

Governor Cummins Opens the Campaign

Sounds Keynote of Iowa Republicanism Before an Immense Gathering at Des Moines.

Governor Cummins opened the republican campaign in Iowa on Saturday evening, September 26th, at Des Moines. His speech, which sounds the keynote of the campaign, follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate beyond expression the generous welcome of this meeting. Under the influence of its unbounded enthusiasm I enter the campaign before me with new inspiration for the work I am to do and a profounder faith in the principles I am to maintain. I defer until another occasion the consideration of matters pertaining to state affairs and pass directly to the issues of national concern.

The Tariff.

It was obvious for months before the democratic convention convened that, in their anxiety to find some plank upon which they could stand together, with a measure of harmony, as they float upon the rather turbulent sea over which they are sailing, they would repeat the assault so often made upon the protective system of import duties established and maintained by the republican party. When the convention came together, impelled, I assume, by the new-born zeal for unity, it declared for free trade as clearly and as unreservedly as it had formerly declared for free silver. In order that we may have before us the precise phraseology employed, I beg to read the announcement of the convention upon this subject:

"As the most alarming features of our present conditions are the evils which come from trusts, and as these evils are made possible by legislation favoring one class and against another by transportation privileges and by monopoly of original sources of supply of natural products, therefore, to the end that the evils connected with the growth of trusts may be eliminated, we call for the removal of the tariff from all trust-made goods, and we demand that all tariff schedules be adjusted with a view to a tariff for revenue only."

With this challenge before it, the republican convention met, and it gives me unqualified pleasure to read the candid statement and glowing eulogy upon the fundamental economic policy of the republican party, announced in our most recent platform:

"We reiterate our faith in the historic policy of protection. Under its influence our country, foremost in the bounties of nature, has become foremost in production. It has enabled labor to secure good wages, and has induced capital to engage in production with a reasonable hope of fair reward. Its vindication is found in the history of its successes and the rapidity with which our national resources have been developed, and we heartily renew our pledge to maintain it."

There is not a republican in the State of Iowa whose eye does not gleam with pride and whose heart does not warm with enthusiasm as he takes this bold and uncompromising oath of allegiance to the party of protection; and the knights of ancient times never rushed into the lists with higher courage than the republicans of 1903 advance to meet the enemy who deny this triumphant doctrine.

I have used the words "free trade" advisedly, because in the terminology of economics "a tariff for revenue only" and "free trade" are synonymous terms. Although the subject with which I am dealing is one which has engaged the attention of the American people more than any other during the last century, and although I despair of adding anything valuable to the literature of the discussion, I beg your indulgence while I put the opposing policies in the plainest possible speech. Import duties, as laid upon those things which we do or can produce, and they are so laid to stimulate and foster their production in our own country. They are so laid with the express design of preventing the free and unlimited competition of the producers of the world in our markets. They are so laid, believing that the competition among our own producers will hold our production to a fair American price and that we can better afford to pay the fair American price than we can afford to have our markets monopolized by foreign productions. The end sought by the protective system of duties is to supply, so far as possible, every need of our own people with their own work. Upon the other hand, a tariff for revenue is a system of duties so adjusted as to occasion the least possible interference with free commerce and restrict as little as possible the free competition of the world in our markets. It is a system which, primarily, lays its duties upon those things which we do not and cannot produce, and if such duties be insufficient, secondarily, upon those things which we do not and cannot produce in the quantities we need. This is a tariff for revenue only, and this is free trade. In the presence of an audience so intelligent and so familiar with the writings of political economists, I feel that it would be an imposition to sustain my definition of a tariff for revenue and its identity with free trade by reference to the acknowledged authorities upon such subjects. If, however, this identity is doubted by any inquiring democrat, I am quick ready to show him the avenues leading to further information. I am inclined to think, however, that when my democratic friends ponder upon the utterances of my distinguished opponent, they will not doubt what I say. In a speech delivered by Mr. Sullivan in Chicago, shortly after his nomination he said:

"The protective policy of the republican party is doomed. Yet it will men, before its last vestige is stricken from the statute books of

"the United States, that the great army of thinking men, the great body of the common people, the great body of the laboring men, must stand as one against combination, centralization, and the trust power of the present day."

