest of all statesmen—not of that period alone, but of all time, for no other statesman, before or since, stands in the class with Thomas Jefferson. But, not satisfied with presenting the greatest executive and statesman, Virginia presented an orator worthy to be classed with Demosthenes, who has for more than twenty centuries been the world's model in public speaking. As an impassioned orator, even Demosthenes was not superior to Patrick Henry.

Sometimes I receive a letter from a student who tells me that he is a born orator, and wants to know what such an one should do to prepare himself for his life work. I generally reply that orators must be born like other people, but that birth is the smallest part of an orator's equipment. Men are not born orators. If I want to calculate the future of a young man in public speaking, I do not ask him whether his mother spoke well, or his father spoke a great deal; I do not think it makes much difference. An orator is a product of his time, and there are and always will be orators when there are great interests at stake, and when men arise with a message to deliver. There are two essentials in oratory; first that the man shall know what he is talking about, and second, that he shall mean what he says. You can not have eloquence without these two essentials. If a man does not know a thing he can not tell it—if he is not informed himself he can not inform others, and if he does not feel in his own heart he can not make anybody else feel. And next to these two, I would place clearness of statement. There are not only certain self evident truths, but all truth is self-evident, and the best service one can render truth is to present it so clearly that it can be understood, for if the truth is clearly stated you do not need to defend it, it defends itself. I do not mean to say that any truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it. I think it was Lord Macauley who said that if any money was to be made by it, learned men would be found to dispute the laws of gravitation. But what I mean to say is this, that a truth can be so clearly stated that no one will dispute it unless he has some reason for disputing it, sometimes a pecuniary reason, sometimes a reason founded upon prejudice, or some other selfish interest, and when you find a man disputing a self-evident truth there is no use arguing with him; it is a waste of time. Argue with some one who is open to conviction. For instance, if you say to a man, "It is wrong to steal," a self-evident truth, and he says, "I do not know about that," it is no use to argue with him—search him, and you will probably find the reason in his pocket.

Next to clearness of statement, I would put conciseness of statement—the saying much in a few words. Patrick Henry had all of these qualities. He knew what he was talking about, he understood the fundamental principles of the science of government; he understood human rights, and he understood the human heart. He not only knew what he was talking about, but he meant what he said—he spoke from his heart to the hearts of those who listened. There were learned and influential men in those days who opposed him, but when he made his impassioned appeal to the sense of justice he was greater than all of them. He had the power of stating a question clearly. He could strip away the verbiage that is sometimes used to conceal ideas, he could present the idea clearly, and he could present a thought in a few words. No great thought has ever been more strongly presented, more clearly presented, more concisely presented than that great thought which he presented when he exclaimed: "Give me liberty or give me death!" He might have spoken for hours, but he could not have added to the strength of the statement by the use of further words. He was a great orator, and his influence rested upon his ability to speak to the hearts of the people. He did not speak for himself, no orator can speak for himself and be eloquent. He must have a larger cause. If a man is to be eloquent he must speak for mankind; only then can he appeal to the hearts of men. A man is of little importance in this world, except as he can advance a principle, or help his fellows. Patrick Henry seized a great principle and brought it into prominence. He spoke not for himself, but for all the people of this country—he was the voice of the people, he was the conscience of the masses, and therefore when he spoke for them he carried conviction. He presented in a few words the greatest theme that we have to deal with in matters of government. I will read you four propositions which he set forth in a few words—four propositions which mean more in matters of government than any other four propositions that I know of, except the four stated in the Declaration of Independence. Let me read you these propositions:

First, "Every attempt to rest such power (the power to levy taxes) in any other person or persons whatsoever, other than the general assembly aforesaid, has a manifest tendency to destroy British as well as American freedom."

What is the principle embodied in that statement. It is that liberty is universal in its application, and that you can not strike it down in one part of the world without striking it a blow in every other part of the world. There was an American, a young man reared in the new country, not acquainted with the classics; there he was warning the people of England that if they dared to strike down liberty in our country they would strike it down in their own country at the same time. He was wiser than the statesmen of England, because he understood human rights and he understood human hearts. He knew that when one denied liberty to others he attacked the foundation upon which his own liberty stood. It was an important lesson, and England learned it, and she has not attempted to govern other colonies of her own race as she had attempted to govern our colonies. She learned something from Virginia's great orator, and she has not forgotten the lesson up to this time. Canada today is more free because of the words Patrick Henry spoke. Australia is more free because of the fight that Patrick Henry led. New Zealand has more liberty because of the wisdom that Patrick Henry taught.

