

.... The Spectacular Declination of Speaker Henderson....

The most sensational bit of political news in recent years was the announcement by Speaker Henderson that he had withdrawn from the congressional race. The Associated press dispatches under date of Dubuque, Ia., September 16, convey the reasons for the speaker's retirement as follows:

Speaker Henderson, finding that his views in respect to the treatment of trusts by reducing the tariff in whole or in part, are not in accord with the views of many of his party in Iowa, has this day declined to accept the nomination for congress and has withdrawn from the race.

Speaker Henderson has addressed the following letter to Hon. C. E. Albrook of Eldora, Ia., chairman of the notification committee:

"My Dear Sir: I have never answered the kind notice communicated by you and your associates advising me of my nomination for the eleventh time by acclamation as republican candidate for congress of the Third congressional district of Iowa.

"Reported conditions in the public mind in my district upon public policies induced me to take this delay. Since my return to the district I have made a careful study as to the sentiment in the district and state, and I believe, that there is no little sentiment and growing sentiment among republicans that I do not truly represent their views on the tariff question. Believing this condition to exist and knowing that I do not agree with many of my people that the trusts, to which I am and have been opposed, can be cured or the people benefited by free trade in whole or in part, I must decline to accept the nomination so generously and enthusiastically made.

"I have devoted twenty of the best years of my life to the service of my people and my country and have fought for what I believed to be best for the farmer, the laborer and the business interests of this district and state. I am grateful for the devotion that has ever been accorded me and to the hour of my death will hold in a grateful heart the memory of that devotion.

"I will later on give in some detail

my views and convictions on our conditions and on public questions and state my reasons why the republican party and its policies should continue in the confidence of the voters of the United States and why the doctrines of the democracy should find no lodgment in the faith and teachings of the republican party.

"In conclusion I desire to say that, after a careful study of conditions and political views in Iowa and in my own district, I am satisfied that I am not in harmony with a great many of the republican voters, who believe that free trade, in whole or in part, will remedy the trust evil. I believe that it will not, but that such a remedy is to involve the nation in dangerous results, and so believing, I feel that I should not accept the nomination for congress, which was so generously tendered me, and I have decided accordingly. I cannot part from a people that I have loved and that have honored me, without leaving an expression of my earnest and sincere views on this and other vital public questions. Very truly yours,

"D. B. HENDERSON."

Speaker Henderson announced his withdrawal after a conference of several hours' duration with Chairman Glasser of the congressional committee and friends this afternoon. He had been contemplating this action for two weeks, but had intimated nothing of it to his friends until yesterday. At the conference, his friends implored him not to take the action, but to no avail. He said he had made up his mind and no argument could cause him to change his decision.

When asked for his reasons for withdrawal, Speaker Henderson said:

"My letter to Chairman Albrook is the whole thing in a nutshell. You cannot kill the trusts by applying free trade without killing our own industries. The foreign trusts are fighting the American trusts and I do not believe that for the purpose of controlling American trusts we should make a market for foreign trusts, thereby crushing out the interests of this country.

"After the conference at Waterloo, hearing the sentiments of the chairman of my district, I concluded my tariff views were at variance with those of many of my party, and I did not wish to appear in a false position."

Speaker Henderson gave out an address this evening that states his views

on the tariff and trust questions and because these views, in his opinion, are not in accord with the state platform and with the opinions of prominent members of his party he declines to accept renomination.

The address is to "The Voters of the Third Iowa District." He says being a republican he is a protectionist, and if he ever entertained a doubt as to the wisdom of the protection policy, comparison between the present and the past would blot out such a doubt. He then speaks of the tariff planks of the last two national conventions.

Continuing, he says: "For three years I have advocated giving control of trusts to congress. In my judgment proper supervision can never be had until congress has power to treat them. I am glad to see by speeches made by our fearless and upright chief executive that he is advocating federal control of these corporations and while in some quarters they may sneer at it, I have not seen any proposition yet, except this, that seems at all likely to bring relief. No proposition has ever been made by the democracy, excepting to put everything on the free list and to give the country free trade. In other words they proposed to kill the child dead in order to cure it.

"In other words, they propose to slaughter every interest in the United States, whether capital or labor, in a wild and blind effort to provide a remedy for trusts. In my opinion if combinations could be regulated and controlled, we would have very little demand for change in the tariff law. To show how strongly the republican party feels on the subject, in its state platform this year it declares for any modification of the tariff that might be required to prevent affording shelter to monopoly.

