

Bryan's Labor Day Speech

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am greatly obliged to the committee for the invitation which enables me to participate in the celebration of Labor day at this place. This day has been wisely set apart by law to emphasize the dignity of labor and for the consideration of those subjects which especially affect the interests of the wage-earner.

The first thing to be considered is the laboring man's ambition; what are his aims and his purposes; for what is he striving? The animal needs only food and shelter because he has nothing but a body to care for, but man's wants are more numerous.

In other countries and in other civilizations men have been condemned by birth to a particular occupation, place and caste, in this country each man, however, is born free and strives for the highest rewards in business, state or church, and these avenues of advancement must be kept open.

No civilization can be considered perfect which does not plant a hope in the breast of every child born into the world, the nearer we approach to this ideal the better is our civilization.

Those who complain of existing conditions cannot be put aside as disturbers of the peace. To seek a remedy for every abuse of government is more patriotic than to profit by bad systems and then frown down all criticism.

The extremes of society are really not as far apart as they appear. Those who work for wages today may, under a good government, be employers in a few years, and the sons of those who are employers today may in a short time be day laborers.

It is of advantage to the rich as well as to the poor that the children of all have an opportunity to secure an education; for education widens the individual horizon, increases his capacity for usefulness, multiplies his enjoyments and makes him in every way more serviceable to society.

Why should the man who eats at a well supplied table forget the man whose toil furnishes the food? Why should the man who warms himself by the fire forget the man whose labor is the force or the mine brings forth the fuel? Why should the man who dined in the best products of the loom, forget the man whose calloused hands make the clothing possible?

How can the wage-earner secure that share of the earth's bounties and the government's protection which he deserves? The associations formed by workmen have been productive of much good.

The labor organizations as we now find it is the product of industrial conditions. The individual found himself at a disadvantage when dealing with the corporate employer, and the organization was only enabled him to contend for his rights upon terms more nearly equal, but it stimulates him to study and understand the conditions which surround him.

The labor organization has been foremost in advocating reforms which have already been secured. Several years ago the secret ballot was demanded by the wage-earners for their own protection. That ballot has been obtained, and through its operation corporations are able to protect their political rights and to use the ballot according to their own judgments. This is a long step in advance.

the twenty-four hours must be given to sleep; if another third of the day is devoted to manual labor, only eight hours are left for eating, for going to and from the place of work, for the reading of current news, for mental improvement, recreation, social intercourse and domestic life.

The labor organization has been a consistent and persistent advocate of the doctrine of arbitration, although supporting the same by a number of reforms should be thrown upon the laboring man. Surely the employer, if he would take a comprehensive view of his own interests, would be as much benefited by arbitration as the employee, and because every prolonged contest between labor and capital brings interruption to business and pecuniary loss to those who are in no way responsible for the disagreement, society in general is even more interested than employers or employees.

The laboring man has abundant reason to fear the trusts. Mr. Charles R. Flint, in a speech delivered in Boston more than a year ago in defense of the trusts, frankly asserts that one of the advantages of these combinations is that "in case of local strikes or fires the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss."

The laboring man is also interested in legislation prohibiting oriental immigration. It is unfair to the American workman, who is the foundation of the nation's wealth in time of peace and its defense in time of war, to subject him to the danger of having his occupation given to an oriental laborer, often brought in by contract, whose labor is scarcely less weighty than the economic ones.

It is of advantage to the rich as well as to the poor that the children of all have an opportunity to secure an education; for education widens the individual horizon, increases his capacity for usefulness, multiplies his enjoyments and makes him in every way more serviceable to society.

Why should the man who eats at a well supplied table forget the man whose toil furnishes the food? Why should the man who warms himself by the fire forget the man whose labor is the force or the mine brings forth the fuel? Why should the man who dined in the best products of the loom, forget the man whose calloused hands make the clothing possible?

How can the wage-earner secure that share of the earth's bounties and the government's protection which he deserves? The associations formed by workmen have been productive of much good.

The labor organizations as we now find it is the product of industrial conditions. The individual found himself at a disadvantage when dealing with the corporate employer, and the organization was only enabled him to contend for his rights upon terms more nearly equal, but it stimulates him to study and understand the conditions which surround him.