Again he said:

"The protective policy is selfish, and if this law is to remain upon our statute books, you should be selfish and vote for those men and the policy that will aid you."

If these criticisms do not mean absolute hostility to the protective policy, it would be difficult to assign them any meaning whatsoever, and if the democrats, as represented by their leader, are opposed to duties levied for protection, and if their platform expresses accurately their views, it follows inevitably that they favor duties levied upon the free trade plan.

I have endeavored to make the issue presented by these platforms sharp, because I want every voter in the State of Iowa to know precisely what the democratic party proposes. I do not intend to allow my distinguished friend, their candidate for Governor, to escape the responsibility for the position his party has chosen. It is already apparent, as I shall presently establish, that he is energetically endeavoring to obscure the real issue for which he stands. It is altogether vain for him to test the capacity of his vocal chords in attempting to show that there are certain duties that are too high, and that there are certain so-called raw materials which ought not to bear any duty at all. The inquiry is, and he must face it: Shall our import duties, whatever they are, be laid under the policy of protection or shall they be laid under the policy of free trade?

As a republican he might be heard to say that the duty on steel rails is too high. As a democrat he must say that there should be no duty at all. I am perfectly willing to see every man in Iowa who in his heart believes in free trade, vote the democratic ticket; but I am unwilling to see any man who in his heart believes in the policy of protection, vote the democratic ticket because he believes that some duties are too high. Every such man belongs in the republican party, and he ought to take his place there bravely and conscientiously, and lend his influence to see that tariff duties are maintained at their proper level, neither too high nor too low. Let us do away with all that mean, strip the situation of all prejudice, and meet the question as honest, patriotic men ought to meet all the grave concerns of life. If you are a protectionist; that is if you believe that fair and reasonable duties should be levied to protect those home industries which need protection, you are a republican, and you will be false to your highest duty; if you do not give republicanism all the strength of your voice and your vote, even though you believe that the system needs readjustment. If you are a free trader, if you are a follower of the democratic platform, if you are a supporter of the democratic candidate, you cannot believe in revision or readjustment of the tariff, you must believe in a revolution of the tariff and the substitution of a system that has no protective feature in it, and which opens every market in your country, not only to the unchecked, but the invited, invasion of every nation in the world. I have done with definitions, and proceed with happy confidence to the examination of these opposing policies.

I have heard it said, sometimes by republicans, that protection is practically sound but theoretically unsound. I make no such concession. I deny and repudiate the sentiment whether it comes from friend or foe. Protection is as sound theoretically as it is efficient practically. The chief purpose of government is to prevent natural consequences and to restrain the operation of natural law. Free commerce is no more sacred than freebooting or free killing. Tariff laws are the weapons with which Nations fight for commercial supremacy. The Government is under as high obligation to prevent the capture of our markets by foreign goods, if thereby the general welfare will be promoted, as it is to prevent the capture of our flag by a foreign army. It has the same duty to protect its people against unlimited importations, if thereby we are enabled to produce for ourselves, as it has to prevent the general issue of our currency in order that the integrity of our currency may be preserved. To say that we cannot divert the natural channels of trade to our advantage, is to impeach our intelligence. I cannot dwell, however, upon this interesting, although abstract, phase of the proposition. I reiterate that tariff laws, founded upon the policy of protecting home markets, are not only of the highest efficiency, but of the strictest national morality, and I have little patience with the theorist who bases his objection to such laws upon the proposition that they contravene natural right.

