

in the mind of man. Will you reason upon it a moment? Suppose that the barriers erected at every port were swept away and that our markets were inundated with the manufactures of foreign lands, what would the millions who have been working in protected industries do for a living? Where would they turn for employment? Who would pay them high wages, low wages, or any wages? The profits made by some of our manufacturers are too great, but it is like the export of free trade to explain to the workmen of this state, or any other state, how a reduction of these profits would tend to an increase in wages. From the standpoint of a workman, it is hard enough to get fair wages when the profits are large, and I want the advocate of a change to explain how the struggle would become easier if the profits were lessened or should wholly disappear. The true analysis of the whole subject is that the workman is interested, first, in enlarging as much as possible the work to be done in this country, so that the demand for labor will overrun the supply. It is under these conditions that the workmen win their enduring victories. In the second place, it is for the interest of the workmen that the profits of industry be great, for in such times the employer most readily yields the employe his fair share. Without extending my view of the subject over other states than Iowa, for what is true here is true elsewhere, I commend to the free trader the current report of our labor commissioner, in which he shows that in six years wages in Iowa have increased an average of 21.46 per cent, and the increase in total wages paid has been 53.48 per cent.

I understand perfectly that this increase in wages has not been the result of unselfishness of employers. I know that it is largely due to the struggle of labor unions for the betterment of their members. I know, also, that the classes of business from which these conclusions are drawn are not in the main the beneficiaries of direct protection, but it is nevertheless clear that these men could not have enforced their just demands had there not been work to do. They could not have made these strides if there had not been profit in the business done.

Before the free trader can establish his title as the friend of the wage-worker, he must be very much more specific than Mr. Sullivan has been. He must show, first, that under free trade there would be more work than there now is. Second, that labor would be higher than it is now or that the wage-worker would be required to pay less for what he buys. He would, indeed, be compelled to go further and produce satisfactory evidence that wages under free trade could be maintained at their present point. This is an appalling task for any man who undertakes it, and I venture to say that throughout this entire campaign no Democratic speaker will attempt it. No thoughtful man has ever declared, or will ever declare, that with free competition in our own markets in everything that we would produce more than we do now, and I therefore say aside that part of the task as one which will never be entered upon. Likewise it never has been claimed, and the defender of free trade dares not pretend to any intelligent audience that his doctrine will increase wages. If I understand Mr. Sullivan's position, he insists that the law of supply and demand must fix the prices and value of everything, and he will not be so inconsistent as to argue that an increase in the supply of labor, without affecting the demand, could by any possibility enhance the compensation of labor. Free trade means the free competition of the world in our markets; that is, free competition of all the labor of the world through the commodities they produce, and this could not operate otherwise than to reduce wages if the workers of other countries receive less than those of our own. This, then, is another branch of the proposition over which the free trader will never successfully pass.

There remains but one other. It has been claimed for free trade, and probably will be again, that it will reduce the cost of the things the wage-worker must buy; that is to say, reduce the cost of living. I will examine this proposition, but I preface my examination by the suggestion that if the claim were admitted, it would still be incumbent upon the free trader to show that his theory of government would maintain the present rate of wages, while lowering the necessary expenses of life. This he cannot do. He has made the experiment in times past, and with one invariable result—the reduction of wages and of men employed. Let us, however, see what the probable effect upon the cost of living would be. The free trader is vociferous and vehement, and Mr. Sullivan is no exception to the rule, in asserting that the duties laid on agricultural products do not help the farmer, and therefore he could not say to the wage-worker that what he eats, insofar as it is produced in his own country, costs him more by reason of the tariff, and it happens to be true that what is imported for the table of the workman is substantially all upon the free list. The only exception of the slightest importance is sugar, and if we assume that the price is increased by the amount of duty upon it, which is not true, the tariff costs the head of an average family so insignificant a sum that I need not express it in figures. Insofar as he is a user of the ordinary articles of manufacture which are upon the dutiable list, I am quite ready to admit that the wage-worker of the United States pays a little more for them than the wage-worker of Europe or Asia, but I assert that he does not pay by reason of the enhanced price of these articles five per cent of the difference between his wages and the wages abroad. This is susceptible of easy demonstration, and I only refrain from reducing the problem to figures because I cannot in one speech embrace all the matters of detail. Do not misunderstand me upon this point. I believe that it costs the American laborer a great deal more to live than it costs the laborer engaged in like

