

withal be of great value to certain financial interests not noted for being over-scrupulous—the public will be justly slow to believe that the sponsors of such a settlement, so condemned yet so consummated, are altogether innocent. Some of them may perhaps deserve to be so considered, and all of them doubtless desire to be; but none can escape the odium of responsibility for pledges broken, an electorate betrayed, and the rights of a city bartered for the favor of conscienceless corporations.

From this reasonable suspicion, only one among the promoters of the ordinance in question has thus far entitled himself to exemption. Edwin Burritt Smith's reply to Judge Tuley is dignified and has all the indicia of candor. It does not satisfactorily answer Judge Tuley's criticism, however, and it wholly fails to justify, to excuse, or even to explain the Mayor's proposed violation of his campaign pledges to approve no franchise-extension ordinance until it has been indorsed by popular referendum.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD ON THE ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

Portions of a speech delivered by Edward M. Shepard at Bennington, Vt., Aug. 31.

THE "PROSPERITY" ARGUMENT HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Is it true that our increase in wealth and prosperity since the rise of the Republican party has been its work, its glory? Was it an appeal to truth for Mr. Hay to treat as result of "Fifty Years of the Republican Party" our increase in population between 1850 and 1900, our fourfold increase in farming acreage, our fivefold increase in corn crop and sixfold increase in wheat crop, our increase in manufacturing capital from \$500,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000? Does any argument deserve less respect from one who has mastered that first rule of reasoning which bids him not infer that event A is the effective and sole cause of event B merely because in order of time event B comes with or after event A? Were there not in the United States fertile soil and moderate suns and rains, the brains and hands and inventive genius of American men and women, liberty, law and order—all these before there was a Republican party; and were not they the prime cause of our prosperity? The growth of American population and wealth between the peace of 1783 and the inauguration of John Adams in 1797 was but a small fraction of the like growth under McKinley and Roosevelt. And in those fourteen years—the years when Franklin and Jefferson and Hamilton and Mad-

ison, under the auspices of the noble, unboastful character of the Father of his Country, established our Republic,—our material growth in absolute figures was small indeed—our railroad mileage nought. Were those earlier statesmen dwarfs, therefore, in comparison with the latter-day Titans, who have dwelt in the White house since March, 1897? What years, O American men and women, have done more, material and moral, than those early ones for their own generation, what years more for this very Twentieth Century prosperity of ours? Is it the Lincoln doctrine—or was it ever—that the merit of moral and political causes is measurable by the wealth and luxury accumulated at the very time of their operation? Is it not the doctrine of prophets and apostles and the lesson of all practical history, that self-denial, simplicity, economy, righteousness, sobriety, lead on—not instantly but after patient years—to power and wealth? Would not Republican orators give better promise for future fruits of present day Republican administration—if they could rather and truly claim for their party under President Roosevelt an enforcement of equal rights, a rigorous economy, a punctilious regard for law?

But if this doctrine of "Present wealth, therefore present virtue in present ruling politics," be not a shallow sophistry, still see with what absurd unfairness it is applied. Do Republican apologists say—dare they say—what alone would be relevant to the political problem, that during the forty-four years since their party came into power, the progress of our country has been as great, from year to year, as during the sixty years of general Democratic supremacy before the civil war? If the Republican party may justly ask another lease of power because from 1860 to 1900 our population increased from 31,000,000 to 76,000,000, or 36 per cent. per decade, why may not the Democrats with greater justice ask their return to power because from 1800 to 1860 the increase was from 5,300,000 to 31,443,000, or 82 per cent. in each decade? Was not the increase in the decade, 1850-1860—and in spite of slavery,—from 23,000,000 to 31,000,000, or at the same rate as in the decades, 1860-1900? If the increase in total wealth between 1860 and 1900 was from \$16,000,000,000 to \$90,500,000,000, or 116 per cent. per decade, and in wealth per capita of

