

than we had ten years ago.

What is the result? The country is what we said it would be—higher prices and better times—and our contention in regard to the quantitative theory of money has been vindicated by events.

And now I want to show you that even the republicans have been bearing testimony to the correctness of democratic principles.

Ten years ago the republicans came into power and for ten years they have had the president, the senate and the house, not to speak of the United States supreme court. They have had everything their own way. They could pass all the laws they wanted. They could repeal any laws they didn't like.

Not only have they had their own way, but they have been blessed by a prosperity that has come in spite of them—not because of them. They have been benefited by the prosperity that has come from a larger volume of money. Not only that, but they have had good crops and they have claimed the credit for the good crops and suggested that they were in silent partnership with the Almighty and that God was smiling on the country because the people voted the republican ticket. They have had ten years of power and yet, notwithstanding the advantages that have come for which they are not responsible, they have not satisfied the country.

The people today are not satisfied. The republican party today is not as popular as it was. I might give you many evidences of it. I might point to the fact that up in Maine they had an election. Republican speakers were there and yet there was a falling off in every republican district in Maine and if the falling off continues throughout the country only equal to what it was in Maine, we will have a democratic majority in the next congress.

Arkansas gave a larger democratic majority than before in a quarter of a century.

Vermont cut the republican majority half in two. But I will not depend on election figures. I will give you something more substantial. I will tell you the republican party has fallen in popularity to such an extent that whereas two years ago they had any number of available men for the presidency, now they have only one man who has popularity enough to be elected, according to republican ideas and opinions, and that man is the president himself.

The republican leaders go down on their knees to the president and they say:

"Oh, Mr. President, you did say the night of the election that you would regard this as your second term and would not run again, but, Mr. President," they say, "you didn't know what a desperate condition the republican party was going to be in." They say: "Mr. President, can't you take it back? Can't you forget that you have said it? Can't you forget that Washington refused a third term? Can't you forget that Jefferson refused a third term? Can't you forget EVERYTHING, Mr. President, and make your mind a blank, just to help the republican party out this once from its desperate condition?"

Now, that is the situation. Where are these other popular men? Where are these other intelligent republicans? For they have men of great intelligence—plenty of them. They have claimed for years that they had all the intelligence in the country.

They have twitted us with our ignorance. They have said democrats could not read or write. I have heard them say they could tell a democrat—just to have him write his name, and if he lolled out his tongue when he wrote he was a democrat.

Yes, they have made fun of us. But where are these intelligent republicans? Why aren't they popular? Aren't they well known? Yes—too well known.

And why is the president popular? Now, republicans, I want to ask you a question. I want you to answer it in your own mind before I do. Then see if your answer is the same as mine.

Why is President Roosevelt popular today? I will give you my reason: Because he is the only prominent republican who has had the courage to desert the republican platform and adopt planks from the democratic platform.

Now, republicans, how does that agree with your reason? Have you any other reason?

I say to you that President Roosevelt has a good element of popularity that is borrowed from democratic doctrines—from his supposed advocacy of something that democrats have advocated before.

This is not the first time I have said it. I said it a year ago. I was about to leave home

and I told the democrats that the president was taking our platform, taking it plank by plank—deliberately. I told them I was almost afraid to be gone a year for fear he would take the rest of it while I was gone.

That was not the first time, either. A year ago last January I attended a banquet in Washington. It was given by the Gridiron Club. The president himself was the guest of honor. From the beginning of the banquet to the end they were joking him about what he was taking from the democratic platform. When it came my time to speak I said I hadn't felt so good in Washington for years as I did then to see the things I had advocated and been called an anarchist for advocating being made respectable by being advocated in high places. Then I enumerated some of the things he had taken.

I said I felt like the old colored woman who was sick and sent for a colored physician and when she got worse she sent for a white physician and the white physician examined her pulse and then said to her:

"Did the other doctor take your temperature?"

She said: "I don't know. I ain't missed nothing but my watch yet."

I told them I hadn't had time to take an inventory to see how much I had lost. I told them I didn't object to it. I told them we felt complimented to have them think so highly of our ideas as to take them without asking for them. I told them it made me feel so good to see the republicans getting up on our platform that if I couldn't take back what I said about them I at least didn't feel like saying it again.

I told them I felt a good deal like the young fellow I heard of—a very bashful young fellow—who courted his girl for a year before he had the courage to propose to her, and one evening he made bold enough to tell her that he loved her and ask her to marry him. She was a frank sort of girl, and she said:

"Why, Jim, I have been loving you these many months and I had just been waiting for you to tell me so I could tell you."

Jim was overcome with delight and when he went out he looked up at the stars and said: "Why, I ain't got nothin' agin nobody."

That is the way I feel about it. I am just getting so I "ain't got nothin' agin nobody."