With what proof does our experience supply the debate? Examine with me, if you will a moment, the general condition of the Republic when protection was first proposed. The country was young in years, small in population and almost wholly undeveloped. Nature had bestowed her gifts with a prodigality not equalled in any like territory in the world. To utilize these treasures and prepare them for the use of man, required infinite labor and vast capital, a large population and a complete diversification of industry. Most of the countries of Europe were well advanced in production, labor was cheap, and capital already centralized. Under such circumstances free com-

merce meant that whatever we needed in agriculture, which Europe could produce, would be sent to us from across the sea. It must be conceded that without the aid of protective laws, capital would have been slow to embark upon industrial enterprises, and our natural resources would have lain undiscovered, much less touched, by the magic hand which has wrought the wonderful transformation which we now witness. Every honest man must acknowledge the truth of what I have just said. I have referred to it in the merest outline. I leave it largely with you to supply the details which make the annals of our growth and development the most wonderful record ever inscribed upon the pages of time.

If, however, the reason for adjusting our tariffs upon protective lines does not appeal to you, I have evidence in the life and growth of the Republic so clear and so convincing that it must overcome the doubt of the democrat and the sneer of the skeptic. I will draw the noisy utterances of the free trader in the mighty hum of an energy which fills not only our land, but that is now heard in every market place upon the earth. I will overcome the campaign sob of the hysterical orator, in the laugh of content and prosperity which is heard high above everything else from ocean to ocean. I will drive away the gloomy countenance which my distinguished opponent wears upon the sad occasions of his political meetings, by permitting his eyes to fall upon the happy faces of the multitudes who meet in these autumn days to taste and enjoy the pleasures of the harvest home. If, after all these things are heard and seen, there are still misanthropes, I ask them to look back over the history of the country which they love, and catch a glimpse of the path over which we have come.

Prior to 1861 the United States for more than half its life had a mild, very mild, protective tariff. Since 1861, barring a few years of well measured disaster, we have been under the influence of a strong and efficient protective system. It would seem that if the republican policy is as fatal to the welfare of the people as the democratic platform and democratic orators would have us believe, the Republic must be a feeble and emaciated body, death stricken with the poison of continuous wrong and paralyzed by the rigorous repression of natural energy. The fires of ambition must be doused in the hearts of the people, and patriotism must be a lost sentiment. We must be the most contemptible figure among the Nations of the earth, and our flag must be drooping in shame before the emblems of sovereignty which float from the peaks of other lands. What an infinite travesty upon the truth! The Republic of the United States, in 115 years, not a span in the life of a Nation, has become the noblest, the most heroic, the most commanding figure in the whole community of Nations the world around. It surpasses every other country in its wealth; it has outstripped every other country in the volume and value of its productions; it has maintained free institutions at a point never before touched by man; it has administered justice with a purity never before conceived by organized society; it has clothed itself with an honor never before worn by the government of any people; it has peacefully acquired, securely holds, and wisely exercises an influence for the good of humanity for which there is no precedent in all the doings of mankind. Its people are more prosperous, live better and die better, than any other people under the sun. Its flag is the proudest emblem whose folds are touched by the winds of Heaven, and it floats in dignity and with power in every land and upon every sea. More than all this, it recognizes that it is yet upon the mountain side—that there are loftier heights to be scaled; that there is yet a more exalted plane upon which human victories may be achieved; and its maxims is, move on and up, until civilization shall embody all that mortals can possess. The man who, seeing all these things, can yet declare that the most important economic law of that brilliant career, and which exists amid the splendor of these conditions, is based upon injustice—is a robbery of one for the benefit of another,—builds up the few and destroys the many. I am totally unable to understand. The evidence, however, is not yet complete, and I venture upon a brief comparison.

In 1860 the population of the United States was 31,433,321; in 1900 it had increased to 76,303,387.

In 1880 the number of farms was 2,044,077; in 1900, 5,781,988.

In 1860 there were 140,433 manufacturing establishments, employing 1,311,246 persons, whose yearly wages amounted to \$378,878,966. The capital invested was \$1,009,855,715, and the value of the products \$1,885,861,676.

