

safety and happiness without giving them the slightest voice in the matter.

And, further, the senator must think, although he does not say so—I suppose he expects to vote so—that we have the right to turn our cannon, bayonets, and ships of war and armies upon that people, if they attempt to exercise this right, and prevent them from doing it.

Thackeray, no mean judge of noble art, no mean judge of noble actions, was one day crossing the rotunda of this capitol in company with Charles Sumner. He stopped before the picture where the genius of the great artist of Connecticut has delineated on the imperishable canvas the scene when the declaration of independence was presented by Jefferson to the solemn sitting over which Hancock presided, and the new nation, born on the 19th day of April, 1775, was baptized in the faith of our new gospel of liberty. He stood for a moment silent, and then said to Mr. Sumner, "That's your painter." Surely he was right. The foremost action of human history is fitly represented by the great work which we fondly hope is to be as enduring as time, enduring as the republic, enduring as liberty. It is there, in the foremost place of honor which can be found on this earth. No Parthenon, no St. Peter's, no Palace of the Escorial, no Sans Souci, not Westminster Abbey itself, can equal, at least to our eyes, this spot where forever a great and free people declares its constitutional will.

Beneath the great dome to which the pilgrim from afar first repairs when he visits the capital of his country hangs the great picture which delineates the scene when the nation was first baptized into immortal life. It was not only the independence of America which was then declared—it was the dignity of human nature itself. When Samuel Rogers visited the Dominican convent at Padua, an aged friar showed him the famous picture of "The Last Supper" in the refectory of the convent. He said: "I have sat at my meals before it for seven and forty years, and such are the changes that have taken place among us—so many have come and gone in that time—that when I look upon the company there, upon those who are sitting at that table, silent as they are, I am sometimes inclined to think that we, not they, are the shadows."

As administrations, terms of presidential office, begin and end, as senators and representatives come and go before the silent figures in that immortal picture, it seems to me that we are but the shadows, while Hancock and Jefferson and Adams and Franklin and Ellsworth and Livingston are still deliberating, still acting, still alive. Ah, Mr. President, shall we turn it with its face to the wall? Shall the scroll first be stricken from the hand of Jefferson and another put there which shall read: "Governments derive their just powers

from the consent of the governed—some of them. Men are created equal—some of them. Taxation and representation go together—for us, not for other men. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are held in the Philippine Islands at our will, and not at the will of the people." And then shall we turn the picture with its face to the wall and put instead of it a representation of some great battle where the guns of our navy and our army are turned on the men struggling for their liberty at Iloilo?

Now, Mr. President, our friends tell us that all this is emotion and rhetoric and sentiment. They tell us that it does not belong to the domain of practical statesmanship, or to the conduct to the affairs of life; that these are the things we think when we talk, and that we are thinking of quite other things when we act and vote. Well, the doctrines I stand upon are the doctrines of the most practical statesmen, of the most practical generation that ever lived on the face of the earth. These sentiments, wrapped in a few sentences, not equaling in compass the Ten Commandments or the Lord's Prayer, amplifying only a little the golden rule itself, have turned out to be a practical force in this world of ours. The Puritans took them for their rule, and in one brief, crowded century they made England, which had been trembling before Spain, whose knees had smote together before Holland, whose monarch had been the pensioner and whose treasury had been the tributary of France, the greatest power the world had ever seen. It is these that make "world-powers."

Our fathers shod their feet with them as with sandals. Borne up by them they crossed the Atlantic, and with their invincible might builded on its sure foundations this temple that covers the continent and whose portals are upon both the seas. Is there any practical statesmanship, is there any cunning of the politician, is there any struggling for power, is there any seeking for office, is there any party discipline which has ever wrought in all history such things as these half-dozen little sentences have wrought? Are there any statesmen in American history, among the living or among the dead, whom the people love and honor as they do the men who planted their feet on these truths, and who bore witness to them in life and in death?

The one great lesson which sums up the teachings of American history during our century of constitutional life is the dignity of labor. It is an unquestionable truth that no tropical colony was ever settled, by men not born in tropical climes, for the purpose of finding work. There was scarcely ever a tropical colony successful at all. There was never a tropical colony successful except under the system of contract labor. That is to be set up, enforced,

and administered by the agencies of the republic of the United States, if we are to succeed in such administration at all.

Our fathers taught us the priceless value of national credit and to keep free from the burden of national debt. We have thought until lately that our strength came in a large part from our unsullied and unequalled public credit. If we were compelled in self-defence to enter into a contest with the strongest or richest power on earth, our credit would remain unimpaired until our opponent were bankrupt. If in time of war or public danger we were compelled to contract debt, we have supposed that the only policy of dealing with it in time of peace was to pay it. But now the senator from Connecticut seems to contemplate that we shall embark on a permanent system of national expenditure which will put this government under an obligation, the equivalent of which will be a national debt greater than that of any other nation on the face of the earth. Have you reflected that a permanent increase of our expenditures of one hundred and fifty millions a year—which we cannot avoid, and from which we cannot withdraw—is precisely the same thing as adding to our national debt five thousand million dollars, capitalized at 3 per cent, which is more than the government now is paying, and that a permanent increase in our expenditures of three hundred millions a year is the same as increasing our national debt ten thousand millions capitalized at 3 per cent? I think it can be easily demonstrated that the policies on which we are asked to embark involve a permanent national expenditure much larger than the amount I have named. Our civil list, already so enormous, must be enormously increased. Instead of taking from the people by fair competition, or even by fair selection, men to take their share in self-government, we must have in the future, as they have in England, a trained class whose lives are to be spent, not in self-government, but in the government of other men.

At the close of the nineteenth century the American republic, after its example in abolishing slavery has spread through the world, is asked by the senator from Connecticut to adopt a doctrine of constitutional expansion on the principle that it is right to conquer, buy, and subject a whole nation if we happen to deem it for their good—for their good as we conceive it, and not as they conceive it. Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln said, "No man was ever created good enough to own another." No nation was ever created good enough to own another. No single American workman, no humble American home, will ever be better or happier for the constitutional doctrine which the senator from Connecticut proclaims. If it be adopted here not only the workman's wages will be diminished, not only will