

SPEECH OF CHARLES S. HAMLIN

AT NANTASKET

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1904.

In the few moments assigned to me I cannot attempt to make any elaborate address. The issues before the country on which the Democrats believe they will win are clear. Lower taxes, Reciprocity, economical government, administrative honesty, respect for the Constitution in spirit as well as in letter; on these issues the people are with us. It is a fortunate circumstance that the so-called money issue is settled and that the single gold standard is the law of the land acquiesced in by the declarations of both parties in the recent National Conventions. I noticed in a speech of Senator Lodge recently delivered, the statement that on the gold standard the people want no flexibility of opinion. By this he intended to criticise our candidate for Vice President, Mr. Davis, because twenty-eight years ago his opinions on financial questions may have differed from those he now entertains. But surely twenty-eight years is rather far back to go to criticise and compare with present opinions. We do not need to go back so far to find many differences of opinions on financial questions by Republicans of good standing. For example, as recently as 1894 the Home Market Club, the leading Republican organization of the country, passed resolutions which were intended to convey a message to the west that the Club looked on Free Silver with no special aversion. To be sure, a clause was inserted for home consumption that every dollar should be as good as every other dollar, but the fair intent of the artfully drawn resolution was to convey the impression of sympathy for the sixteen to

one idea. This is merely one of many instances which can be cited and which will be cited if our Republican friends seek to inject discussion of dead issues into the present campaign. The silver issue is dead, no thanks to Massachusetts Congressmen or Senators.

The principal issue is Reform of the Tariff. The people of the country are overwhelmingly in favor of Tariff Reform. Remember the Bill of Mr. Babcock of Wisconsin reducing duties on iron and steel products. Mr. Babcock was a prominent Republican, yet his Party did not dare to allow a vote to be taken on this Bill in the House. The Joint Committee on Federal Relations of the Massachusetts legislature reported a resolution in favor of this Bill, but it was killed at the command of the Republican organization. Gov. Cummins of Iowa came out squarely for tariff reforms, but only recently he has been crushed at the command of the Republican machine. The Republican leaders have determined to throttle every attempt at reform, relying upon the contributions of the protected industries to keep them in office. The Democratic Party pledges itself to a revision of customs duties in the interest of the consumers of the country.

Another great issue is Reciprocity, especially with Canada. As the products of Canada are similar to ours, no comprehensive Treaty could be made with her without lowering duties on her products which are similar to those we make here. This is called Reciprocity in competing products. To this sort of Reciprocity the Democratic Party pledges itself in its National platform. To this sort of Reciprocity the Republican Party, for the last few years at least, has been violently opposed. In 1900 the Republican National Convention stated

squarely that it favored Reciprocity only for foreign products which are not produced in this country. This was a repudiation of the Reciprocity treaties negotiated by President McKinley and, as well, of that part of the Dingley Tariff which authorized their negotiation. In 1901, the Home Market Club violently attacked the theory of Reciprocity in competing products and the treaties above referred to.

In April of this year, the Massachusetts Republican Convention declared for Reciprocity in non-competing products. The plank of Mr. Foss calling for general Reciprocity was attacked by Senator Lodge and overwhelmingly voted down.

On June 11, 1904, Senator Lodge, in a ^{public} speech, said that there were two kinds of Reciprocity, the first being non-competitive and the other being the Democratic kind. He further stated that the Republican National platform would declare for Reciprocity in non-competitive products.

The plank in the Republican National platform on Reciprocity while somewhat ambiguous, yet in the light of the prediction above quoted of Senator Lodge and the interpretation of Mr. Clarke of the Home Market Club, can fairly be said to be for non-competitive Reciprocity and against competitive Reciprocity.

Senator Lodge has recently stated, however, that he has always believed in competitive Reciprocity, and that the only subject of non-competitive Reciprocity with Canada would be arctic furs! What then are we to assume? That Senator Lodge has been for years opposed to the non-competitive planks of the Republican platforms,

State and National. Or that these planks were wrongly printed, the word "non" having been inadvertently printed.

The people of Massachusetts fully appreciate the benefits of a liberal Reciprocity treaty with Canada. The record of the Republican Party should teach them that they can expect from it no such Treaty. Their only hope is to vote the Democratic ticket, State and National.

The Democrats have nominated a worthy candidate; an upright Judge, a man of eminent fitness for the exalted office of President. They are content to leave the issues and candidate to the people of the country for decision.

REGENT LINEN W. S. & B.

MADE IN U.S.A.