The labor organization has been foremost in advocating reforms which have already been secured. Several years ago the secret ballot was demanded by the wage-earners for their own protection. That ballot has been obtained, and through its operation corporations are able to protect their political rights and to use the ballot according to their own judgments. This is a long step in advance.

that the representative of the people has personal interests at variance with the interests of his constituency. Corruption in municipal, state and federal governments is due to the misrepresentation of the people by public servants, who use their positions for private advantage.

But the laboring man is even more interested in the proposition to establish a labor bureau with a cabinet officer at its head. Such a bureau would keep the executive constantly in touch with the wage-earners of the country, and open the way to the redress of their present and future grievances. If labor is given a place in the president's official household, the man selected will necessarily be a worthy and trusted representative of the people for whom he speaks, and his presence at cabinet meetings will give to those who toil for their daily bread assurance that their interests will be properly guarded.

The laboring man has abundant reason to fear the trusts. Mr. Charles R. Flint, in a speech delivered in Boston more than a year ago in defense of the trusts, frankly asserts that one of the advantages of these combinations is that "in case of local strikes or fires the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss."

The laboring man is also interested in legislation prohibiting oriental immigration. It is unfair to the American workman, who is the foundation of the nation's wealth in time of peace and its defense in time of war, to subject him to the danger of having his occupation given to an oriental laborer, often brought in by contract, whose labor is scarcely less weighty than the economic ones.

It is of advantage to the rich as well as to the poor that the children of all have an opportunity to secure an education; for education widens the individual horizon, increases his capacity for usefulness, multiplies his enjoyments and makes him in every way more serviceable to society.

Why should the man who eats at a well supplied table forget the man whose toil furnishes the food? Why should the man who warms himself by the fire forget the man whose labor is the force or the mine brings forth the fuel? Why should the man who dined in the best products of the loom, forget the man whose calloused hands make the clothing possible?

How can the wage-earner secure that share of the earth's bounties and the government's protection which he deserves? The associations formed by workmen have been productive of much good.

The labor organizations as we now find it is the product of industrial conditions. The individual found himself at a disadvantage when dealing with the corporate employer, and the organization was only enabled him to contend for his rights upon terms more nearly equal, but it stimulates him to study and understand the conditions which surround him.

The labor organization has been foremost in advocating reforms which have already been secured. Several years ago the secret ballot was demanded by the wage-earners for their own protection. That ballot has been obtained, and through its operation corporations are able to protect their political rights and to use the ballot according to their own judgments. This is a long step in advance.

now than it was forty years ago. The Army and Navy Journals is already justifying the colonial idea, and declaring that fate has decreed for us a destiny in which an imperial executive, free from the restraints of a written constitution, will govern subjects according to his own pleasure.

Only a blind person can fail to see that remarkable transformations of one kind or another are in store for the race; hence the folly of asserting that the policy of this country, which is destined to play such a leading part in human affairs of the future, shall be governed for the most part by political maxims uttered more than a hundred years ago.

The laboring man has abundant reason to fear the trusts. Mr. Charles R. Flint, in a speech delivered in Boston more than a year ago in defense of the trusts, frankly asserts that one of the advantages of these combinations is that "in case of local strikes or fires the work goes on elsewhere, thus preventing serious loss."

The laboring man is also interested in legislation prohibiting oriental immigration. It is unfair to the American workman, who is the foundation of the nation's wealth in time of peace and its defense in time of war, to subject him to the danger of having his occupation given to an oriental laborer, often brought in by contract, whose labor is scarcely less weighty than the economic ones.

It is of advantage to the rich as well as to the poor that the children of all have an opportunity to secure an education; for education widens the individual horizon, increases his capacity for usefulness, multiplies his enjoyments and makes him in every way more serviceable to society.

Why should the man who eats at a well supplied table forget the man whose toil furnishes the food? Why should the man who warms himself by the fire forget the man whose labor is the force or the mine brings forth the fuel? Why should the man who dined in the best products of the loom, forget the man whose calloused hands make the clothing possible?

How can the wage-earner secure that share of the earth's bounties and the government's protection which he deserves? The associations formed by workmen have been productive of much good.