* All my statistics are taken from the Summary of Commerce and Finance for May, 1904, issued by the bureau of statistics, department of commerce and labor. For total wealth and other data before 1850, there are no official figures. In each case the percentages are computed upon the earlier figure given.

population from \$513.92 to \$1,235.86, or 35 per cent. per decade—was not the Democratic increase in total wealth between 1850 and 1860 from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000, or 128 per cent. for the decade, being still larger than the Republican, and in wealth per capita from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the rate of 67 per cent. for the decade—nearly double the Republican rate? Although the value of farms and farm property increased from \$7,980,000,000 in 1860 to \$20,514,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 39 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from \$3,967,000,000 in 1850 to \$7,980,000,000 in 1860, or at the rate of 100 per cent. per decade; and were not, therefore, Democratic auspices far more favorable to prosperity than Republican? Although the corn crop increased from 838 millions bushels in 1860 to 2,105 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 37 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from 377 millions in 1840 to 838 millions in 1860, or at the rate of 61 per cent. in each decade; and if therefore, we wish large increase in the next four years, ought we not to prefer a Democratic president? Even if the wheat crop increased from 173 millions of bushels in 1860 to 552 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 50 per cent. in each decade, did it not increase from 84,000,000 in 1840 to 173,000,000 in 1860, or at the larger rate of 53 per cent. per decade? If this kind of argument be fit, what shall be said of the increases in wealth under Democratic auspices from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 in 1850-1860, or at the decade rate of 128 per cent., as against the increase under Republican auspices during the decade 1890-1900 from \$65,000,000,000 to \$94,000,000,000, or at the rate of only 44.6 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increases in wealth per person throughout the United States in the decade 1850-1860 from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the decade rate of 67 per cent., as against the corresponding increase under Republican auspices in 1890-1900 from 1,038.57 to \$1,235.86, or at the decade rate of only 19 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increase in export of American manufactures of iron and steel from \$52,144 in 1800 to \$5,870,114 in 1860, or an average rate of 1859 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$5,870,114 in 1860 to \$121,913,548 (at the abnormally high figures of 1900), or an average increase per decade of only 494 per cent.? Or what shall be said, and perhaps more reasonably, of the increase under Democratic rule in our export of agricultural products from \$25,000,000 in 1800 to \$256,000,000 in 1860, an average of 150 per cent. per decade, as against the increase under Republican rule from \$256,000,000 in

1860 to \$835,000,000 in 1900, an average of only 56 per cent. per decade? What shall be said of the Democratic increase in our total domestic merchandise exported from \$31,000,000 in 1860 to \$316,000,000 in 1860, or an average Democratic increase of 153 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$316,000,000 in 1860 to \$1,370,000,000 in 1900, an increase of only 83.5 per cent. per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase in American tonnage engaged in foreign trade from 669,921 in 1860 to 2,546,237 in 1860, a Democratic increase per decade of 46 per cent., as against the decrease from 2,546,237 in 1860 to 826,694 in 1900, a Republican decrease of 16 per cent. per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase of tonnage engaged in domestic trade from 301,919 in 1860, to 2,807,631 in 1860, a Democratic increase of 138 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from 2,807,631 in 1860 to 4,338,145 in 1900, or only 13 per cent. per decade? If the increase in railroad mileage be so significant a Republican glory, is it not fit to point out that under Democratic auspices the mileage increased from 23 miles in 1830 to 30,626 in 1860; or, if this be a crowding of the argument, then that the increase under Democratic auspices in 1850-1860 was from 9,021 to 30,626, a decade increase of 239 per cent., as against the increase from 161,276 in 1890 to 194,334 in 1900, or at the decade rate of only 20.5 per cent.?