employment in other countries. It is not, however, because of duties laid upon the things he buys, but it is because the standard of life is higher in this country than it is elsewhere. The laboring man eats more and better things. He wears more and better houses. He spends more to maintain his position in society, for he is a factor in the most important affairs of the community in which he lives. This is the price he pays for the manhood he enjoys, for the power he exercises, and for the responsibilities of citizenship; and if free trade robs him of the opportunity to make these expenditures, it at the same time robs him of the opportunities which alone make life tolerable and honorable.

In a further effort to incite the prejudice of the wage-worker, the Democratic candidate for governor insists that while we protect the manufacturer, we do not protect the laborer, and that, whereas the former meets only the competition of his own country, the latter must meet the competition of the world. This is the most astonishing statement I have ever read. It is the very climax of error. While the republican party has put upon many manufactured commodities an import duty, it has absolutely prohibited the importation of labor, and with respect to one nationality, has imperatively forbidden the admission of laborers. One of the most stringent statutes ever passed by congress is that which prevents American employers from bringing men of other countries into the United States under contract for employment. Barring the Chinese wholly, we admit the laborers of other lands. We have assumed that when a human being comes free into the United States and breathes our air and becomes a part of our institutions, he will be a competitor upon the plane of American life, and not upon the plane of the country from which he comes, and our experience demonstrates that the first thing that an immigrant learns is to demand high wages for his work. From the same experience we discovered that the Chinaman did not assimilate the conditions of his new country, and therefore, solely for the purpose of eliminating unfair competition in labor, he is excluded from our shores. I do not believe that our immigration laws are perfect. There remains still much to be done in order to limit the men and women who come hither to those of whom it can be said they will become good citizens; but the suggestion that we have not been as careful to protect the labor as we have to protect manufactured commodities is so unwarranted that it is overthrown by the most casual reflection. If there is any logical deduction from the Democratic position, it is one which will hardly commend the party to the wage-workers of this country. It means, if it means anything, that it will be the Democratic policy not only to create free competition in our markets for manufactured products, but free competition in labor as well, and that means the repeal of the statute forbidding the introduction of contract labor and the removal of the prohibition against the Chinese. When these things are done, the Democratic party will have free trade, and have it with a vengeance, and the people will have free ruin, and have it in plenty. I marvel at the audacity of a Democratic speaker proposing remedies for the relief of the promotion of the welfare of the laboring man. It had to be said when he elected Cleveland in 1892, and a year after his inauguration it had both branches of congress. It thus had the government complete, and what did it do for the betterment of the wage-worker? To reply graphically and feelingly you have but to summon your memories of the years between 1893 and 1897. It has been said that the people naturally hunger for a change. I do not believe this is true, but if it is, for the sake of humanity, let the change be made by some other power or some other party than the Democrats, whose whole history is one recurring round of folly and failure.