The labor organizations as we now find it is the product of industrial conditions. The individual found himself at a disadvantage when dealing with the corporate employer, and the organization was only enabled him to contend for his rights upon terms more nearly equal, but it stimulates him to study and understand the conditions which surround him.

The labor organization has been foremost in advocating reforms which have already been secured. Several years ago the secret ballot was demanded by the wage-earners for their own protection. That ballot has been obtained, and through its operation corporations are able to protect their political rights and to use the ballot according to their own judgments. This is a long step in advance.

CHAMP CLARK'S LETTER

Bryan's Masterly Speeches and Their Effect.

POWERFUL CAMPAIGNING.

Secretary Hay as a Hauler Down of the American Flag.

TEDDY IS THE WHOLE THING.

Alteid Portrays the Braggart in His True Colors—Strong Possibility That the Democrats May Carry Ohio—Philippine Policy of the Administration—Different Kinds of Expansion.

(Special Washington Letter.) In prize ring parlance Bryan is a wonder.

He succeeded in making a speech at Indianapolis against which even the most bitter Republicans have nothing to say except that he ought to have discussed 16 to 1 instead of imperialism, which the Kansas City convention declared to be "the paramount issue."

What a contrast all this forms to the bowl of ribald execration with which his wondrous speech at Chicago in 1896 was received! Truly Bryan is to be congratulated on having conquered the good opinion of his enemies.

As a gun is made of iron the white man is mighty uncertain. It grieves me sorely to state it, but it now appears that the theory embodied in the presidential questions propounded at a banquet down south at 2 o'clock in the morning—"Who will haul down the American flag? Men of Dixie, w'l you haul it down?"—is an adjustable theory made to fit circumstances. This discovery causes me to somewhat lose faith in human nature.

But, mirabile dictu! now, after all this boasting and cavorting round, after all this playing of the Pharisee, Colonel John Hay, secretary of state, gives away to Johnnie Bull a strip of Alaska 20 miles wide and over 100 miles long! Didn't our flag float over that strip of auriferous soil? Hadn't it floated there triumphantly since 1867, when Andrew Johnson and William H. Seward added Alaska to our possessions? And in order to make Mr. Bull this valuable present, will it not be necessary to haul Old Glory down? Isn't this the swiftest and most thorough exposure of rank hypocrisy in modern times?

Colonel Hay is one of the most amiable of mortals. He is a scholar and writer of rare ability. His "Pike County Ballads" are famous, and his "Life of Abraham Lincoln" is a standard work, but I fear that Colonel Hay's residence at the court of St. James has given a bias to his thoughts and sentiments in favor of Mr. Bull which is detrimental to his country.

Colonel Teddy is it. He has been ever since he delivered that St. Paul harangue. By this time it has perhaps percolated through his noddle that it is dangerous for the occupant of a glass house to throw stones. Ex-Governor John Peter Alteid in that Toledo speech to which I referred in my last letter says:

Who, then, is this man, and what is his history? Personalities are offensive, and I will not indulge in them. But surely, when we are thus publicly assaulted, we may ask who it is that is assaulting us. I will notice only a few of the incidents of his public career, which throw light on the question of his sincerity and discretion. I find it recorded that when he was a member of the New York legislature, and on one occasion he refused the hopes of the country by making a speech against a class which he called the criminal rich. But he at once dashed these hopes by turning around and voting with and for these very criminal rich whom he had denounced.

the legislature in extra session and had it change this law as the corporations dictated. The canal fund of New York had been robbed of about \$9,000,000 by Republican politicians, and although he talked loudly of prosecution, the governor has not brought one of these men to justice.

History records the fact that the governor has never lost an opportunity, when standing in the temple or the market place, to make loud protestations of heroic virtue, but the historian has searched in vain for any evidence of performance. The volume of profession is full, but the page of performance is a blank.

I wish to avoid even the appearance of severity, and as I have not the language to properly characterize the burning of towns, the slaughter of people and the assassination of liberty. But the Democratic party will pay no attention to his vulgar assaults.

If anything more caustic than that has appeared since Sir Philip Francis wrote the "Letters of Junius," I have not seen it. What's more, Colonel Roosevelt richly deserves the execration.

