

# MR. HARDY'S SPEECH

Representative Rufus Hardy, representing the Sixth Texas district, and whose home is in Corsicana, Texas, delivered a tariff speech at Cameron, Texas, on the evening of October 18. In this speech Mr. Hardy took the position that Mr. Bryan is right in his position on the tariff question. The text of the speech follows:

My Fellow Citizens: I shall endeavor to discuss, as you have requested, the issues raised by Mr. Bryan and Mr. Bailey in their recent Dallas speeches. This will involve a discussion of the Denver convention and platform, the force and value of party platforms, the merits of several pledges of the Denver platform and the question not named or referred to in that platform—whether the raw material of the manufacturer should be admitted free of duty. The convention that met at Denver last year was a great convention. It was composed of many of the most distinguished members of the party, including many United States senators, governors, ex-governors and members of congress, and many who were not officeholders, but great leaders of the party, fresh from the great body and heart of the people. Its platform committee was selected and included its greatest men, among them Alton B. Parker, our standard bearer in 1904, who was favored, I think, by Mr. Bailey himself.

This platform committee devoted thirty-six hours to the discussion and preparation of the platform, and notwithstanding Mr. Bailey's attack upon it as being incapable of preparing a platform of democratic principles worthy to bind him, it needs no defense at my hands. Having made this attack upon the convention itself in the senate, Mr. Bailey proceeded to attack the platform. In bold terms he simply declared that the platform had no binding force upon him or any other democratic member of the house or senate whose conscience or judgment differed from it, which means that it had no value whatever. In that declaration, was Mr. Bailey right? Especially was he right as to those two planks of our platform which he denounces; first, the demand that trust-controlled products be placed on the free list, and, second, the lumber plank? As to the first, Mr. Bailey was not in the convention when it was adopted, but the convention had his credentials from the Texas state convention, containing instructions to him as a delegate to vote for that plank, and all the Texas delegates at Denver voted for it. The second plank included a demand for free wood pulp and print paper, for which every democrat in the house of representatives of the Sixtieth congress had declared.

## APPROVAL OF PARTY

These two planks had, to the public, every evidence of being approved by the whole party, after a strong campaign upon them during which no democrat raised his voice even in mild opposition. While Mr. Bailey did not attend the Fort Worth or Denver conventions, his closest political and personal friends did, and they voted without a murmur for both those platforms, and when they came home the closest of them all, perhaps, Mr. Ousley of the Fort Worth Record, indorsed the Denver platform as the embodiment of wisdom and democracy. This was the attitude in Texas and elsewhere while we were asking the people for their votes, and while I and many other Texans were making speeches in a dozen states of the union urging our platform and our candidate before the voters.

What are platforms? I want to read you just a little from other and former platforms. In 1868 the democracy concluded its platform thus: "Upon this platform the democratic party appeals to every patriot." In 1876 they say: "We do hereby appeal to our fellow citizens." In 1884 they say: "With this statement of the hopes, principles and purposes of the democratic party, the great issue is submitted."

In like manner every four years we have given forth our platform of promises and pledges of policies and principles, and on them asked for the people's trust and votes. The doctrine is certainly strange and modern that the candidate is sacred and must be supported, but principles and pledges, policies and promises—our platforms—are worthless; that the man, not the principle, is binding. In the olden time we voted for the man for the sake of the principle, now we are told we must vote for the principle for the sake of the nominee.

I don't believe the platform can bind me to vote for a dishonest or dishonorable measure,

but, my fellow citizens, if Mr. Bailey is right, party platforms are absolutely worthless. They are either republican platitudes to be twisted and tortured in construction or democratic falsehoods uttered only to cajole and deceive and to be spit upon by senators and congressmen who are bigger than the party.

In 1894 we had another democrat who was greater than his party, and the democrats were in power. They had made a platform and given promises and pledges to the people, but Senator Gorman was greater and wiser than his party. I happened to sit in the senate chamber on the day after Senator Gore had made the charge that Andrew Carnegie, through the kind offices of Mr. Gorman, was permitted to prepare the iron and steel schedule of the Wilson bill. Mr. Gore submitted with his statement a magazine article written by Mr. Carnegie.

## CARNEGIE ARTICLE

Mr. Bailey addressed the senate, and in substance denied the truth of Mr. Gore's speech and Mr. Carnegie's article, and left the impression on my mind that Mr. Gorman was absolutely free of any responsibility for any schedule of the Wilson bill. Mr. Gorman was highly eulogized by Mr. Bailey and the whole credit or discredit of that part of the Wilson bill applying to iron and steel was fixed upon the democratic senate finance committee or sub-committee, including Roger Q. Mills.

The cleanness of Mr. Mills was justly held up as guaranty that Mr. Carnegie was not allowed to write any schedule for him, and thus with Mills, irreproachable, in charge and Gorman far away, not even in touch with the committee, as shown by Mr. Bailey, Mr. Carnegie had only dreamed what he wrote.

Mr. Aldrich corroborated Mr. Bailey, and together they left friend Gore not a peg to hang upon.

