

utter confusion that results from local legislatures attempting to treat national issues as local issues."

WHAT DOES "NEW NATIONALISM" MEAN?

What does that mean? It means that new nationalism wants to deprive the state of some of the powers that they now have, and transfer those powers to Washington. One of the things desired is the national incorporation of railroads. Mr. Roosevelt has recommended it in one of his messages, and one of the reasons he gave was that it would relieve the railroads of annoyance by local legislatures. President Taft is now preparing, through his attorney general, a bill that provides for the national incorporation of corporations engaged in interstate commerce; and why? Because state restrictions are objected to by these great corporations. The first step toward the new nationalism is to concentrate power in Washington, to increase the proportional power of the federal government and decrease the proportional importance of the states. It means that when you want to deal with a railroad, or with the big corporations that come into your state, instead of doing so by your state legislatures, you must wait until Washington acts. And remember that when you wait on Washington you wait on the senate as well as the house; and that senate now has so many representatives of predatory interests in it, that it is the bulwark of the exploiting interests of the country. Are you willing to surrender the power you now have, and put your government farther away from you? The democratic party says that federal remedies should be added to the state remedies, not substituted for state remedies. The democratic party says, let the state exercise the power it has, and let the nation exercise the power it has. When both state and national have acted you will not have any more regulation than you need. Let me illustrate this. The home, the church and the school join in developing the character of our boys. What mother would be willing to strike down either the home, the school or the church, and leave it all to the other two? And yet, my friends, the advocates of new nationalism would diminish the power of the people of a state to protect their own rights, and make it more difficult to secure redress by removing the seat of power to Washington. That is the first step in the new nationalism—the concentration of power in Washington. And the second:

"The new nationalism is still more impatient of the importance which springs from the over-division of government powers."

You are not only to concentrate power in Washington, but you are to consolidate the powers of government. Instead of having a division of powers such as the fathers thought necessary for the protection of liberty you are to have a rising executive and a diminishing court and legislature. That is step number two. And what is the third step? It naturally follows:

PERNICIOUS AND DANGEROUS DOCTRINE

"Third, the new nationalism regards the executive power as the steward of the public welfare." There you have it, my friends. First, put everything in Washington. Second, put everything in the hands of the president. And then he is to stand as a sort of earthly father and take care of us. How do you like new nationalism, my friends, when you find out what it is? This is the doctrine from which the world has been moving. It has cost the lives of millions of patriots to get away from this doctrine. God forbid that we should go back to it?

I doubt if there is another man in the United States who would desire to exercise the power that Mr. Roosevelt wants to vest in a president. I do not believe there is another; and even if you are willing to trust him with this power I beg you to remember that he is only human and may die; you must trust another man to exercise it when he is dead. You can not judge a monarchy by a good king. There have been good kings, but there never was a good monarchy. The doctrine is bad, and never since the days of Alexander Hamilton has such a doctrine been promulgated in the United States by a prominent man as is now advanced in the name of new nationalism. You need John Kern there to vote against these initial steps toward a one man power. You need John Kern there to vote against national incorporation of railroads. You need John Kern there to vote against the national incorporation of great corporations that are now hard to deal with, and will be stronger still if they can rid themselves of all state restrictions and stalk, uncontrolled, across this land.

FREE SPEECH AND FREE PRESS

And then there is the question of a free speech and a free press. Is it a part of new nationalism to commence libel suits in Washington, and drag editors across the continent to defend themselves for criticism of an administration? Is that to be considered a part of new nationalism? If we are to increase the importance of the federal government by concentrating all power there; if we are then to increase the powers of the presidential office by consolidating all power there, and then be required to reverence it as the guardian and steward of the people—if that is to be the doctrine then you need not be surprised if you are told that you must not frown when you look up towards this source of power; that if you do frown you must not speak; that if you speak, they can take you from your home and make you defend yourself at such a distance from your home that even a victory will be bankruptcy for you and your children.

There is another matter that will come before your senators. It is the ship subsidy. Mr. Roosevelt is for it. Mr. Taft is for it. Mr. Beveridge has voted for it; it is a part of their plan. They do not always put it in their platform but they are for it; and you need John Kern there to vote against this new kind of graft that will be worked upon you whenever they think you are able to bear it.