The Farmers.
I turn now to the farmers, for whom the tears of the free trader flow so copiously. Mr. Sullivan declares, and apparently with the utmost sincerity, that the system of protection not only does not benefit them, but destroys and impoverishes them. Without analyzing the statement, as I presently shall do, but taking it up by its four corners and looking at it broadly, and then looking at the farmers, knowing what they are, what they have done, and what they are doing, it is inconceivable that any serious man should believe that they are the victims of a dishonest and vicious economic system. How emphatically they will repel the charges will be seen in the coming November. Before they speak, I say for them that they are the happiest, most prosperous, most progressive and most contented people within the borders of the republic. They have their ups and downs, their high prices and low prices, their good years and bad years, but taking all times and all conditions together, they have accomplished more than any other class, and I congratulate them most heartily upon their brilliant success. The Democratic candidate for governor seems to be of the opinion that because the duties levied upon agricultural products do not materially enhance the price of these products, that therefore the protective system robs them of the amount of the duties collected upon manufactured importations and otherwise saps their vitality and hampers their progress. I propose to deal with this subject from my own point of view, which may not be that occupied by every advocate of protective laws. I believe it to be true that, with the exception of sugar and cattle, the duties levied upon the principal agricultural products have little or no effect upon their prices; that is to say, under present conditions the right of free importation of agricultural products would not materially enlarge the supply or increase the competition of our own markets. Mr. Sullivan will unquestionably take this statement and proceed at once to the conclusion that the farmers are bearing the burdens of protection. If he does, he will disqualify himself as a man of thought and convince his hearers that he takes the most superficial view of economic and industrial affairs. My proposition is, and I shall establish it, that of all the classes into which people are divided, no class has been more benefited by protection than the farmers.

The first thing that the farmer wants to insure his prosperity, is a large population not engaged in agriculture, who will consume the things that he produces. We have such a population, and its growth has been the wonder of the world. Would we have had it under the influence of free trade? The second thing he wants is that this population shall be able to buy and consume what he has to sell. We have such a population. Would we have had it under free trade? The third thing that he wants is transportation from his farm to the market. We have in this country, besides all our waterways, 200,000 miles of railway. Would we have had these miles of railway under free trade? Fourth, he wants all the inventions which genius can discover, to aid him in planting and harvesting his crop. Would we have had these inventions under free trade? The truth is that with our vast regions of territory, the farmer, without the development which can be imputed to no other cause than protective duties, would have had both inadequate markets and inadequate access to them. For illustration, take Iowa. It is a conservative estimate to say that the farms of the whole state—good, bad and indifferent, are worth from \$45 to \$50 per acre. What gave them this value? Suppose that the manufacturing interests of the United States had been left to the mercies of free trade, that would New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburg, Cleveland, and Chicago have been insignificant as compared with their present magnificence. What would the tens of thousands of cities and towns in which the protected industries are now being carried on have been?—farms competing with Iowa in the markets of the old world; and if these cities, towns and manufacturing homes had not been expanded under tariff duties, who would have built the more than 9,000 miles of railway which now touch every community in the state of Iowa and bear with little expense and with great speed the products of our farms to the markets in which they are sold? I have little patience with the theorist who cannot look deeply enough into the philosophy of human activity to see that the farmer, more than any other man, is the beneficiary of the development and general growth of his country. His land is worth nothing, his labor is worth nothing, his products are worth nothing, unless the stream of a busy life flows all about his cherished acres. The human mind is a mysterious thing, and it is difficult to predict its vagaries, but it may be foretold with absolute confidence that whatever delusions the Democrats may be able to fasten in the hearts of the people, it will not succeed in its efforts to convince the farmer that protection robs him of his just dues.

Reciprocity.
Upon the subject of reciprocity, the Democratic platform is silent, and necessarily so. There is no place in the political economy of the Democratic party for reciprocity. Insisting as it does, upon free trade, the basis for reciprocal trade arrangements is at once destroyed, for there can be no such thing unless we have tariff duties which we can yield in trade. The republican platform upon this point declares:

"We endorse the policy of reciprocity as the natural complement of protection. Reciprocity between nations is trade for mutual advantage, and both sides must give and take. Protection builds up domestic industries, and both sides must give and take. 'try and trade and secure our own markets for ourselves, reciprocity builds up foreign trade and finds an outlet for our surplus.'"

