

state in the union, so far as I know, that gave the Nebraska platform a sweeping endorsement before the Denver convention was held, and the Nebraska platform contained this plank in regard to the free admission of articles coming into competition with articles controlled by the trusts.

I ask you to read the speech of Senator Culberson in defense of his vote for free iron ore. He quotes the testimony of the representatives of the steel trust themselves. They control over 62½ per cent of the total output of iron ore. We can not fix the exact amount of their control, but it is not less than 62 per cent. You tell me that I am disturbing the harmony of my party when I say that a democrat can afford to vote against any tariff demanded by the steel trust? Am I disturbing the harmony of the party when I tell you that the democratic party can not afford to favor the collection of \$250,000 on iron ore when by doing so it collects ten millions of dollars for the steel trust?

Have I not convinced you that this is more than a personal question? Is there anyone in Texas who will insist that nobody is involved in this question but Senator Bailey and myself?

My life is an open book. You took me up when I was a young man in Nebraska and helped to make me a candidate for the presidency. For thirteen years I have been combatting the trusts. Three times have they helped to defeat me in the national campaign; three times have they poured out their money like water; three times have they coerced employes and intimidated business men but they have never intimidated me. You can not point to a vote that I have cast on the side of monopoly. You can not point to a speech that I have made that was ever quoted with approval by a monopolist. They have never quoted my speeches, for they know that if ever I have had an ambition, it has been to deserve the confidence that six millions and a half of people have shown in me.

You ask why I come to Texas. Because I am not willing to believe that I must avoid Texas and visit the other states only. I expect to go elsewhere, why not to Texas? I shall come to Texas as I come to other states, and I expect when I come to have a respectful hearing as I have always had here as I have had in other states, and when I speak in Texas I shall use the same language that I use in other states, for I have not prepared a variety of speeches to suit the different sections of the country. Do I surprise you when I make an argument in favor of free raw material? You convict yourself of gross ignorance if you say I surprise you for when I was in congress I was on the ways and means committee and helped to prepare and pass the free raw material measures. The first speech of importance that I made in congress was in favor of free wool and a reduction of the tariff on woolen goods.

When I visited Dallas a few days ago the papers were asking why I came to Texas. Some of them have criticised me for even coming to the state. Some of them have been weeping tears because they think I am losing some friends. Do not worry! I am not losing any friends; I am simply locating my enemies. Some of the democratic papers in Texas say that I am insulting the democracy of Texas. Do not Texas speakers go into other states, both north and south? Is it an insult for a man to go from one state to another and talk democracy? When a paper tells you that it has supported me in the past and is grieved to have to leave me now, read the editorial carefully and see if you can find any grief embodied in the language used. If this was the first time I had ever had a fight on my hands, it might pain me more to read the criticism of such papers but I have never made a fight that I did not have to meet not only the criticism of open enemies but the criticism also of editors who claimed to have been my friends and who declared they were distressed over my course. I have not changed my position even if they have changed theirs.

If you will read the Texas platform of 1896, which condemned the doctrine of free raw material, you will find that it complains that free raw material subjects "the agricultural and pastoral classes to competition with the world." Where did that language come from? That is Rhode Island language. That is what they say in Rhode Island when they are demanding protection. They protest against being compelled to enter into competition with the world and they want a protective tariff to prevent competition. Why did that platform avoid the word protection? If you are going to defend that platform, why not come out and say that you are for protection? Why commence your platform with a declaration for a tariff for revenue only and end your platform with another declar-

ation for a tariff for revenue only, and then put in the middle of it a demand for the protection of your products from competition with the world? Why do you not take the position that they do in New England and frankly say that you want protection? Those who insist upon a tax upon raw material can not defend it as a revenue tariff; if they defend it at all, it must be as a protective tariff, and when you begin to ask for protection on one thing, you can not well refuse it on other things.

A word as to platforms. Why should it be necessary for me to enter into a joint debate with anyone as to the binding force of a platform. Insofar as Senator Bailey has discussed this question, he has not met my proposition. He says that a man ought to be governed by his conscience, and he quotes me as saying the same thing. It was unnecessary for him to go back to a speech of mine in congress to secure proof of that, for I say it nearly every day. I said in my speech a year ago when I accepted the third nomination that a man had a right to repudiate his platform and that his repudiation then became his platform, but if he wants to repudiate a platform, he must do it before the election. When a man endorses a platform and comes before the people of his district asking their votes on the platform, he gives them to understand that the platform represents his conscience and his judgment. Do you tell me that an honest man can make a canvass upon a platform in which he does not believe? Do you tell me that an honest man will conceal from his constituents his objections to the platform upon which he is running? A man who would go out and secure votes by an endorsement of a platform that he does not believe in is on a level with a man who secures anything else by false representation. I do not believe that Senator Bailey will differ from me on this proposition. I do not believe that he would stand before an intelligent audience and say that a man is justified in running upon a platform with a secret reservation and an intention to repudiate the platform after the election.