And there is another menace, there is the central bank. They have wanted it for years. They have planned for it for more than a decade. Last July a letter was sent out by the National City Bank of New York—the biggest bank in the United States. The letter was handed to me by a man who is now a candidate for congress in Kansas. He obtained it from a national banker. This letter, sent out by the biggest bank in New York,

contains the statement that one of the provisions of the postal savings bank law was intended to form the basis of a central bank; and that letter says that Mr. Taft favored the law because it had this provision in it. You do not want a central bank. If that central bank is established, with its branches throughout the country, it will run out of business every other bank in the town, or compel the other banks to do business on the terms prescribed by the central bank. It will be the greatest financial despotism that this world ever saw, and all the business of the country will be under its control. It will suck money from the extremes of the country and pour it into the hopper of Wall Street to carry on gambling transactions there. You need John Kern in the senate to fight the central bank to a very death.

PARTIES DIFFER ON TRUST QUESTION

The parties differ on the trust question. Mr. Roosevelt said at Osawatimie that it had been demonstrated that combinations could not be prevented. He said that instead of trying to prevent them we should simply try to regulate them. Think of it, my friends! How humiliating a confession that this nation of ninety millions of people, can create corporations and give them every right that they have, and yet can not prevent combinations. I shall not make any such confession as that. I do not believe it to be true. Mr. Roosevelt says try regulation; that you can not prevent combinations. Well, if he had never been president he might tell us that, if we would just make him president, he would regulate them where others have failed, but he has been president. For seven years and a half he occupied the White House. He appointed the attorney general. He had behind him a republican senate, and more than that, he had Mr. Beveridge in the senate all the time. He had a republican house behind him, and he had republican judges in the United States courts; and yet in seven years and a half, with his party in absolute power he did not put one trust magnate behind the prison bars; and there were more trusts in the United States when he got through than when he commenced. That is his record.

Not only that. While he was president the representatives of the steel trust went to the White House. There was a panic on, and, my friends, I never can have any respect for that man, contemptible panic that refused to wait for a democratic administration, but had the impudence to come during a republican administration. While that panic was on the representatives of the steel trust went to the White House, and convinced the president that they had power to control the industrial situation; that, if they were not allowed to swallow their largest rivals and thus destroy competition, conditions were going to get worse. And they so frightened the president that he consented to what they wanted.

AN IMPUDENT PROPOSAL

Never but once before was such an impudent proposal taken to a president, so far as we know only one; and that was when Andrew Jackson was president. Then the national bank of that day sent its president to him and told him that the bank could elect him or defeat him. And what did Jackson say? Did he say "Oh, well if that is the situation, you can do just as you please?" No, he said, "Mr. Biddle, if your bank has the power to elect a president or defeat him it has a blank sight more power than it ought to have and, by the Eternal, it won't have it long." That is the way Andrew Jackson dealt with a similar situation. And if, in 1907, Andrew Jackson had been in Washington instead of Theodore Roosevelt and the representatives of the steel trust had tried to frighten him he would have said: "Gentlemen, if your corporation is big enough to control the financial and industrial situation of this country; if you can turn panics loose and call them off at pleasure, you have more power than any corporation ought to have and, by the Eternal, you will not have it long if I can prevent it."

Regulation! We have tried it, and it has failed. The steel trust's net earnings for one year were one hundred and fifty-four millions. One per cent of its net earnings that year would have financed a political party with a fund two and a half times as large as we could collect two years ago from six million, four hundred thousand democrats. What folly to create trusts and then try to control them by entering into such an unequal struggle when they are so powerful? The democratic policy is different. Our platform says that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. Our party says that God never made a man good enough to stand at the head of a private monopoly and arbitrarily fix the price that you must pay for that which you must have and which he alone can furnish. The democratic party says, draw the line to these corporations. "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." The democratic party says that the law should make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. That is the democratic position. That is your position; and you need John Kern there to defend that position.

TARIFF QUESTION PARAMOUNT

But Mr. Beveridge says that the tariff question is the paramount issue; and I am willing to accept that statement, although Mr. Roosevelt did not seem to think it worth discussing in his speech last week. Mr. Beveridge says that it is the paramount issue, and that he deserves credit for trying to get some reduction, but he says, "Beware, don't lay hostile hand on the principle of protection," and what is the principle of protection? It is that ninety millions of people shall be taxed for the benefit of a few of the people. According to the platform two years ago, and Mr. Beveridge helped to write it—at least he was a delegate in the convention that adopted it—and Mr. Roosevelt appealed to the people for the support of the candidates who ran upon it—that platform says that you must not only have a tariff high enough to cover the difference in cost of production, but a reasonable profit for the manufacturer besides. For what other class does the republican party demand a reasonable profit? Does the republican party demand that the laboring man shall be guaranteed that he shall have permanent employment? Does it guarantee that the merchant shall have a reasonable income? Does it guarantee that the farmer, who sells his wheat in competition with the cheapest labor of the world, shall have a rea-

sonable profit? Does it guarantee that the farmer who raises corn for hogs or cattle shall have a reasonable profit?