It is not a new doctrine in American politics, but it was a theory only until Blaine made it a living part of our economic policy. It was in full force and accomplishing great things for the business of the country when it was stricken down by the Democrats when they came into power in 1894. Its revival was provided for in the Dingley law of 1897, and the last and most eloquent speech of McKinley's career was devoted to its explanation and defense. In recent years it has not received the loyalty it deserves. Many people have misconceived its scope, and have opposed every trade treaty which gave something for the benefits received. Our platform of this year pledges the party to reciprocity in its true sense; that is, the reciprocity which gives as well as takes. We will no longer dream of condemning a reciprocal treaty simply because it admits foreign commodities to our shores upon terms more favorable than theretofore existing, but will examine also the volume of our commodities which under its operation can be sold in the foreign markets opened or widened by its provisions. Reciprocity is called the complement of protection, and so it is. Looking at all other nations as hostile competitors, protection is the banner of war, and it bars them out. If, however, any one of them approaches under a flag of truce, and is willing to make terms for getting in, if the terms be favorable, it is admitted, and thereafter we do business with that nation according to the terms of the treaty of peace. Protection relates to imports—reciprocity to exports. Protection is the best adjustment that we can make within ourselves to enlarge the production of the country. Reciprocity is the best adjustment we can make with another nation to enlarge the production of our own country. The object of the two policies is identical—to develop to the utmost our own resources and create opportunity for the greatest possible amount of work by the American worker. I firmly believe that in the next decade the test of a successful administration will be found in the laws and treaties relating to an interchange of trade. I cannot dwell at this time, as I intend to later in the campaign, upon the details of trade treaties, and shall content myself with the most general reference to the possibilities of the future. We ought speedily to establish reciprocity with Canada, a country just fairly started in its development, and whose markets in all manufactured articles we ought to supply by reason of the ease of our access to them. The United States is already the largest importer of commodities into Canada, and that notwithstanding the fact that her preferential duties admit England, our sharpest competitor, upon terms 33 1/2 per cent better than they admit the United States. We ought to obtain better terms there than England, but if we

could enter upon the same terms the volume of our exports to that country would be mightily increased and thereby the work done in the republic would be correspondingly multiplied. To obtain these terms, it will be necessary that certain of the products of Canada shall be allowed to come into the United States under lower duties than now prevail. Her coal, her iron ore, and pig iron should come in free as raw material, and the natural products of her soil can be well admitted upon the best terms we can secure if thereby this great dominion can be opened up to the enterprise of American manufacturers. We have no need to fear the competition of Canada in our own markets in those products which constitute our chief exports, nor is there any time to lose in pressing forward the negotiations for these freer relations with Canada. Joseph Chamberlain, England's great statesman, sees the future with a clearer vision than the most illustrious of the English administration. He knows that if England were to impose a duty upon the agricultural imports from the United States and permit those same exports from Canada to enter free, and thereby induce Canada to raise still higher her barriers against the United States in manufactured articles and lower still more the barriers against the imports from England in manufactured articles, he would at once deprive the United States of its best customer, promote the business of the English manufacturer, and bind the colony to the mother country with chains of enduring strength. We must thwart the designs of Great Britain, and reciprocity is our most effective weapon. Confronted by such an emergency, the Democrats are helpless and powerless, for when they have instituted their system of free trade, we are at the mercy of the intelligent statesmen of Europe.