So much for the platform before the election. Now when the votes are counted and the candidate is elected, what then? Do you believe he is at liberty to change his mind after the election—that he is at liberty to follow his conscience and go in another direction? You will not find that doctrine endorsed in any of my speeches. It is a very poor district that has but one conscience in it—a mighty poor district. I take it for granted that in a district of two hundred thousand people—that is about the size of our districts—there are about two hundred thousand people with consciences. If the vote is one to every five of the population, it means that there are about forty thousand voters with consciences, and I assume that the conscience of each voter is just as sacred as the conscience of the representative. I assume that each voter voted according to his conscience, and has he not a right to expect that his conscience will be respected? When a representative feels that he can not conscientiously do what he conscientiously promised to do and what his constituents conscientiously expect him to do, he ought to be conscientious enough to resign and let some one else give expression to the conscience of his constituents. Is not that sound democratic doctrine?

Senator Bailey said that the platform ought not to deal with details—that it ought to confine itself to general principles, but that is the opinion of one man. Suppose that a candidate for congress goes before his constituents and says: "I want you to trust me; I do not want to be hampered by details; my conscience might not agree with your conscience, and I must follow mine regardless of what you say and regardless of what I promised." If a candidate makes such a speech before his constituents and they are willing to trust him without any platform, that is their business, and they have nobody to blame but themselves if he misrepresents them. But suppose a candidate says to his constituents: "I want a platform but I want it to deal with general principles and not with details," and suppose the constituents reply, "We tried that before." Have they not a right to be specific—just as specific as they desire? There was a time when we elected men to congress on the general declaration in favor of bimetalism, but we found that some of them construed their platform to mean one thing and some another. Some did not want immediate bimetalism; some wanted only international bimetalism, and some wanted bimetalism at an impossible ratio. After awhile the party decided to be specific, and the platform of 1896 was specific. Texas joined in making the

bimetallic plank specific, and I think that the time has come to make a specific declaration on the tariff question. Our general declarations have been misconstrued and misinterpreted, and I think that the people have a right to demand specific declarations which will be binding upon those who are elected.

It has been suggested by some of the advocates of a tax on raw material that I am not asking to have Nebraska products put on the free list. I would be ashamed to come before you if my record did not answer any charge of that character. I have been advocating tariff reform all these years, and I have never asked whether the protected interests were located in Nebraska or not. When I made my speech in congress in favor of free wool in 1892, we had about a fourth of a sheep to the inhabitant—almost as many in proportion to population as Texas has now, and I think if the facts were known, we now have as large a percentage of our population owning sheep as Texas has, and the same may be said of hides. I am quite sure that as large a percentage of our people own cattle as own cattle in Texas, and yet I am in favor of free hides. Everybody knows that the tariff on wheat is a fraud so far as the farmer is concerned, and I would vote to take it off. We export wheat, and the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool. A tariff on wheat has no more effect than a tariff on cotton would have. The same may be said of the duty on corn, oats, cattle and nearly all other farm products. I think it would be better if there were a duty on none of these things so that the farmer would know that he is not getting any benefit from protection. The main use of the duty on farm products is to deceive the farmer and lead him to consent to a duty on manufactured products. If democrats have not removed them it is because they have been immaterial.

The main point in this discussion is whether a duty placed on raw material is transferred to the consumer. I affirm that it is and that a tax on raw material contemplates an increased price of the product to the consumer. That is not only the theory but that is the practice. In my Dallas speech I pointed out that the duty on leather, harness, boots and shoes was reduced when hides were put on the free list. If you will examine the tariff on cotton goods, you will find that the average rate is a fraction over 50 per cent while the average rate on woolen goods is about 89 per cent. The difference between the two is almost exactly the duty levied on raw wool. There is no duty on cotton, and cotton manufacturers come in at about 50 per cent; there is a duty of 40 per cent on wool, and that being added to the duty on the manufactured product, the rate is nearly 90 per cent. That means that when a man buys your wool under a 40 per cent tariff, he adds the price to the manufactured product. If you tax him 40 per cent on his raw material and then put his product on the free list, you will simply tie his hands behind him and leave him unable to compete with those who have free raw material. If you think that you are getting even with New England by putting a tariff on wool, examine the statistics and you will find that the tariff on wool leads to a high duty on woolen goods and that your people pay many dollars to the manufacturers in increased price of woolen goods for every dollar that your woolen growers collect from the tariff on wool.

Senator Bailey in defending a tariff on lumber, says that free lumber would only help a few people on the Canadian line, but if the Kirby Lumber company wants a tariff on lumber, what does it want it for? Is it to collect a tribute from the people on the Canadian line or is it to collect a tribute from the people of Texas? If the people of Texas do not suffer from a tariff on lumber, then a tariff on lumber will not benefit the lumber companies of this state, and my observation is that the men who ask for a tariff know what they are doing. I would not insinuate that any democrat in Texas is influenced by a beneficiary of the tariff, but I simply present this proposition as a matter of mathematics. When one man in a hundred asks for a tariff on something that he produces, the other ninety-nine men must contribute to the payment of that tariff, and you need not tell me that the one who demands the tariff does not know what he is doing.

Let me illustrate this by a story. When I was a boy I lived on a farm, and by father used to send me out to work with the men. I was not large enough to do much, but he thought it was a good thing to have me help even if I could help but little. I remember one day when I went out with two men who were repairing a rail fence. I was not big enough to carry