"Our democrat friends treat this as moving into free trade ground. It is nothing of the sort. It is a bold declaration that if modifications of the tariff are required to prevent monopoly from sheltering itself under the wings of protection, then the tariff laws shall be modified to prevent that condition. For my part if any great interest in this country is prospering through protection policies and is using its advantage, growth and prosperity to plunder the American people, I am for one ready to strike it by whatever legal means we may be able to adopt, providing that by so doing we will not hurt innocent persons. I am not

prepared to say we will strike down American combinations, and let outside corporations come in and do the work, but I would like to control our own corporations.

"I have been more amused than hurt at the suggestions that I have been against any changes in the tariff. While I have been against a general revision, recognizing the wisdom of President Roosevelt in his first message to congress in which he advised against it, I have never been opposed to making needed changes. And now, I must say that I do not believe that a single schedule of the Dingley tariff law can be amended so as to relieve the people from the oppression of trusts, and that such action may involve the retarding of our expanding commerce and the getting and holding of foreign markets. Indeed, I believe such a plan to be fraught with great danger to our people.

"I am a great friend of reciprocity. I worked with zeal to attain reciprocal relations between this country and Cuba, and was successful in getting it through the house. The senate did not act on the bill, because it would have permitted the opening of the whole question of tariff revision.

"The house has nothing to say about the ratification of treaties, but the reciprocal resolution by which it legislated in the relations with Cuba were not in the nature of treaties, but were reciprocal agreements in which I think our country would have the best of the bargain, although they would be of great advantage to Cuba.

"While I cannot speak for the prospects of favorable action on bills sent to the senate, I still hope and believe the same result may be accomplished and I have no doubt that President Roosevelt is now working on the question of a treaty with Cuba to give that struggling young republic needed help; a help, too, in which, while they will be gainers, we will not be losers. Now let me say and let there be no misunderstanding as to my position, I believe in protection that will protect the hand of labor, the wheels of industry, every farmer and miner, and I am against wicked corporations that would trample on the rights of the people to fair play and the fruits of honest efforts. I am against useless legislation that would throw our country into panic, and bring the horrors bequeathed to us by the last democratic administration."

In response to numerous requests for copies of this Speech, it is published in The Commoner. The principles then discussed are yet vital ones.

The Tariff Question

Speech of Mr. Bryan in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 16, 1892.

(Continued from last week.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the committee will pardon me for detaining them so long I want to say that it is as difficult to defend the necessity for a tariff as it is to defend its principles or its policy. And this brings me to another contradiction which we often find in the arguments of our republican friends. If you ask them why they need a tariff they at once tell you that we pay so much better wages in this country than are paid abroad that we cannot compete, and that until we are willing to reduce the wages of our workmen we never can compete. That is a very plausible argument to start with, but then comes along some person who asks a question something like that asked yesterday

by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Crain) of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Walker). The gentleman from Texas asks, "Does not that protection make the price of goods higher in this country than abroad?" "No, sir," says Mr. Walker. "Everything that a man uses, except woolen goods, is cheaper in this country than it is abroad."

Now, to an "untutored mind," such as we are told new members possess, it would seem that if you need protection to labor in this country because labor is higher, that idea is hardly consistent, upon the republican theory, with a cheaper product. Yet the same gentleman who yesterday told you that we must have a tariff to protect the laboring men in this country told you that the laboring men of this country were producing articles cheap-

er than the laboring men of other countries.

I want to call attention—it is with some diffidence, I assure you, after the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Walker) has said that it is nothing but "nonsense"—I want to call attention, however, so that those may consider it who are not inclined to look upon it as "nonsense," to what Hon. William L. Evarts said when he was secretary of state, in his report in 1879. He said:

The average American workman performs from one and a half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman. This is so important a point in connection with our ability to compete with the cheap labor manufacturers of Europe, and it seems at first thought so

strange that I will trouble you with somewhat lengthy quotations from the reports in support thereof.

That was the statement of a republican secretary of state. And I hope that none of my republican friends will reflect upon the next authority I shall quote, Hon. James G. Blaine, who, when secretary of state, said:

Undoubtedly the inequalities in wages of English and American operatives (that is, in cotton manufactures) are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as it seems to me to be proven by official statistics, it would be a very important element in the establishment of our ability to compete