France may be instanced as another nation with which diplomacy can work wonders for American trade. Substantially all our agricultural products, and many others, now enter France under a discriminating duty against us of 25 per cent, as compared with the favored nations. A treaty, negotiated upon our part by the most illustrious son that Iowa has given to the field of international politics, is now before the senate. It gives us equality in France, and what we surrender is so little that it would not create a ripple upon the industrial waters. It ought to be ratified, and I doubt not will be so soon as the republican voice is fairly heard upon the subject. Should the Democrats prevail, however, it must fall into oblivion, for when free trade comes in we have nothing to give and therefore can take nothing save that which we conquer in hot commercial warfare. It is quite true that our export trade is insignificant compared with our home trade, and so it will always be, but to keep it an increase of it, is absolutely essential to our continued prosperity. Least of all can we afford to adopt a policy that will permit the gradually developing resources of other countries to drive our agricultural products from foreign markets or impose upon them a discriminating duty; and the administration which, by the introduction of free trade or the neglect of opportunities for reciprocal trades allows this consequence to fall upon the farmers of the United States, will go down into history under the fierce condemnation of all the people. I have not hitherto mentioned, nor can I develop at length, the beneficial effects of reciprocity with the South American countries. One has but to examine the increasing trade which followed the reciprocal treaties which were so senselessly abrogated by the Democrats in 1894, to know that there is no field in which our statesmen can employ their abilities with greater rewards than in the cultivation of closer commercial relations with the South American continent. With American lines of steamships established between the ports of the United States and the ports of South America, and with fair trade arrangements, we can commercially dominate these undeveloped lands for all time to come. Mark my prediction, that in the ensuing quarter of a century, trade arrangements, by whatever name they be called, will be the most prominent and important subjects of discussion and decision, not only in our own country, but in every country of the civilized world. How indispensable and unparalytic it would be to cast away in the very beginning of this great struggle the only weapon with which we can fight our way to victory.

Before I close my consideration of the tariff and of reciprocity, I must refer to some peculiar conceptions which my friend Sullivan has of its operation and effect. There was a difference of opinion in 1897 among republicans, and still is, respecting the wisdom of putting the duty on lumber. It is one of those differences which will always exist, and I am not contending against the modification of the duty. I desire, however, to point out the exaggerations for which Mr. Sullivan seems to be responsible. Taking the prices of lumber in 1897 as a guide, the average duty put upon it was less than 8 per cent of its selling price, and yet, in the fervor of his love for free trade, Mr. Sullivan says:

"There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know it to be a fact that when the Dingley act passed, the price of lumber in every form was increased from 20 to 40 per cent."

He may be right about the increase in the price of lumber in the prosperous days following the overthrow of Bryan and the establishment of the republican party in power, but I leave him to explain how an 8 per cent duty can increase the price of an article 40 per cent.

The Standard Oil company has been the subject of indefinite discussion. I do not defend its methods, and I deplore its monopoly, but I believe that Mr. Sullivan is entitled to the distinction of being the first man who has ever imputed its mighty power to the tariff. He says:

"I wonder if Governor Cummins does not believe that this tariff schedule is a shelter to monopoly in this instance."

I will instantly relieve his mind of any uncertainty upon this point, by saying that I do not believe that the tariff has contributed, or in any way does contribute, to the monopoly en-

joyed by this corporation. It may be that the greater part of the tin which it uses pays no duty, because its product is exported in the cans made from the imported tin, but it must be borne in mind that any person or any corporation can import tin with exactly the same privilege. With respect to the product itself, there is no duty upon it, and if there were it would be a dead letter, for there is not an oil field in the world that can import into the United States petroleum and compete with the Standard Oil company if its product were admitted free. But I repeat, that there is no duty on petroleum. There is a provision of the law which declares that if any country imposes a duty upon petroleum exported from the United States, that a similar duty shall be imposed by the United States upon petroleum exported from such country into the United States. There is no country which can import petroleum, the law is of no consequence whatever, to the users of the article, and the tariff has nothing whatever to do with the greatness, the exactions, or the injustice,—in a word, the monopoly, of the Standard Oil company. It is perfectly fair for a public speaker to point out the evil effects of so immense and successful a combination, but it is wholly unfair to impute whatever evils he may discover to the operation of the tariff.