In 1900 the number of manufacturing establishments had increased to 512,555, employing 5,310,598 persons, whose yearly wages amounted to \$2,323,407,257. The capital invested was \$9,855,630,789, and the value of the products was \$13,019,251,614.

I beg that the free trader will note the startling comparisons which these statistics will furnish. With respect to many things, the information collected prior to 1860 is not complete, and I pass down to 1870 for a further basis.

In 1870 there were 52,992 miles of railway in operation in the United States; in 1900 there were 190,833 miles of railway—an increase of 261 per cent.

In 1870 we produced 235,834,700 bushels of wheat; in 1900 we produced 522,229,505 bushels—an increase of 121 per cent.

In 1870 we produced 1,094,255 bushels of corn; in 1900 we produced 2,105,102,516 bushels—an increase of 92 per cent.

In 1870 we produced 32,863 tons of coal; in 1900 we produced 238,877,182 tons—an increase of 626 per cent.

In 1870 we raised 857,000 bales of cotton; in 1900 we raised 3,644,000 bales—an increase of 325 per cent.

In 1870 the oil wells of the United States yielded 185,262,672 gallons of petroleum; in 1900 they yielded 2,396,975,700 gallons—an increase of 1198 per cent.

In 1870 we produced 1,665,179 tons of pig iron; in 1900 the output was 13,789,242 tons—an increase of 728 per cent.

In 1870 we made 68,750 tons of steel; in 1900 we made 10,539,857 tons—an increase of 15,376 per cent.

In 1870 we exported agricultural products worth \$361,188,483; in 1900 we exported agricultural products worth \$835,858,123—an increase of 132 per cent.

In 1870 we imported steel and iron worth \$32,655,454; in 1900, notwithstanding the unparalleled increase in the consumption of steel and iron, we imported them to the value of but \$20,478,727.

In 1870 our exports of manufactured steel and iron amounted to \$11,002,902, while in 1900 they amounted to \$121,913,548—an increase of 1,008 per cent.

In 1870 our exports of all manufactures amounted to \$68,279,764, while in 1900 they amounted to \$433,864,756—an increase of 535 per cent.

Our total exports in 1870 amounted to \$392,771,768; and in 1900 to \$1,294,483,082—an increase of 256 per cent.

The amount of money in circulation in the United States in 1870 was \$275,212,794, while in 1900 it was \$3,113,294,983.

Fascinating as these statistics are, I can quote no more. From every field of industry they can be paralleled, and they are open to the investigation of every man or woman who cares to pursue the inquiry. Is there yet a man in this presence who believes that protection destroys and that free trade builds up? If there be, I despair of lighting up the chamber of his prejudice. He is fortunate, however, for if he cannot be convinced, he shall still be protected, and the republican party will see to it that he is saved from the peril of his unbelief.

You will carefully observe that what I have said relates to the merits of the controversy between the policy of protection and the policy of free trade, and there is still before me the duty of examining the application of the policy of protection to conditions as they from time to time exist, and it will be my pleasure to consider that part of our platform which points out in the clearest and most emphatic phrase how this policy is to be applied to the business of our country.

Before I do so, however, it is, in this courteous and appropriate for me to give some attention to the opening speech delivered by the democratic candidate for Governor at Des Moines, on the 12th instant. I have read it with care and delight. With care, because I wanted to know how a good man could defend a poor cause; with delight, because I soon discovered how feebly even genius attacks the citadel of truth. His speech has two main divisions. In the first, he takes the tariff, the corporations, the trusts, and the rich, and in the cauldron of his eloquence he boils them together until it is impossible to distinguish the one from the other; and with glowing indignation he pours out his wrath upon the composite for whatever he finds bad in any of them. Human justice has not adopted vicious punishment, and therefore he must allow me to separate his victim into its component parts and deal with each according to its deserts. In the second division, he quotes some things I have said, many things that I have not said, to prove that I believe in competition, that some of the duties now levied upon imports are too high, and he belittles with all the solicitude of a good citizen, my inconsistency in helping to formulate the platform upon which I am now a candidate.