Oh, how pleasant it is to welcome to almost full fellowship these "reform republicans." I am willing to take them in on the Methodist plan of six months probation. Yes, it makes us feel good to see the democrats and the populists and the republicans all moving along in the same direction, all harmonious—with the democrats a little bit ahead.

Why, they used to say that the democrats camped each night where the republicans had camped the night before. They don't say that now.

We have got it turned around now. The republicans are following. When a republican reformer wants to make some progress he is a little timid about it and gets down on his hands and knees and crawls around looking for tracks and when he sees where the democratic army has gone he gets up and says: "Come on, boys! They have been here! This is safe!"

Oh, it is so nice. Yes, the president hasn't an element of popularity that he has not got by being a little democratic. And, my friends, if a republican president can become the only popular man in his party by being sporadically and spasmodically a little democratic, what would be the popularity of a democratic administration that was consistently and persistently and everlastingly democratic?

Well, what has the president done to earn popularity? You tell me that he brought about peace between Japan and Russia. I glory in it. Wherever I have been they have mentioned the name of the president as a peace-maker and it has made me proud of my nation.

In Japan I went out to visit a man—he couldn't speak our language—and he met us at the bottom of a hill in front of his house. Leading us up the hill he asked us to be seated and before we had a chance to say a word he asked the interpreter to interpret for him and thanked me, as an American, for what our president had done in bringing about peace between his country and Russia. Yes, it has been a glory to him, but, my friends, was he elected as a peace-maker?

On the contrary, the man who put him in nomination at Chicago two years ago nominated him with an eulogy of war. I have read speeches from my boyhood. My library is filled with books

with speeches in them and I never read a speech before that gave an eulogy of war. Yet this man, ex-Governor Black of New York, in his nominating speech, delivered an eulogy of war. He said men might preach and women pray, but at last these questions must be settled on the battlefield and that there must forever be the silent upturned face.

He gave the lie to Christian history. He denied the Christian's hope, if I know what Christianity means. In every Christian heart there must be the hope and the faith that the time will come when we will not kill because we differ in opinion, but will settle questions by the arbitration of reason. And yet, this man, after delivering an eulogy of war, presented the president as a man of blood and iron—a modern Mars to fit his eulogy.

How strange that this modern Mars should within a year, find his greatest fame in adopting the democratic idea that the nation's prestige must rest upon a moral basis and not upon a great army and a great navy!

What else made him popular? Why, he settled the coal strike. I am glad of it. I praised him at the time. I am glad to praise him yet. We had lost, according to the report of his arbitration board, \$99,000,000. But he settled it at last.

But where did he get his inspiration?

From a republican platform?

No. From a democratic platform. We had an arbitration plank in the platform adopted at Chicago. It was again in the Kansas City platform. It was again in the St. Louis platform. Three democratic national platforms have demanded arbitration. Not a republican national platform has demanded it.

I am so glad we had an arbitration plank to loan to the president when he needed something.

But, my friends, the republican leaders didn't seem to enjoy it. After the president settled one strike the republican leaders were not willing to establish a board of arbitration to make other strikes unnecessary. The laboring man has no remedy but a strike if he cannot agree with his employer.

I say to you that it is a disgrace to our civilization, a disgrace to our generation and a reproach to the republican administration that it has not given the laboring man a better remedy—that it has left the laboring man to fight out his differences and starve his wife and children during prolonged idleness in order to get justice in his demands.

Why haven't the republicans taken our plank and used it? They have stolen our thunder—why don't they steal our lightning, and not be satisfied with mere noise?

What else made the president popular? Why, he has done something on the trust question. I am glad he has. But, my friends, every step he has taken has been a step instigated by the democratic platform, and encouraged by democratic counsel, and he cannot find authority in his republican platforms for anything he has done on the trust question.

I am so glad that we have a plank on this subject to let him have when he needs something on the trust question.

Oh, my friends, he has not gone far enough! He has not gone fast enough! They don't intend to do enough. Read the Globe-Democrat—if any of you are so foolish as to read the Globe-Democrat—and what do you find?

On the front page a report of a speech by Speaker Cannon. Who is Speaker Cannon? The speaker of the house of representatives—the one man power that dominates congress. In the headlines you will see it says that Cannon says you must not destroy the trusts—just regulate them. Yes, my friends, they are very careful not to destroy the trusts. Why don't they regulate the trusts? Because the trusts regulate them. That is the reason.

They talk about reforms. What reforms of any magnitude have come that republicans can trust republican platforms, promises or speeches? When they talk about their reforms and what they have done and what they are going to do, I am reminded of the old colored man who married a second time and got an extravagant wife. He was telling one of his friends how extravagant she was.

"Why," he said, "today she wants a dollar and tomorrow 50 cents, and the next day a quarter, and then the next day she wants a dollar again and then 50 cents, and then the next day a quarter, and then a dollar and then 50 cents and then a quarter and it is just dollar and 50

(Continued on Page 14)