Trusts.
I pass from this altogether too extended consideration of our tariff system, to another principal feature of the Democratic platform. The republican administration is arraigned in the severest terms on account of the existence of certain corporations, which, though widely different in every respect, have been, by a loose generalization grouped together and termed "trusts." It is alleged that they are bad and ought to be exterminated from the business world. It is further alleged that they spring from the protective system and that therefore the system ought to be abolished. Within the limits of any political speech it is impossible to consider the subject with that fullness which its importance deserves, but when we do discuss the affairs of these corporations, it is in the highest degree necessary that we maintain our composure. It is somewhat difficult to do this, because hysteria seems to be in the atmosphere as we approach the topic. I will do the best I can to talk of them uninfused by the fear which they seem to beget. It is admitted that there is economy in centralization, and unquestionably many of the consolidations have been brought about to reduce the cost of production. No reasonable man will or can complain of the enlargement of a corporation for the purpose of reducing the cost of the things which it produces. There is a point, however, beyond which it is not economical to aggregate industries, and many of the so-called trusts have passed that point, and we must therefore seek for some other motive underlying the combination. The vast increase of wealth in modern times and the intensity of those who possess it have introduced two other elements into these combinations. The first is the desire to make money out of the mere organization through the medium of gross overcapitalization. This is utterly indefensible, disastrous to the country, and demands the speediest and the most effectual remedy that can be devised. I think there is a remedy, and I believe it will be applied, but inasmuch as it is not an issue between the parties, I do not dwell upon it. I pause only to remark that in the republican platform of this year is to be found the only suggestion that commends any political party to reform in the organization of such corporations. It is in these words:

"We believe that the large corporations commonly called 'trusts' should be so regulated and supervised, both in their organization and operation, that their evil tendencies may be checked and their evil practices prevented."

It is my firm belief that if all corporations are so organized that the aggregate par value of their bonds and stocks is limited to the actual value of the capital contributed to the corporation, the trust question will not long vex the people of the United States, and I fervently hope that all parties will unite to hasten this much needed reform.

The second element in these corporations to which I have referred is the desire to stifle or restrict competition. It is as natural for producers to seek the death of competition as it is for them to breathe. It is the common, ordinary, motive of business enterprise, and the man who will voluntarily share his market when he can monopolize it, is too good for this world. The individual or the corporation that can overcome actual competition by producing better wares or by selling at a lower price or by superior management, is not the enemy, but the friend of mankind, for there always remains the potential competition which insures absolute safety for the public. The corporation or association, however, that is brought into existence for the express purpose of suppressing competition by the purchase or consolidation of independent plants covering the whole field, and that proposes to destroy the force of potential competition by the same method, is a vicious and unlawful combination, and all the powers of government should be employed for its annihilation. What has the Democratic party ever done or proposed to do in this direction? Nothing except to clamor for free trade, a remedy whose blighting effects, like the show-ers of Heaven, fall upon the just and unjust alike. On the contrary, the republican party has set itself courageously and intelligently at the work, and with the Sherman act and its recent amendments it will solve the problem, slowly and laboriously, it is true, but in the end it will be settled, and settled right.

Admitting freely that the most strenuous attempts have been made to establish monopolies, it is yet true that they have been generally thwarted by natural causes. Trusts are very many, monopolies are very rare, and he who does not distinguish between them is a poor guide in the labyrinth of modern affairs. He who would destroy all the so-called trusts in order to disintegrate the occasional monopoly, has given little thought to the gravity of the undertaking, and he who, believing in protection at all,

would abolish the duty on all trust-made goods because the trust may ripen into a monopoly, would remain childless lest his offspring may become criminals.

I illustrate with a commodity often mentioned by Mr. Sullivan. The United Steel corporation manufactures steel rails. There are at least three other great corporations, which also manufacture steel rails, and there is substantial competition. If a duty is necessary to enable steel rails to be made in this country, why remove the duty because they are made by trusts? If, however, the United Steel corporation should purchase its competitors and thus establish and maintain a monopoly in steel rails so that every buyer must be subjected to its arbitrary will, then there is a reason for the removal of the duty and it is therefore that our platform declares that tariff schedules must be opposed to domestic monopoly.