My first thought upon reading Mr. Sullivan's speech was one of admiration for the courage he displayed—I say nothing of the discretion, in venturing to charge the republican party in this state or myself with a sidestepping, receding, or inconsistency. In the heat of his enthusiasm he overlooked the fact, so obvious to all others, that he is at the present time living in a house built of the finest gossamer glass that ever came from the hand of an artist. It has not been many years since Mr. Sullivan was wailing the echoes all over the plains of Iowa, in his frantic demand for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 without the aid or consent of any other nation. I looked carefully over his keynote to discover how firmly he is now wedded to this financial doctrine, and I found a faint whisper in a paragraph relating to asset currency, running something like this:

"Personally and independently of party, I am an old fashioned democrat, believing in the use of gold and silver, as the money of our country, and so believing, I cannot bring my mind to the thought that the bank 'has the power, or is more secure than the government itself.'"

What a diminuendo after the crash of his eloquence in 1896 and in 1900. Nor can I forget, as I look upon the horrid picture which he paints of the dismal effects of the tariff, and when I hear the clank of the chains which he fastens upon the farmer and the artisan, as the bonds of serfdom to an iniquitous system of import duties, that a very few years ago I saw this same picture, painted by the same brush and heard these same chains rattled by the same stalwart arm; but then all this misery had been brought about, and this miserable slavery established, by the crime of 1873 and the failure to coin silver at the sacred ratio, and the tariff was not even mentioned. I am even more impressed with the courage of this speaker when I look into the democratic platform and the history of its adoption, and find not a single word from which any man can determine whether the democratic party of Iowa is for free silver or against free silver. It might be that if he beams in the democratic eye where would be less conspicuous.

It is not enough, however, to suggest counter inconsistencies, for I desire fairly and in the most amicable way, to enlighten my opponent upon some matters concerning which he has been misled. I am not a stickler for consistency, and I reserve the right to change my mind and avow the change just as often as it is necessary to hold and proclaim what I believe to be true. Respecting the tariff, however, I am not conscious of any change or modification in my views during the time that my utterances have been quoted. I have spoken often upon the different phases of the subject in the last two years, but never without the most careful reflection and the most mature consideration. I have said nothing that I desire to retract, and I reiterate in this broad and general way, everything I have said in the discussion of protection, competition, and the trusts. Referring to me, Mr. Sullivan said:

"Our worthy governor declared in 'one of his public utterances that the 'duty on steel was the cause of monopoly and increased the price to the 'consumer 100 per cent, and that the 'duty should be reduced.'"

I am sure that my friend did not intentionally impute to me a statement that was never made, and I am equally sure that if he does me the honor to read what I say tonight, he will never repeat it. I never said in any utterance, either public or private, that the duty on steel was the cause of monopoly, and I say now that in the great majority of steel products there is not at this time, and never has been, a monopoly. I never said, either in public or private, that the price of steel was increased by reason of the duty, nearly 100 per cent. The statement is not true, and no sane man would make it. I have said many times, both in public and private, that I believed that upon many of the products of iron and steel the duty was too high and should be reduced to the protective point. I repeat it, and I shall use what influence I possess to bring about that result. But this is no more an impeachment or criticism upon the policy of protection than is the censure of an imperfect law upon evidence, an attack upon trial by jury.

I quote again from Mr. Sullivan a further reference to my views. He said:

"Our worthy governor never uttered 'a truer sentiment than when he said 'that the people needed competition 'more than the monopoly needs protection.'"

This is so palpable a misunderstanding of a well known statement of mine upon this subject, that negligence borders closely on recklessness. In discussing monopolies, in a speech delivered at Minneapolis, I said:

"The consumer is better entitled to 'competition than the producer to 'protection.'"