Or shall we take the increase in total manufactures, which is the glory of the protectionists? We have not the official figures before 1850 which would, no doubt, show enormous proportional increases. Let us, as we must, begin with 1850. The Democratic increase for 1850-1860 was from \$1,019,000 to \$1,885,000, or at the decade rate of 84 per cent. But in 1890-1900 the Republican and "protected" increase (allowing the abnormally high prices of 1900) was from \$9,372,000,000 to \$13,039,000,000, or at the decade rate of only 39.2 per cent. Is it not significant that, while the total manufacturing product increased in 1890-1900 by 39 per cent., the increase in wages and salaries paid employes was from only \$2,283,000,000 to \$2,735,000,000, or at the decade rate of 19.8 per cent., being only one-half the ratable increase in the manufacturing output? So it is to be noticed that, while population increased in 1850-1860 by 35 per cent., the increase in manufacturing output was 84 per cent., or 2.5 times the rate of population increase; but that the population increase from 1890-1900 was 21.8 per cent., while the increase in wealth was 39.2 per cent., or only 1.81 times the popula-

tion increase. Indeed, in whatever just way the figures of even manufacturing growth are treated, they tell for the period of Democratic rule and greater economic liberty.

The Republican orators and campaign book refer to the recent great increase in exports of domestic products as a crushing proof that, even if foreign trade be considered, Republican administration and a high protective tariff are best. Did not—so they say—exports increase from \$316,000,000 in 1860 to \$1,370,000,000 in 1900, a per decade increase of 83 per cent. upon the amount in 1860? But here again it is easy to explode their argument. For the increase in 1850-1860 was from \$134,900,000 to \$316,000,000, or at the decade rate of 134 per cent.—a Democratic rate of increase under a revenue tariff half as large again as the Republican and "protected" rate of increase. From 1890 to 1903 the increase was from \$845,000,000 to \$1,392,000,000, or at an annual rate of 4.9 per cent., being less than half the Democratic rate of 13.4 per cent. in 1850-1860.

Mr. Hay ventured to include the decade 1850-1860 in his figures of Republican glory. Yet those were years of Democratic power; and the Walker tariff, enacted by Democrats in 1846 for revenue only, was then in effect. Is there anything so truth telling in the vast masses of figures in the Republican campaign book as the fact it would conceal, that those were years of greater ratable growth in material things than any our country has since known?

I cannot leave this mass of figures, made necessary by the almost overwhelming dependence of the Republicans upon the "prosperity" argument, without asking you to think of another point. Does it not illustrate the debasing effect upon the latter-day morale of the Republican party produced by its change of dominant purpose from the restraint of human slavery to the maintenance and tightening of the shackles of a "protective" tariff, that Messrs. Hay and Root and the authors of the Republican campaign book have made no allowance for the regenerative and stimulating effect of the abolition of slave labor? If other things were equal, the rates of industrial increase from 1860, when in nearly half the country the labor was chiefly the crude, wasteful, hopeless labor of slavery, to 1900, when all labor was free, ought to have exceeded those of the preceding decade, instead of to have fallen far below them.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Messrs. Hay and Root, and even the

sordid pages of the Republican campaign book, affirm a moral kinship between Abraham Lincoln and the statesmen who control their politics in 1904, between the men and women who gave the all necessary religious and humanitarian uplift to the anti-slavery struggle and the war for the Union, and, on the other hand, the vast corporate and business influences, which, by and for their own profit, dominate the Republican party. To these influences even its gallant and strenuous candidate has—after his much protesting eloquence to the contrary in 1902 and 1903—been compelled to completely submit with promises not again to "run amuck," and not again to treat the tariff question as open, even to the extent to which President McKinley at the last held that the welfare of the country required it to be open. Surely the claim to this kinship needs only to be stated to refute itself. What part, indeed, did a protective tariff play in the national uprising of 1861? How much was it discussed in the Lincoln-Douglass debates of 1858, or Lincoln's Cooper Union speech of 1859, or the important speeches, Republican or Democratic, of 1860 or 1864? It was not mentioned. The Republican platform of 1856 said not one word in behalf of protection nor did it mention the tariff, although the Walker tariff—a tariff for revenue, and not for protection—had been in operation ten years. The Republican platform of 1860 did not refer to protection or a protective tariff. In one of the later and subordinate clauses of the platform it did declare that, "while providing revenue . . . by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these impositions as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country." But even this vague suggestion, which might mean high or low protective duties, or no protective duties whatever, made no part of the campaign. Lincoln did not refer to it in his letter of acceptance or in his inaugural. In 1864 the Republican platform made not a single reference to protection or the tariff; nor did Lincoln in his acceptance or inaugural.