I cannot leave this subject without a reference to the reiterated statements of the Democratic platform, amplified in the speech of the Democratic candidate for governor, that the tariff creates and fosters the trusts, and is responsible for whatever is bad in our industrial and commercial life. What a confusion of thought. The tariff is an antecedent of the trusts just as wealth, energy, enterprise and development are antecedents of the trusts. They have all helped to create conditions out of which the trust evolved, but they are conditions without which there could be no growth, no prosperity, and no progress. The tariff bears exactly the same relation to the trusts that the Chinese exclusion law and the prohibition against immigrants under contract for labor to labor unions; and I am impatient to know from my worthy opponent whether the Democratic party is in favor of abolishing these laws in order to destroy labor unions.

The Philippines.
I had intended to enter upon some discussion of our policy in the Philippines, but I must forego the pleasure until some other time. I must content myself tonight by saying only that of all the bright pages which record the worthy deeds of the republic, there are none which glow with more steadfast honor, more fervent patriotism, more exalted regard for the rights of humanity, than the page upon which is written the achievements of William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and the army and navy of the United States in the Philippine Islands.

Currency.
I had intended also to refer to the subject of currency reform, and I only defer the discussion until I can again be heard. Let me say, however, that no proposed measure has yet become a party policy, and whatever is said must be the expression of individual views. I hold certain opinions which I am quite ready to disclose, and lest my friend Sullivan shall again misquote me, I venture to say now that I am opposed to any currency which the government does not agree to redeem.

I have been somewhat analytical and therefore have already consumed more time than is ordinarily devoted in one evening to a political meeting. I am nearing the limit of my strength and your patience; but before I leave you may I move back from my close view of affairs, and from a standpoint that will allow a sweeping vision of the whole history of republican administration say a word in conclusion? I know what all of you want for it is an instinctive and inherent desire planted deep in the heart of every good citizen. You are all conscious of the greatness of the republic, of the possibilities of growth and decay. You are all conscious of the truth that every year is a vital year with the United States full of questions that must be answered and answered right if we are to fulfill the destiny for which the patriot prays. You want a government wise enough to know what is right and strong enough to do what is right. You want a government imbued with the spirit of the age in which we live, and that can keep pace with the swift march of events. You want a government that knows the worth of its manhood and womanhood, whether high or low, rich or poor, white or black, at home or abroad, and that will defend and protect them with all its might and power. One party or the other must give you such a government. Take your choice, but make no mistake. Remember that parties have characteristics, traditions and impulses. Remember that they have histories that may be read and lives that may be studied. When you are looking for a government to grapple with the problems of this day and the days to come with which your happiness and prosperity are inseparably bound do not forget that it was the republican party that said the Union must be preserved, that no star should fade from the blue field of its flag and no stripe should be torn from its beautiful folds and that was Abraham Lincoln, who led our hosts through the valley and into the shadow of death, to an undivided and indivisible country. Do not forget the perils of reconstruction and the turbulent days which followed when the republican party under the guidance of the silent hero of the war restored peace and order among a distracted people. Do not forget with what courage the republican party lifted the depreciated currency of the war and assumed specie payments without a quiver in the body of our commerce. Do not forget that the republican party through its cherished policy of protection has made the republic what it is and has conferred upon the American name a people of honor that is borne by the people of any other nation of the earth. Do not forget that when men were without work and capital without profit, when we were quaking with fear in the throes of financial disaster it was the republican party raised high the gold standard and following William McKinley marched into the sunshine of peace and plenty. Do not forget that Theodore Roosevelt, who has brought to his office a quality of integrity, courage and intelligence never surpassed in all our noble line of leaders and who is patiently and patriotically working out republican thought and lifting to a higher altitude the national life, is a republican. What more would you have? What surer promise of honor and glory for your country and of prosperity for all its people?