What was my astonishment on my return home to have shown me the copy of a letter written in 1903 and published in the Houston Post from E. H. Church, cashier of the First National bank of Corsicana and lifelong friend of Roger Q. Mills, which in part says:

## AS TO MILLS

"Corsicana, Texas, October 20, 1903.—Editor Post: Noticing a letter from Senator Butler of South Carolina \* \* \* and an editorial in a recent issue of your paper concerning the part played by Senator Gorman in changing the Wilson bill along protection lines \* \* \* I beg leave to submit the following facts which I think can not be controverted \* \* \* and I think the truth of history demands it. When the Wilson bill was sent from the house to the senate, it was referred to the senate committee on finance. That committee referred it to a sub-committee with instructions to make a more truly democratic bill. This committee was made up of Senators Jones of Arkansas, Vest of Missouri, and Mills of Texas. Mills was not a member of the committee on finance. When he went from the house to the senate he had been at once tendered an assignment on that committee by a special resolution introduced by Mr. Voorhees of Indiana \* \* \* but declined owing to ill health. When, however, the Wilson bill came to the senate, he was asked by the democratic senators on the finance committee to act with them in remodeling the bill along lower tariff lines, and when he agreed to do this was made a member of the sub-committee referred to above. This committee had the bill in hand several weeks, and reported it back to the full democratic membership of the finance committee. Senator Gorman, becoming acquainted with the provisions of the bill as framed by Jones, Vest and Mills, was very much displeased and was instrumental in having a caucus of all democratic senators called to consider the bill. At that time the democrats controlled the senate by, I think, only two majority. One of these, Hill of New York, intended to vote against the bill \* \* \* on account of the income tax provision which it contained. Therefore it was necessary to have such a bill as could command the support of all or it must fail of passage. In the caucus, Senator Gorman spoke for three days against the bill, until finally it was seen that the only thing that could be done was to allow himself and those who agreed with him to make such changes in its schedules as would cause it to receive their support. This being done, it was

turned over to Gorman, Brice of Ohio, Smith of New Jersey and possibly Murphy of New York and one or two others. \* \* \* Under their charge more than 600 articles were increased, thus undoing the work of Jones, Vest and Mills and making it worse than the Wilson bill had been when it came from the house.

## CLEVELAND'S ATTITUDE

"This action caused Mr. Cleveland to denounce it as a measure of party perfidy and dishonor." The Congressional Record will show that when this bill was reported to the senate, Senator Mills rose in his place and denounced the bill and said that it was not the Wilson bill, but that it was the Gorman-Brice bill and that he intended to vote against every one of the amendments and to denounce the republican and protective features injected into the bill by those senators who called themselves democrats, but wanted a republican protective tariff bill passed. The letter of Senator Butler of South Carolina is, of course, written in the interest of Senator Gorman's candidacy for the presidency. \* \* \* One who reads Senator Butler's letter can readily understand why he appears as counsel for Senator Gorman. Being a protectionist himself, he naturally desires some one of his own faith to lead the party so that in any event, whether the democratic or republican party win, we may have a protectionist president."

The letter continues very forcibly, but I have given enough of it to show that Mr. Bailey and Mr. Aldrich must have been very much mistaken when they acquitted Mr. Gorman in the senate of having any hand in the mutilation of the Wilson bill, and enough to show that Andrew Carnegie spoke true in his magazine article when he said that he was allowed by Mr. Gorman to prepare the iron and steel schedule.

If I remember rightly, Mr. Gorman, before his death, was Mr. Bailey's first choice for the democratic nomination for the presidency in 1904.

It is any wonder that Mr. Bailey, treading the very paths that Gorman had, should desire his nomination?

## THE LUMBER PLANK

In attacking the lumber plank at Houston, Mr. Bailey said: "What is the next article? Print paper. Why? They wanted to bribe the newspapers and magazines to support the democratic ticket. The bribe didn't work. I am glad it didn't for I pray God the democratic party may be spared of victory it must purchase." In the senate he said: "Mr. President, the story of that convention need not be told. This particular free lumber proposition was put there to carry two or three of the northwestern states. It did not carry them, and I think the consideration for the promise failed." Strange words from a democrat and strange recognition in its peculiar way that he was or ought to be bound by the promise unless he could find some excuse. I leave you to construe his words as to what he was glad of and judge of the excuse he gives for violating the promise.

The next attack he makes is upon the plank demanding that trust controlled products be admitted free.

He says: "Repeal the duty on every article controlled by a trust and we remit \$150,000,000 of revenue at one stroke of the pen. Now, let us be practical men. The remedy is not to put trust-controlled articles on the free list but put trust-controlling magnates in the penitentiary." And with that, Mr. Bailey demolishes the strongest tariff demand of the Denver platform and of the Fort Worth platform. He is going to solve everything by putting trust magnates in the penitentiary. The democratic party in state and nation have been demanding that trust magnates be put in the penitentiary for many years, and that is one of the remedies called for by the Denver platform. Mr. Bailey is not original in urging it. He is only original in urging that we leave all other remedies alone and seek no other relief, and depend alone on criminal statutes to protect the people from oppressive combinations fostered by the tariff and sustained by the trusts; but the stubborn fact remains that no great trust magnate so far has ever worn a convict's stripe for violating an anti-trust criminal statute.

## BAILEY'S ARGUMENT

Mr. Bailey defends the duties he voted for on the ground that they were not protective duties, and were revenue duties both in their rates and results. I deny this, but if it were true it would still not answer or disprove the charge of disloyalty Mr. Bryan brings against him. The plat-