

The Falls City Tribune.

VOLUME I

FALLS CITY, NEBRASKA, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1904.

NUMBER 39

UNCLE JOE CANNON

Speaks to a Crowded House at The Gehling Thursday Night— What He Said.

Speaker Joseph Cannon of Illinois and Hon. James E. Watson of Indiana arrived in Falls City, Friday afternoon at three o'clock. The party was met at the depot by Geo. Holland and C. F. Reavis. Speaker Cannon, Mr. Watson, E. J. Burkett and C. F. Reavis took an extended ride into the country much to the delight of the visitors who were charmed as well as astounded at the wonderful country which met their view.

When the orators stepped on the stage at the Gehling Friday evening. They found a magnificent audience which not only filled every portion of the house but had about one hundred and fifty men crowded on the stage as well. Speaker Cannon was introduced by C. F. Reavis and spoke in part as follows.

Mr. Chairman and Fellow citizen—I come to take council with the good people of this community touching the proper policies for the Republic for the coming four years. The Master said, almost two thousand years ago: "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gether grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" The human race, through all its history has walked in the present and prophesied as to the future in the light of experience. Dreamers may dream, and prophets may prophecy from the standpoint of romance and sentimentalism, but practical men who move the world, who make the hearthstone, who promote the civilization, walk in the light of their best judgement and formed by experience, and taking counsel with the people. I know of no way to tell whether I can trust man, policy or party, except by the character of the man, the fruits of the policy and the record of the party. From that standpoint I shall talk to you, and if I mention the past it is not to boast, but merely to hold up the light to illuminate our paths as we walk in the present.

In this campaign while there are many issues that our friends, the enemy hint at, there is but one great issue between the two parties, and that is that protection, first obtained by a majority of the people under Abraham Lincoln, and continued practically for forty-four years, is the proper policy still. Our friends the enemy say that protection is robbery and unconstitutional.

The Republican Party stands for protection. What is it? In brief, the Republican Party from

its foundation under the leadership of Lincoln to the present time stood for that policy; why? Because we believed that God had so disturbed natural riches upon this continent, and in our boundaries, that we could, diversifying our industries, live substantially by exchanging our products amongst each other. And we had another reason, wider, deeper and stronger than that. We had a Republic which the people were and are, thank God, competent to govern themselves. Sovereignty rests in them, and one individual, however humble, is as great as any other however strong. In other countries substantially this is not the condition. One man or two men may govern, but the Sovereign must first be patriotic, he must be wise intelligent, and he must perform his function properly if the country is worth anything. Sovereignty resides among our people. We speak at the ballot box. We had the patriotism, and it was necessary that we should have the intelligence.

As I say, the Republican party stands for protection, a cardinal doctrine. I want to argue from the standpoint of what protection has accomplished, that it is a good policy, that it is wise to continue it.

Now I will go back a little. When we came into power under Lincoln we needed money. Our Government was threatened, half our people had stepped out and taken everything with them. Our treasury was empty, we needed money, and under the lead of our party and its representatives we wrote upon the statute books a taxing law called a tariff. We said that the people elsewhere shall not come in and enjoy our markets with their products made by cheap labor without bearing, in a measure, our burdens, without paying a tax for that privilege that was equal to the difference between the wage of labor there and what ought to be the wage of labor here. The law went upon the statute book, and the money we needed began to come in.

Now I want to call attention to another fact. The confederate states drafted a constitution, into which they placed a clause stating that their congress should not, at any time, have the power to enact a law that would act as a protection to American industry. The south did not want it, under their system of labor, and

they so arranged their constitution as to absolutely prevent it at any time. This fact should not be lost sight of.

Before that time our nation was fifth or sixth amongst those of the earth in manufactures, and at the time Lincoln was elected we were however first in agriculture. We then manufactured eighteen hundred million dollars worth of products all told. It was considered large then. We fought the war, preserved the Union and flag, eating up and shooting away as the cost of that struggle seven thousand millions of dollars worth of property. It has all been substantially paid. Today, or I will say in the year 1900, the time of our last census, we are what in manufactures in the world? First, and still first in agriculture. Did the policy of the Southern brethren prevail? No. Did the policy of the republican party prevail; yes, and under it absolutely we have reached this stage. The platform of the Democracy in 1860 said that protection was unconstitutional. In 1892 Mr. Cleveland was elected upon such a declaration. In 1896 and in 1900 the democratic platform said the same, and this year in their platform just adopted they say that protection is robbery.

Now the manufactured product of this nation in the year 1900 was enormity of that without figuring, but the amount is more than seven times as great as the value of the product when the tariff law was first enacted in 1860. Our industries grew and grew until the number of mouths to be fed who were engaged in and directly connected with our great industrial progress was enormous. That is the great market.

Our manufactured product now is greater than that of Great Britain, Germany and France combined, and almost as great as all the rest of the world. Think of it. The manufactured product of our eighty millions of people nearly as great as all the other fifteen hundred millions of inhabitants of the rest of the earth.

In 1882 we were at a high tide of prosperity, and our democratic friends nominated Grover Cleveland upon a platform and by pledges that everything was too high. "Give us power, and we will see that the prices of products shall be less," they said. They went to the workers of our large centers of population and said: "Yes, you are fairly well employed and receive a fairly good wage, but, my gracious, see what you have to pay the farmer for flour and meat; see what you have to pay the grocer, see what you have to pay for clothing, for everything." Then they went to the farmer and said: "Yes you are getting a pretty fair price for your produce, but there is a tar-

iff of fifty per cent on all you wear and all that you use, and if you will give us power we will change it, so the products of foreign labor can come in which will enable you to buy all things for less. Protection is robbery; and it is unconstitutional." Benjamin Harrison was turned down, the great leader of the republican parties. I have never been able to understand why it was done. It is true, we had been in power for a long time, and the young men growing up could not remember to a majority said: "We will try it." The democrats came into full power, controlling both house and senate. Well, but some one says, "Cannon it was eighteen months after Cleveland was elected before any change was made in our tariff." True, but we discount things in the United States. It was seen that there was going to be a change of policy, and the farmer who is one third of our people said: "Look here, we will go slow. We will get along with less clothing, we will abandon any building; we will get along with the old wagon and the old plows, for there is to be a change of policy and every one is beginning to be uncertain about the outcome." The moment that the farmer contracted his purchasing power by twenty-five per cent or more, the production of the balance of our people depending upon that market was affected just that much. The manufacturer said: "The farmer is not buying, and others are not buying. There has been a change of policy and we must look out. We cannot manufacture for our future market, so we will manufacture only on orders. The banks do not want to loan or carry me, and I will have to place my men on half time." Then the laborer was forced to curtail his purchasing—and the result was the miserable history of that period. The democrats kept the pledge that things would be cheaper.

Under Cleveland we barely kept house. There is such a thing as having barely enough to get along with, barely enough clothing, barely enough fuel to keep from suffering. If you want to be efficient, if you want to be capable, you must have enough bread and meat to satisfy the demands of the body and the mind.

Now, I said we discounted things in this country. McKinley was elected. It was six months after his election before the tariff was again changed, but it was known that such a measure would be enacted if the Republicans kept their promises. So the manufacturer said it himself that he would clean up the shop a little, and prepare for better things. The farmer began to put out more corn, more wheat, more oats, more of other grains,

(Continued on last page.)