Politics in Ohio. I have been in Ohio lately, giving political joint lectures at Chautauques with my Republican friends, Hon. Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver of Iowa and Charles B. Landis of Indiana.

While I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, I should not be at all surprised to see Bryan get the electoral vote of Ohio and to see a majority of the Ohio delegation in congress Democratic. Now, mark you, I am not claiming Ohio, but I am stating that from close observation, from conversations with all manner and condition of people, my conclusion is that Democrats have the best chance to bag Ohio that they have had since Franklin Pierce mopped up the earth with General Winfield Scott in 1852.

The Jones vote added to the McLean vote would give the state to the Democrats by some 50,000, and that's precisely the thing which makes all things uncertain and which keeps everybody jumping. Where will the Jones vote be found this time? Is the question that gives Mark Hanna trouble, for Mark knows—none better—that if it once gets rated about that Ohio is a doubtful state that fact alone will defeat Mark.

At Lancaster Colonel Davidson and I had what may be said as the greatest crowd assembled in Ohio at a political function since the log cabin, coonskin, hard cider campaign of 1840. Excitement was intense, which bodes good for the Democrats.

Human Nature the Same Everywhere. Napoleon once said, "Scratch a Russian, and you will find a Tartar," and it really appears that if you scratch the average American citizen you will strike a savage.

But, mirabile dictu! now, after all this boasting and cavorting round, after all this playing of the Pharisee, Colonel John Hay, secretary of state, gives away to Johnnie Bull a strip of Alaska 20 miles wide and over 100 miles long! Didn't our flag float over that strip of auriferous soil? Hadn't it floated there triumphantly since 1867, when Andrew Johnson and William H. Seward added Alaska to our possessions? And in order to make Mr. Bull this valuable present, will it not be necessary to haul Old Glory down? Isn't this the swiftest and most thorough exposure of rank hypocrisy in modern times?

Colonel Hay is one of the most amiable of mortals. He is a scholar and writer of rare ability. His "Pike County Ballads" are famous, and his "Life of Abraham Lincoln" is a standard work, but I fear that Colonel Hay's residence at the court of St. James has given a bias to his thoughts and sentiments in favor of Mr. Bull which is detrimental to his country.

Colonel Teddy is it. He has been ever since he delivered that St. Paul harangue. By this time it has perhaps percolated through his noddle that it is dangerous for the occupant of a glass house to throw stones. Ex-Governor John Peter Alteid in that Toledo speech to which I referred in my last letter says:

Who, then, is this man, and what is his history? Personalities are offensive, and I will not indulge in them. But surely, when we are thus publicly assaulted, we may ask who it is that is assaulting us. I will notice only a few of the incidents of his public career, which throw light on the question of his sincerity and discretion. I find it recorded that when he was a member of the New York legislature, and on one occasion he refused the hopes of the country by making a speech against a class which he called the criminal rich. But he at once dashed these hopes by turning around and voting with and for these very criminal rich whom he had denounced.

It is most recorded that he entered the Spanish war in Cuba, and, although his regiment was commanded by another man, he succeeded, by means of that modern weapon of warfare known as a newspaper bureau, in winning more renown in a week than General Grant did in four years of hard fighting, and he seems to be the only man on this continent who boasts of having, with his own hand, shot down and killed a Spaniard that was fleeing from the battlefield. In his book he says: "As they turned to run I closed in and fired twice, missing the first and killing the second." He then boasts that he had considered this a unique feat, and so it is. He is the first brave man to shoot an enemy in the back.

to the pole. There is not a member of the house on either side of the big aisle who does not entertain a wholesome respect for Bob Williams.

In discussing the policy of the president toward the Philippine Islanders Congressman Williams rang the bell every shot. In concluding his speech he said:

But in answer to all these allegations we are met with the very eloquent but empty phrase, "Who will pull down the flag?" I answer, the American government. Whenever a nation shall ever haul it down, our government has always pulled it down from places where it did not belong. It pulled it down in Mexico, in Canada, and if we observe our sacred pledge, we will haul it down in Cuba whenever its people desire it.