Something from Abraham Lincoln in behalf of a high protective tariff would be precious indeed, to the Republicans of to-day. But they can find nothing. For even their campaign book the best they can do is to pick out a few sentences from speeches of Mr. Lincoln in 1843 and 1847, a dozen and more years before he was president, and even before he was in Congress, in which he declared that the justification of a protective duty would be its result in establishing some new industry in our country, so as to secure

the goods to the consumer at a cheaper rate than he could bring them from abroad. The modern Republican idea that the use of a protective tariff is to keep prices high to the American consumer in order that the profits of other Americans engaged in gigantic and long established industries shall be increased, would have been as abhorrent to Abraham Lincoln as it is to Judge Parker.

Even in 1868 when, the war being three years ended, business questions began to be thought of, the Republican party said not a word in behalf of a protective tariff, but, rather to the contrary, declared that "it is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the national faith will permit;" and General Grant in his letter of acceptance was equally silent on this question. Could there have then been Republican success in 1860 or 1864 or even 1868 unless Walker tariff men and even free traders whose economic views remained unchanged, had not left the Democratic party for the Anti-Slavery party? Would not that success have been defeat if Chase, Sumner, Blair, Bates, John M. Palmer, Trumbull and a host of other former Democrats and believers in low duties had not—and because the tariff was not in question—joined the Republican party? Are you not, Mr. Hay, forgetful, very forgetful, when you say that—

Only those who believe in human rights and . . . who believe in the American system of protection . . . have any title to name themselves by the name of Lincoln, or to claim a moral kinship with that august and venerated spirit. *

IMPERIALISM HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

And what part did colonial exploitation of inferior races or weaker countries, or the policy of "big stick" suzerainty over the republics to the south of us, or the policy of the "strong man armed" in the trade and territorial disputes of foreign countries, play in the politics conceived or directed by Lincoln or his party? If, in 1854, the Democratic party boasted the Ostend manifesto in behalf of a conquest of Cuba, did it not result in Democratic shame and disaster? If Seward, at the head of a Republican cabinet, a month after Lincoln's inauguration, secretly urged his chief to avoid domestic difficulties by plunging us into an European war, did not Mr. Hay's own disclosure in his Lincoln biography of the secret well nigh blast Seward's reputation for statesmanship? Quote, Mr. Root and

*Mr. Hay, in "Fifty Years of the Republican Party."

Mr. Hay, if you can, any remembered and honored utterances of honored Republican statesmen before McKinley's presidency, in behalf of your foreign and colonial policy. Quote, if you dare, the Republican platform assertion in 1856, that the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions, that the "highwayman's appeal" that "might makes right" would "bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people." Or quote the Republican declaration of 1860 that the doctrine that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed," is "essential to the preservation of our republican institutions." Or quote the platform declaration by the Republican party in 1868 of its "sympathy with all oppressed peoples struggling for their rights," and of its solemn recognition of "the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government." If to these challenges you must remain dumb, are you not, truly, in Mr. Hay's eloquent words, guilty of "sacrilege to try to trade upon that benignant renown" of the humanitarian Lincoln "whose light 'folds in this orb o' the earth' "?

DEMOCRACY AND THE TARIFF.