I believed what I said then, and I believe it now. If the time ever comes when I must choose between a monopoly of any important product and the protection of that product, I am for competition. I do not believe that any producer who successfully maintains a monopoly, is entitled to the advantages of a protective duty. I do not divide the people into consumers and producers. I say that when a monopoly is established, there is one producer, and that all who use or buy the product of his monopoly are consumers; and I repeat that these consumers have a higher and better right to competition in that article than the single producer has to an import duty upon it. This position is not only consistent with the deepest devotion to the policy of protection, but it is the logical sequence of the argument for protection, for the obvious reason that one of the conditions which protection is intended to create is competition between the producers of the article protected, in the country which levies the duty.

Mr. Sullivan finds much food for melancholy in the fact that the phrase:

"We favor any modification of the 'tariff schedules that may be required 'to prevent their affording shelter to 'monopoly.'"

found in the republican platforms of 1901 and 1902, was not repeated in terms in the platform of 1903, and because I favored the substitution of another expression. He asserts that the clause in our platform substituted for the one to which I have just referred is:

"Duties that are too low should be 'increased, and duties that are too 'high should be reduced.'"

In so suggesting, my distinguished friend does not employ the fairness I have a right to expect. If he has read our platform with any care, he knows that the phrase which was substituted for the one he quotes, reads as follows:

"Tariff rates enacted to carry this 'policy into effect should be just, fair, 'and impartial, equally opposed to 'foreign control and domestic monopoly.'"

I claim no greater influence in the councils of the republican party than is exercised by its humblest member, and I hope that I will not be accused of vaunting myself when I say that I am more responsible for the substitution of the one expression for the other than any other man concerned in the construction of the platform. I gave absolute loyalty to the platform of last year, and I give absolute loyalty to the platform of this year, for with respect to the subject of which I am now speaking, they are identical in thought and purpose. I prefer the expression of this year, for I believe it to be clearer and more emphatic than the expression of last year. I fancy Mr. Sullivan has accepted the headlines of some enthusiastic reporter and has not made himself familiar with the real declaration of the republican convention. I hope that at some future time he will inform his listeners what the words are.

"Tariff rates enacted to carry this 'policy into effect should be just, fair, 'and impartial, equally opposed to 'foreign control and domestic monopoly, 'to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism, and must from time 'to time be changed to meet the varying conditions incident to the progress of our industries and their 'changing relations to our foreign and 'domestic commerce.'"

"Tariff rates should be opposed to domestic monopoly." I do not pretend to be the master, I do not pretend to have explored all the treasures of one mother-tongue, but in the limited range of my knowledge I do not know of any words that express the thought that our protective system must be the unrelenting foe of monopoly more clearly than the words chosen by the republican convention. They not only mean that tariff duties shall not shelter monopoly, but they mean that tariff duties shall be arrayed against monopoly. I commend to my fair-minded adversary a re-reading of the platform, and that he discover the meaning of its terms, not in the lightning flashes of partisan debate, but in the calm and tranquil glow of an unabridged dictionary.

It matters but little, however, what I believe, what I have done, or what I have said. The important question is: What does the republican party believe, what are its purposes, what has it done, and what has it said? It believes in the policy of protection, and if we may credit the evidence of