We had better haul it down in Cuba now than have it wave over that fair island. For a banner of glory and corruption, I would rather see it go down in honor than up in dishonor; down as the emblem of liberty than up as the emblem of despotism. Our flag should never remain in a land where the constitution of the United States and American liberty can never dwell. I would rather have it snatched from its mast a thousand times than see its sacred folds unfurled to the breeze as the new banner of imperialist aggression, the federal signal of the republic.

Who will pull down the flag? I ask: Who will pull down the Declaration of Independence? Who will tear the constitution of the United States from the White House, William, the conqueror, he will pull them down. He has already torn from their sacred pages the sublime assurance that liberty is a God-given right, written in their blood, in letters of blood, the bitter words of tyranny and oppression.

Would to God the Republican party of today contained within its ranks another Lincoln, to check it in its downward course of criminal aggression and restore it to the sacred precincts of human liberty it once enjoyed.

But the question of freedom raised by gentlemen on the other side, how can the Democrats oppose the annexation of those islands when Jefferson, their great founder, was such an expansionist? Jefferson's expansion consisted in acquiring territory here on this hemisphere, then in the possession of a foreign power, thereby removing from our very shores the power whose presence here made war more threatening and defense more difficult.

McKinley's expansion gives us territory 10,000 miles from this capital and carries us right into the broils and entanglements of all the warring powers of Europe. Jefferson's expansion removed the foreign flag from our shores, while McKinley's expansion carries our flag into the broils and entanglements of all the warring powers of Europe. Jefferson's expansion carried the foreign flag from our shores, while McKinley's expansion carries our flag into the broils and entanglements of all the warring powers of Europe.

At Lancaster Colonel Davidson and I had what may be said as the greatest crowd assembled in Ohio at a political function since the log cabin, coonskin, hard cider campaign of 1840. Excitement was intense, which bodes good for the Democrats.

Human Nature the Same Everywhere. Napoleon once said, "Scratch a Russian, and you will find a Tartar," and it really appears that if you scratch the average American citizen you will strike a savage.

But, mirabile dictu! now, after all this boasting and cavorting round, after all this playing of the Pharisee, Colonel John Hay, secretary of state, gives away to Johnnie Bull a strip of Alaska 20 miles wide and over 100 miles long! Didn't our flag float over that strip of auriferous soil? Hadn't it floated there triumphantly since 1867, when Andrew Johnson and William H. Seward added Alaska to our possessions? And in order to make Mr. Bull this valuable present, will it not be necessary to haul Old Glory down? Isn't this the swiftest and most thorough exposure of rank hypocrisy in modern times?

Colonel Hay is one of the most amiable of mortals. He is a scholar and writer of rare ability. His "Pike County Ballads" are famous, and his "Life of Abraham Lincoln" is a standard work, but I fear that Colonel Hay's residence at the court of St. James has given a bias to his thoughts and sentiments in favor of Mr. Bull which is detrimental to his country.

Colonel Teddy is it. He has been ever since he delivered that St. Paul harangue. By this time it has perhaps percolated through his noddle that it is dangerous for the occupant of a glass house to throw stones. Ex-Governor John Peter Alteid in that Toledo speech to which I referred in my last letter says:

Who, then, is this man, and what is his history? Personalities are offensive, and I will not indulge in them. But surely, when we are thus publicly assaulted, we may ask who it is that is assaulting us. I will notice only a few of the incidents of his public career, which throw light on the question of his sincerity and discretion. I find it recorded that when he was a member of the New York legislature, and on one occasion he refused the hopes of the country by making a speech against a class which he called the criminal rich. But he at once dashed these hopes by turning around and voting with and for these very criminal rich whom he had denounced.

It is most recorded that he entered the Spanish war in Cuba, and, although his regiment was commanded by another man, he succeeded, by means of that modern weapon of warfare known as a newspaper bureau, in winning more renown in a week than General Grant did in four years of hard fighting, and he seems to be the only man on this continent who boasts of having, with his own hand, shot down and killed a Spaniard that was fleeing from the battlefield. In his book he says: "As they turned to run I closed in and fired twice, missing the first and killing the second." He then boasts that he had considered this a unique feat, and so it is. He is the first brave man to shoot an enemy in the back.