Another thought that he expresses. Let me read this resolution:

"Resolved, That the taxation of the people by themselves or by persons chosen by themselves to represent them, who can only know what taxes the people are able to bear and the easiest mode of raising them, and are equally affected by such taxes themselves, is the distinguishing characteristic of British freedom, and without which the ancient constitution can not exist."

Now I want to refer to the last portion first. "And are equally affected by such taxes themselves." My friends, Patrick Henry has put into few words an indictment against every colonial system that this world has known. The curse of the colonial system is that the people who make the laws for the colonies do not have to live under the laws, and therefore the colonies are sacrificed to the mother country. It has always been true. It was true when we were colonies. England tried to sacrifice our industries to her industries and our people to her people. Go down into Mexico and you will find that the war with Spain grew out of the fact that Spain was sacrificing Mexico to Spain. Go into Cuba, and you will find that the thing that stirred the people to revolution was that Spain was sacrificing Cuba to Spain. Today the thing that stirs the heart of the native of India is that England is sacrificing the people of India to England. It has always been true that the mother country sacrifices the colonies to the mother country, and we are not entirely free from it ourselves, for we have sacrificed the industries of the Philippines to the industries of the United States. We have deprived them of their markets, we have made them subjects of this country, and we have compelled them to depend upon our laws, and then we have refused to treat them justly because great interests in our own country demanded first consideration. In that phrase Patrick Henry put his finger upon the evil that runs through every colonial policy. The people who make the laws do not live under them.

I have sometimes in the north had occasion to remind our republican brethren that they were very inconsistent when they objected to the suffrage qualifications in the south and yet would not allow the Filipinos to be citizens at all, and I have emphasized this very point. The black man when he can not vote has this protection, that he lives under the law that the white man makes for himself, and that that is a protection, but we make the Filipino live under a law that we make for him, and that we would not live under ourselves.

But the two thoughts that I desire to emphasize today are expressed in this resolution—taxation and representation. Taxation is the most permanent question that we have to deal with. Other questions may come and other questions may go, but taxation like Tennyson's "Brook" goes on and on forever. We may dispute about the amount, we may discuss the method, but there will always be taxation. The power to tax is the power to destroy, and those who can exercise the taxing power can exercise it to the destruction of those whom they tax. Now, we have two kinds of taxation, direct taxation and indirect taxation. Direct taxation is better than indirect taxation—why? Because a thing that you can watch is not as dangerous as a thing which you can not watch. The best definition of indirect taxation I have ever read was given by a Frenchman. He said that its chief merit was that by means of it you could get the most feathers off a goose with the least squawking, and I have sometimes thought that man had to have some of the qualities of the goose to be fond of indirect taxation. Indirect taxation is most liable to abuse because excesses are not so easily observed and, therefore, not so quickly corrected.

People bear much heavier burdens when they are collected indirectly than they would be willing to bear if they were collected directly. Now most of our taxes, nearly all for the support of the federal government, are collected on consumption and taxes on consumption are the most inequitable that there are, because a tax upon consumption taxes people according to what they need and not according to what they have. Our needs are more uniform than our possessions, for God was the creator of our needs and he was quite democratic in his method of distributing them. We all need about the same amount of food and we need about the same amount of clothing. It takes the same amount of fire to protect us from the cold, we need the same shelter. When you tax people according to consumption you make the poor man pay more than his share and the rich man less than his share.

There are two forms of taxation that are more equitable than taxes on consumption. One is taxation in proportion to the property. If one man has a home worth one thousand dollars, and another man has a business block worth half a million, why should they not pay in proportion to the property they own? It is property that needs the protection of the government. Go into your courts, talk to your policemen, and you will find that it is property, not human life, that most needs protection. Human life needs protection far less than property—then why not tax property, if property is the chief object of the government's care.

But there is a better form of taxation even