We will not concede that the principle of protection is a sacred one, and when a man tells you that the principle of protection must not be harmed, he will be so anxious to keep those things protected which he thinks needs protection that he will not have time to get you relief even where he thinks the protection is not needed. How, then, are you to get relief? If you want reduction how are you to secure it? Mr. Beveridge says by commission. Ask Mr. Beveridge how much reduction we ought to have. He says, "How can I tell?" And when will we get it? He answers, "How do I know?" How? By commission only. Commission! Can they fool you on that, as they fooled you on revision two years ago? Do you remember that word revision, and do you remember how they deceived you with it. You ought not to have been deceived, but it is easy to deceive a man if he thinks he is being complimented by the deception. I heard of a man once whose wife called him a model husband, and he walked around and bragged for days, and finally one of his friends said, "That is no compliment. Did you ever look the word up in the dictionary?" He said "No." And then he went to the dictionary and what do you suppose he found? He found that the word "model" was defined as "A small imitation of the real thing." If they ever prepare a political dictionary you will find the word "revise," when applied to tariff reduction, defined as a small imitation of the real thing. That was the word they used two years ago. But they can not use it again. That word will never appear again in a tariff plank of any platform. It is out-worn; it has outlived its day. The new word is commission. They haven't used that before for twenty-five years.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION IDEA

I warn you that you can not possibly reform the tariff by commission before the next presidential election. Let me show you. Let us take the most favorable circumstances. The congress that is elected this November will not meet in regular session until a year from next December, and then when it meets it must elect a speaker. If the republicans win, Mr. Cannon will be the speaker, and he does not want any commission. But suppose some other republican is selected; he will be like Cannon in his views, and he will be as much opposed to a commission as Mr. Cannon is. But suppose, by any possibility, you get a republican for speaker who is in favor of a commission. He is elected, and then he is given until after Christmas to announce the committees, and the committees will get to work about January 1. Now, let us see how a bill makes progress. Somebody introduces a bill to provide for a commission. It is referred to the committee. The committee considers it carefully and reports it back. It goes on the calendar. And then in time a day is set for consideration, a certain time is given for discussion and at the end of that time they vote and pass it and it goes to the senate. Then the senate refers it to a committee, and that committee considers it carefully and reports it back, and then a day is set for discussion. In the senate they can not take a vote until every senator has spoken as often as he wants to, and as long as he likes. And then it passes and it goes to the president and he signs it. Then he appoints a commission, taking time to get good men. He sends their names to the senate, and then the senate confirms the appointments, taking time to find out whether they are good men or not. And then the men are given time to close up their business; for they are important men and engaged in important business; and then they meet in Washington, and organize for investigation. And then they set a time for hearing, and then they hear, then they hear some more, and they keep on hearing, and then they go around over the country and listen. They they divide up into sub-committees, and go to Europe to investigate; and in the meantime you have a presidential election. But you can not say anything, you can not do anything, you can not think anything, because the commission will not have reported yet. And so you get past another presidential campaign. If you elect a high tariff president and a high tariff congress it will be regarded as an endorsement of the protective system, and then you don't need any commission; and if you elect a low tariff president and a low tariff congress, they will proceed to reduce the tariff without waiting for the commission. How do you like the commission plan?

WOULD TAKE A LONG TIME

When they talk about reforming the tariff by commission I am reminded of a man who had a breaking out on his hands. He went to the doctor and the doctor gave him some medicine and told him to put it on every morning and come back at the end of the month and report progress. He followed directions faithfully, and at the end of the month he went back. The doctor said, "How is your hand?" "Well," he says, "doctor, looking at it from day to day I can not see any change. Looking at it from week to week I sometimes think I can, and now at the end of the month I think it may be better, and, doctor, it may get well, but I am afraid it will not be in my day."

But, my friends, why wait? If any man tells you to wait until the commission acts let me give you an answer for him. Tell him you are in favor of acting now and reducing the tariff; that, if you have to have a commission, you will appoint it after you reduce the tariff; then you can wait patiently while it recommends an increase.

Turn the tables on them. They are willing to wait while you pay hundreds of millions in taxes every year that you ought not to pay. How patient they can be while you bear the load! Reduce the tariff first, and then see if they will be patient about it. It is all a farce and a fraud. No commission will ever take the question of taxation out of the hands of the people. The people will never permit a few men to decide for them what burden they shall carry under the system of protection.

Why do you wait? Haven't you learned enough of the manner in which tariff bills are prepared? Haven't you this bill before you that follows a campaign in which you were promised "revision"? Didn't Mr. Taft tell you, after the bill was passed,