The limits of even this long speech prohibit discussion of the great issue which Democrats wisely and courageously raise by their assertion that the system called "protection,"—that is to say, the support of specially favored interests by duties, payment of which is enforced upon the whole people—is a "robbery," and by the Republican vindication of it as a "cardinal policy" to be followed. I point out, however, that, notwithstanding the former urgency of both Mr. McKinley and Mr. Roosevelt for revision of tariff schedules in the interest of larger export trade, the Republican party is now pledged, not only against revision, but against any discussion whatever of the question. The citizen who would undo any injustice in the tariff or let down any of its obstructions by partial repeals or reciprocity treaties, or who would have light shed upon the operation in detail of its multifariously complicated system constructed by "give and take" between the attorneys of special interests before Ways & Means and Finance Committees, is peremptorily refused any relief if Mr. Roosevelt be elected. The policy of "stand pat" means that, under Republican auspices, no committee shall investigate,

nor house of Congress consider, the working of the tariff. On this subject there must be mute obedience as before a deity. If the manufacture of steel and iron be no longer an "infant industry" to be cherished, but a practical monopoly within the American republic, out of whose profits the vastest fortunes in the world have been built up—if it sell its products to foreigners more cheaply than to Americans—nevertheless there must be silence. If its charter of monopoly in the Dingley tariff or any other schedule of that law is found to be unjust, or corrupt or oppressive—still they are never to be revised until those who have made them thus vicious shall choose to revise them. Judge Parker has pointed out that, since the Senate must be Republican during the next four years, no tariff reform can be enacted without Republican support; but he promises, if elected, an effort to obtain that support, and, in any event, a presentation of the cause to public opinion from the vantage ground of the presidency of the United States. A vote for Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, is a vote that not even an effort at tariff reform—even the slightest measure of it—shall be made, and that every iniquity of the Dingley schedules shall be borne in silence. The Republican platform declares that, when England "agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it." This praise of Mr. Chamberlain for his policy of defensively economical warfare against the United States finds a fit place in the Republican creed. They applaud the retaliatory blow aimed at ourselves, so much are they in love with any blow given by any nation to another.

THE DEMOCRATIC CREED.

Before we Democrats propose any specific measure we ask the American people to remember their own history. We also begin with the marvelous statistics of national growth from the first census in 1790 to the last in 1900, with the increase in population, and in the produce of farm and manufactures and forests and mines, in the achievements of American invention and organized industry. We do not say that these material results have been achieved by laws, however good. We recognize their source in the natural bounties of God, and the hearts and brains and muscle of American freemen. We do add, however, that here between the Atlantic and Pacific, between Canada and the gulf, was first tried on a great scale the new experiment of human and indus-

trial freedom, of equal rights and no special privilege. If the presence of Negro slavery, until the civil war, created dismal exceptions—and if the presence together in the South of a great or equal or even outnumbering mass of a colored race with profoundly different characteristics and as yet vastly behind the white race in the faculties of disciplined industry and high-class government, gave, and even now gives, rise to anomalies and inconsistencies—they have made only clearer the wisdom and beneficence of our fundamental policy. We Democrats point out that during this period of splendid growth, there was systematic hostility to a large military or naval expenditure, there was systematic preference for simple and inexpensive administration, there was systematic dislike of personal and sumptuary restraints. Democrats do not, like Republicans, forget how vast during our wonderful economic progress has been the American area of free trade between our 45 States, an extent of free trade far beyond anything ever before or now elsewhere known. For that area has included the widest difference of climate and soil and human labor, and also far differing conditions in organized society, ranging from settlements nearly three centuries old to frontiers occupied but a few years. They remember that the internal trade of this truly imperial domain which is free of all tariff is in volume and amount vastly, very many times, more important than its foreign trade which is subject to tariff.* They point out that for more than a century the American nation scrupulously refrained from foreign entanglements and made no forcible conquest except as it took from Mexico as a war indemnity the practically uninhabited country on the Pacific slope and the Rio Grande. They point out that, although the conditions of American life have, to a large extent, been those of a new and frontier country, the public men and the official life of our country have been so dominated by love of law as to command the just tribute of every intelligent foreign visitor, and that the very "lynch law" which has now and then in thinly settled parts of this vast domain disgraced portions of our population, has often been mere reaction against technical administration of law—that is to say, against misdirected respect for law on the part of those in authority.

