

Record of Wilson and Democracy Deserves Indorsement of the American People

(Continued from Page Two.)

to relieve this situation with a government owned merchant marine, but the shipping trust objected to it, and the shipping trust controlled the republican leadership in the senate and the house. But we had a democratic senate, a democratic house, and a democratic President, and now we have a government owned merchant marine, authorized by law, and it can be used to protect the shippers from the extortion practiced by the shipping trust.

Mr. Hughes has ventured to denounce this law; he has made it an issue and you will decide by your votes whether the President was right in protecting the people with a government owned merchant marine, or whether Mr. Hughes is right in saying that the shipping trust or the shipping industry, as he calls it, must not be interfered with, even if it does take advantage of the war to collect extortionate freight rates.

THE CHILD LABOR LAW

We have a Child Labor law as the eighth reform. I am glad that the democratic party is leading in this matter. I am glad that the democratic party can look the children of the nation in the face and tell them that we are endeavoring to protect them from the greed of any employer who would dwarf their minds, stunt their bodies, and coin their blood into illegitimate dividends.

THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY

And then, just before adjournment, a new question came up, and the President has shown his ability to deal with these questions, whether they have been deliberated on a long while, or are sprung upon him as a surprise. There came a time when the controversy between the railroads and the members of four great brotherhoods of railroad employees reached a crisis. After the employers and employees had failed to agree the President called them to the White house and tried to bring them together. When that failed he proposed a law, and that law was passed. If any republican criticizes that law, call his attention to the fact that a majority of the republican congressmen voted for it. The first effect of it was to save the country from a nation-wide strike—a strike that would have suspended traffic, paralyzed business and caused a loss of hundreds of millions to the producers of perishable products. But important as that was, I do not regard that as most important. The greatest effect was the support it gave to the eight hour day in the United States. While the immediate beneficiaries of this law number only between three hundred and four hundred thousand, every wage earner in the nation is a participant in the benefits of this law, for it has brought that struggle to a successful issue. It has been a long struggle. If you will read the platforms of the parties you will find that as far back as eight years ago both of the great parties declared in favor of an eight-hour day. I put myself on record as in favor of an eight-hour day years ago. I believe in it. These laboring men are a part of our community; they are a part of our business life; they are part of our political life, and they have a right to live up to all the possibilities of American citizenship. If you drive the laboring man from his bed to his work and from his work back to his bed again, how is he to know the comforts of home life? And how is he to prepare himself for the discharge of the duties of citizenship? It is a farce to say to the laboring man that he is a citizen and then allow him to be prevented from preparing himself to enjoy the things you give him. The eight-hour day is now a fact, and it has been established under the leadership of a President who wisely used the opportunity presented.

MR. HUGHES OPPOSES LAW

Mr. Hughes, although he declares himself in favor of an eight-hour day, says that the President was wrong in proposing this law; he insists the law should not have been passed without investigation. Well, the republicans, by keeping me out of office, have left me free to keep an eye on republicans in office, and I have been busy. Mr. Hughes happens to be one of the re-

publicans whom I have watched. When he, as governor of New York, vetoed the two-cent railway fare bill, he gave as a reason that there had not been time for investigation. And they are still investigating down there after eight years have passed. Now he says the eight-hour law ought not to have been passed, that they ought to have investigated. Have they not been investigating all these years? The trouble with Mr. Hughes is that he takes the side of those who have ANOTHER REMEDY and is against those who have NO OTHER REMEDY. Let me illustrate: Had he signed the two-cent fare law in New York the railroads could have gone into the courts, and if they could have shown that an injustice had been done they could have suspended its operation. When, therefore, he vetoed the two-cent fare measure, he took the side of those who had another remedy and could not have been injured even had he signed the bill, but when he opposed the patrons of the road he decided against those who had no other remedy, for they could not go into the courts to secure justice.

And so on this question, he says the President was wrong—that means that, if he had been president, he would have taken the side of the railroads; he would have taken the side of those who HAVE A REMEDY and would have opposed those who had no remedy except the law that was proposed, or a strike. The railroads announce that they will test this law in the courts. If the courts decide that the law is unjust it will be suspended. When the President took the side of the railroad men he did no injustice to the railroads, because they have the courts to protect them. He took the side of the men who needed a friend in the White house.

Why do Mr. Hughes and President Wilson differ so radically on public questions? It is because they view public questions from opposite standpoints. There is only one line that can be drawn through society always and everywhere, namely, the line that separates the man who is at heart a democrat from the man who is at heart an aristocrat. I do not use the word democrat in a partisan sense. The word is more than two thousand years older than the democratic party. It describes an attitude of the human heart. Nine-tenths of those who call themselves republicans are at heart democratic and some who call themselves democrats are at heart aristocratic.