our senses, a large proportion of the democratic party also believes in the policy of protection. When, however, we undertake the task of applying this policy to the commerce of the nation, differences of opinion at once appear. There always have been these differences, and there always will be. Under the law of 1897, which bears the name of a pure patriot and great statesman, substantially one-half of the imports into the United States are admitted free. Some of these imports are things we do not and cannot produce. Others are in the nature of raw material, the admission of which, free of duty, is intended to enable the resulting commodities to be profitably produced in this country. In its literal sense, no such thing as a strictly material ever came into a part of the United States, nor was pure raw material ever offered for sale in any market, for the manifest reason that before anything can become of any value, either labor or capital must have been employed in its creation. In a commercial sense, however, raw material represents a minimum of labor. It follows that whenever any particular article is proposed as raw material, men differ respecting it and respecting the propriety of admitting it free of duty. Recurring to something already said, I reiterate that when it is proposed to levy a protective duty upon anything that may be imported, the question at once arises: What duty shall be laid upon it? Abstractly, all protectionists agree upon the criterion. It should be such a duty as will enable the home producers of the article to make and sell it in the domestic markets at a fair profit. Here again, men of the most mature intelligence and of the sincerest convictions divide, and the differences must be composed as all other differences are. It is impossible to write tariff schedules into a platform, and therefore all that the party can do in its conventions is to declare a general principle to which it pledges itself in the enactment of laws. Every sane man must recognize the truth that the cost of production is not constant, has not been in the past, and will not be in the future. Every sane man knows, and every candid man will admit, that the developments of the last few years have been so mighty, and conditions have been so revolutionized, that it is worth our while to examine and determine in the light of existing conditions, whether the tariff duties of 1897 answer the test which we agree must be applied to protective duties. Recognizing these things, the republican party of Iowa, without a dissenting voice, in its convention declared, as I have already read, but which for emphasis I read again:

"Tariff rates enacted to carry this 'policy into effect should be just, fair, 'and impartial, equally opposed to 'foreign control and domestic monopoly, 'to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism, and must from time 'to time be changed to meet the varying conditions incident to the progress of our industries and their 'changing relations to our foreign and 'domestic commerce. Duties that are 'too low should be increased and duties that are too high should be reduced.'"

Personally, I have no hesitation in avowing that there are duties which should be lowered to bring them to the point of protection, and the little that I can do to influence legislation in that direction, will be done. There are others, undoubtedly, who believe that the duties as a whole are as fairly adjusted as they can be, and it is assume that they will act on that belief. It is not to be expected that direct modification will be made during the next session of congress. A work that requires the utmost forbearance, the most unprejudiced consideration, and the most temperate discussion, will not be well done in the fierce partisanship which attends a presidential contest.

We may differ, we do differ, respecting the details of application, but when the policy itself is threatened, it becomes every man who approves it, whether he be republican or democrat, whether he is for revision or against revision, to lift his voice in its defense and cast his vote for its safety.

Workingmen and Farmers.

I must refer with more particularity to two phases of the opening speech of the democratic candidate for governor, upon which he expended intense energy. He seems to concede that all classes of American business life, save two, are benefitted by the protective system. These are the laboring men and the farmers; and he appeals to them in the most impassioned terms to overthrow a system which has reduced them to poverty and slavery. They are the men upon whom protection has committed its crimes and who have been the victims of grand larceny at the hands of all others for more than an hundred years. This is so remarkable a revival of an ancient delusion that I must give it more than a passing notice. It may be assumed that when the champion of free trade speaks of workingmen, he means the wage-workers of the United States. First, it is one of the accepted facts in the statistics of the world that the wage-workers of the United States receive for their labor at least fifty per cent more than their fellows in England. A week ago I happened to read in one of the well known newspapers of Chicago, a synopsis of the report and examination made by the government of Great Britain, looking to some changes in its tariff policy. I quote from it in order that I may be relieved of any charge of partisan conclusions:

"The average level of wages in the 'United States is one and one-half 'times greater than in the United 'Kingdom, while in Germany wages 'are only two-thirds, and in France 'three-fourths of the average prevailing in the United Kingdom.'"

It thus appears that from England's point of view, and if there is an error in the statement it is not in our favor, the men in whose behalf Mr. Sullivan pleads for free trade, earn and receive one and one-half times the compensation paid to the workingmen of the most favored nation across the sea. Accepting the same authority, they earn and receive substantially twice as much as is paid to the workingmen of Germany and France. Is it believable that a system under which these conditions exist is a system which robs labor of its just reward? The proposition will not deceive the feeblest intellect that ever found its seat