From all these conditions and from

*Senator Hoar, in his speech on Trust Legislation in the Senate on January 6, 1903, states that "our domestic commerce is . . . more than twenty times as great as that with foreign nations."

these institutions—and in spite of their faults—has come—so the Democrats say—the industrial productivity and triumph of the American citizen. After praise to God for His gifts to us of land and water and climate, it is to these deep lying and truly dynamic causes, and above all to the American devotion to liberty and law, that the Democratic party assigns our splendid results in agriculture and mining, our vast treasure houses, our enormous increase in railroad and manufacturing plants, and all other material as well as political glory of our land. Democrats know, nor would they have any American forget, that the most stupendous force the world has known, is the free, self-governing, law-abiding, self-respecting citizen, regardful of the rights of other men and therefore justly insistent upon his own. From the marvelous success of our country summed up in the census of 1900 and its tables of comparisons with the results of other censuses, the Democrats draw the conclusion, not that the general and broad principles of the American people should be reversed, or their sacred traditions undone—but that they should be continued; that only faults and exceptions and inconsistencies should be eliminated. They would not have less respect for law but more respect; not less freedom of trade but more freedom; not less respect for the rights of other countries and races, however inferior to us, but more respect; not more foreign entanglements but fewer; not increase, but decrease in the proportion of military and naval and general government expenditure to the ability of the people.

Such is the general creed of the Democratic party; and such must and will be its practice when it returns to power.

THE NATURAL SENSE OF JUSTICE.

I have lived with communities of savages in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law-courts, but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of those rights rarely or never takes place. In such a community all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant which are the product of our civilization. There is none of that widespread division of labor, which while it increases wealth, produces also conflicting interests. There is not that severe competition and struggle for existence or for wealth which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitements to great

crimes are thus wanting, and petty ones are suppressed partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice and his neighbor's right which seem to be in some degree inherent in every race of men.—Alfred Russell Wallace, in "Malay Archipelago."

ECONOMIC RENT.

I had timber cut on Virginian tide-water rivers. A cord of pine wood at that time was selling at four dollars put aboard a schooner. Labor and capital obtained one dollar a cord to cut the wood and to put it aboard if the timber grew right at the landing; consequently for such timber the landowner netted three dollars a cord. As the trees grew without the application of any human work, this was economic rent which tenants would have been willing to pay to obtain permission to cut the wood. For that timber which grew away from the landing the hauling to the landing had to be paid before any rent could be collected. Let us say that at four miles distance this hauling cost three dollars a cord. The owners of the land at that distance just were paid for their labor and capital (use of tools, oxen and cart), but obtained no rent, whereas land on the shore was worth three dollars for each cord of wood which grew there. Why should James obtain a present of these three dollars for which William had to do the hard work of hauling?—Michael Fluersheim, in Land and Labour.

"I'm afraid there is a great deal of dishonesty in some of these trusts," said Senator Sorghum, sadly.

"But you have always defended the trusts," exclaimed the friend.

"Yes. Of course, you expect a trust to take advantage of the public. But when the men who organize the deal get to taking advantage of one another—that's dishonesty."—Washington Star.

Brother to the Ox—Why is it that I work hard, and have nothing, while you don't work at all, and have more than you need?

Brother to the Fox—I vote for my interests, while you vote the same ticket I do.

"I don't understand why, if we vote the same ticket, I don't get half the benefits."

"I know you don't understand. That is the reason you don't get half the benefits."—Boone (Ia.) Independent.