DEMOCRAT OR ARISTOCRAT, WHICH?

The democrat believes that society is built from the bottom, the aristocrat thinks society is suspended from the top. The democrat says: **Legislate for all the people**, for he believes that the prosperity of the masses will find its way up through all the classes that rest upon the masses. The aristocrat, believing that society is suspended from the top, says, and he says it honestly—for he believes it: **Legislate for the well-to-do** and then be patient and wait until their prosperity leaks through on those below. This explains why Mr. Hughes took the side of the railroads on the two-cent fare bill, why he vetoed the bill giving the poor of New York a five cent rate to Coney Island, why he took the side of the big tax dodgers on the income tax amendment, why he took the side of the shipping trust on the new shipping law, and why he has taken the side of the railroad managers against the men who asked for an eight-hour day. And it explains, also, why Mr. Wilson has taken the people's side on all questions. Will you vote to take the government out of the hands of Mr. Wilson and his progressive supporters, and turn it over to Mr. Hughes and his reactionary friends?

Now here is a record—is it not a record to be proud of? But I am not through. There are two other reforms that I ask you to consider.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

This administration is responsible for the passage of a law that gives to the Filipinos the promise of ultimate independence. Let me give the history of this struggle; the fight began eighteen years ago. Just as soon as imperialism raised its head the democratic party struck at it. It supported the Bacon resolution introduced in February 1899, within three months after the

treaty was signed that gave us the Philippines. The Bacon resolution promised ultimate independence, and in 1900, a year after, the democratic platform demanded ultimate independence, and it repeated the demand in 1904, 1908, and 1912. Our party has now carried out the promise and the law recently passed announces to the world that we have not repudiated the Declaration of Independence; that we do not intend to continue a colonial policy. The democratic party has not only done justice to the Philippines, but it has done justice to its own name and reputation. We can now stand erect and deny that we have surrendered to the temptations that overcome monarchies—the temptation to throw the net of government over helpless people and govern them without regard to their wishes.

THE THIRTY TREATIES

And, eleventh, the treaty plan. Europe has had machinery for war, but not for peace. Europe could go to war on a minute's notice but had no machinery for dealing with questions that defied diplomatic treatment. And until within four years, we were as poorly supplied with machinery for peace as Europe. Until within four years the best treaties we had were the twenty-six known as the arbitration treaties, and they had two serious drawbacks. In the first place, they only ran five years and then they died, and when one of these treaties died it had to be renewed just as it was made in the beginning. It had to be ratified by two-thirds of the senate, and, therefore, one more than one-third could prevent the extension of a treaty, notwithstanding the President and a majority of the senate might wish to renew it. Each of these treaties also had four exceptions, namely; questions of honor, questions of independence, vital interests, and the interests of third parties—the very questions out of which wars grow.

We now have thirty treaties with thirty nations, numbering a billion and three hundred millions, or three-fourths of all the world; and, besides this, we have the endorsement of the principle by three other nations with a combined population of over one hundred millions. Today we have either treaties, or agreements on the principle, with all the nations of the world, of any size or population, with the exception of less than five.

Instead of running for five years and then dying, these treaties never die. They run on and on for twelve months after one side or the other has asked that the treaty be discontinued, and if neither side asks that the treaty be discontinued, the treaty runs on and on forever. I believe that neither side will ever ask that one of these treaties be discontinued—I have such faith in these treaties that I believe that a thousand years from now the name of Woodrow Wilson and my name will be linked together in these treaties in the capitol of the world, and that these treaties, by furnishing machinery by which peace can be preserved with honor, will still be preserving the peace of our nations.

But, what is more important than their length of life, they have no exceptions. These treaties were intended to close the gap that other treaties had left, and they do close the gap. Every one of these thirty treaties provides that every dispute of every kind and character, no matter what it is, if it defies diplomatic treatment, shall be submitted to an international tribunal for investigation and report, and a year's time is allowed for the investigation and report, during which the parties are pledged not to resort to war.

If they had had treaties of this kind in Europe there would have been no war. They had only twenty-four hours to answer the ultimatum that went from Austria to Serbia; European diplomats told me that, if they had only had a week, they could have prevented that war. Our treaties provide a year's time for passion to subside, for questions of fact to be separated from questions of honor and for the peace forces of the world to operate. Already Argentine, Brazil and Chile have paid us the high compliment of copying the plan of these treaties into a treaty between the three great powers of South America, so that war is made a remote possibility now in South America, as well as between us and the thirty contracting nations.

These treaties have been so universally approved that they could muster no more than five votes against the ratification of any one, and