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Wheeling, WV - Campaign Speech
I wish that Senator Harding would speak every day and every night. Every address emphasizes the true shallowness of the Republican campaign - a combination of trite, time-worn generalities with equally time-worn flings at anything and everything ever done by Democrats or the Democratic Party in our National Life, instead of talking about the real issues of this campaign.

For instance, last night at Wheeling he tried once more to re-vamp the old tariff question. Personally, I think it fair to tell the whole story. Senator Harding, on the other hand, spent his time talking about the dangers to our industries of having a Democratic President or a Democratic Congress during the next four years - while he carefully avoided all reference to the fact that under a present Democratic President the Nation has not suffered in its industries from the competition of foreign countries, but that the Country, on the other hand, has enjoyed the most remarkable period of prosperity in its whole history. I wonder how many thinking voters are really influenced by the gloomy picture which he draws of the flooding of American markets with the products of cheap European labor. I wonder how many people really believe that the Democratic Party want to see or would be willing to allow the closing down of our steel, iron, oil, mining and agricultural activities, or even the hampering of their operation, through foreign competition. In the face of the splendid prosperity which the Country is now enjoying, is it honorable or even wise to condemn the Democratic Party for this prosperity, or to assume that only the Republican Party wants to see it continue?
Now there is such a thing as a tariff question in this Country, but it is a scientific question and one which, by the common consent of the great mass of the voters, has been taken out of politics and placed on the scientific basis to which it belongs. The tariff must, of course, be changed from time to time, and should be handled by a non-political, scientific body such as the present Tariff Commission constituted several years ago with the assistance of purely patriotic members of the Senate and House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats. Here is the fundamental difference between Senator Harding's tariff stand and that of Governor Cox. Both are equally in favor of preventing any injury to honest American industry by cheap foreign labor, but Governor Cox and I are firmly convinced that this must be done for the broad good of the Nation by non-partisan experts. Senator Harding believes that it must be accomplished by a reversion to the discredited methods of the past, by which certain special, highly favored, political manufacturing interests were given such high protection that it constituted more than a complete monopoly in their own special lines of production. Many of the products thus given a special privilege were products which enter into the cost of living of the average American citizen. This special privilege enabled the special interests controlling them to place the price of their articles at any figure they chose, thereby forcing the consuming public to pay out of their own pockets abnormal profits — constituting what we would call today profiteers of the most shameless kind.

Senator Harding's associates in the Senate of the United States are men of the type of Senator Penrose, men who seek the good
of a small number of their own special friends, men who would give additional and enormous wealth to the privileged few, men who have no interest in the question of whether that abnormal wealth comes out of the pocket of the average citizen or not. I want it clearly understood that if Senator Harding's tariff policy should prevail, it would serve only to create a greater concentration of wealth in the hands of the few and to start the now declining cost of living of the average citizen once more on the upgrade.

One other point in this same connection: Senator Harding makes a false appeal to the labor of the United States when he raises another cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" in regard to the splendid provisions for the recognition of the interests of labor in the Treaty of Peace. It is purely campaign buncombe to talk about control of American labor by the labor of any other nation. The great purpose of the provisions for labor in the Treaty of Peace is to give justice to the laboring classes of nations who in the past have been downtrodden and exploited by the governing class of certain Old World Nations. No American workingman will hesitate in this great policy of helping the workingman in every nation of the world where he needs help. Do not forget the big basic fact that if the conditions of labor improve in the other Nations of the World, such an improvement must and will help the workingman of America. We are opposed to the exploitation of labor anywhere - The higher the standards throughout the World, the higher will be the leadership which American labor can continue to take. This cry of Senator Harding sounds like a despairing appeal to win back a labor vote which he knows he has lost, the support of which he knows he has no right to claim.
I invite a comparison between the records of Senator Harding and Governor Cox, and I further invite a comparison between the records of the other two candidates, Governor Collidge of Massachusetts and myself. Governor Cox and I do not need to make special appeals. During the past eight years both of us have been confronted on many occasions with countless labor problems, and we glory in the fact that our decisions have been based on fairness to both sides and on honest efforts to see that justice was done under the broad application of the best American spirit.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
Mr. Chairman - Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to get to Wheeling. I am glad to be here tonight because tonight is right after last night; and I am only embarrassed by one thing - I have never seen a hall shaped like this before. (Applause)

Frankly, I am accustomed to speaking out of the front of my mouth; though I can conceive very readily that this hall was built on purpose for some candidates in this campaign. (Applause - Put that in your pipe). No, I have not got a speech to read either. I have not prepared anything - I never need to prepare anything - All I need to do is to read the morning papers. I have got in my hand a paper I only got two hours ago when I struck town - a copy of one of the Wheeling papers of this morning. Never mind which one - but it has got so much humor in it that I am going to give up my subscription to "Puck" and I am going to take this paper instead. I could talk all night about the humor in this paper. I do not know where to begin, but I suppose it is simple and at the very beginning, and so I will begin best policy to begin with the first column story of this paper, which relates to the speech made in this "Both Sides of Your Mouth" Hall last
night; and I want to refer, first of all, to two subjects. I do not know whether they were part of the prepared portion or of the extemporaneous portion. I want to talk first about a dead friend of ours, a friend of ours that was buried seven years ago. You buried him here just as they buried him back in New York - just as the whole Country buried him in 1913, because that old friend, a political nuisance, kept cropping up every two years - every time there was a Congressional Election - every four years when there was a Presidential Election - and we got heartily sick of our old friend because no one understood him.

He was one of those people you could not make head nor tail out of, and it required an expert doctor to find out what was the matter with him. This old man of the scene, figuring in politics all over the United States, was the tariff. Along about 1913 both parties - I will not say both parties, I will say the Democratic party plus the progressive element of the Republican party - got together. They got together down there in Congress in a sincere effort to carry out the American wishes of their American constituents. They had a magnificent funeral - a political funeral, for our old friend and they buried him just where he belonged, out of politics for all times. They turned him over - what was left of him, to the care of an undertaker called the Tariff Commission, a
non-political, non-partisan board made up of experts, made up of
trained men who could understand things called schedules. We were
all agreed on what the old boy died of. We were all agreed on what the
policy of this Nation should be, and yet though he was relegated to a
political grave

Last night we find right in this hall that my friend, Senator
Harding has gone and opened up that grave and he has taken out that
poor old corpse. He has dressed it up in a new suit of new store
clothes and he is asking the American people to believe it has the
breath of life in it once more. I won't go into a full quotation of
what he said about the tariff other than to tell you of the impression
which he attempted to convey, not merely to the audience which was here,
but to all the rest of the United States. He tried to convey the same
old impression that if the United States did not get rid of our
present tariff system - a non-political system, and if we did not go
back to the high protective tariff that took care of the special interests
of this Country in those palmy days that this nation
would go on the rocks in the next four years. Can you people think
as far back as 1912. It is a long while ago, and a lot of water has
passed over the dam since then, and in 1912 I can remember speeches
that were made by another gentlemen from Ohio, a very dear \*\*
Soul, my old friend, Mr. Taft, and he was going up and down this Country
talking the same old \*\*\* bogey of the high protective tariff and
what a victory for the Democrats would mean. He was painting some old
picture of closed shops, abandoned mines, bank failures, closed factories
bread lines, in case of a Democratic victory. That was in 1912 and
what happened in the next four years? Well, curiously enough the
American people did decide on a Democratic victory and during the next
four years the wealth of this country, and wealth of the average citizen
in this Country increased faster than it had ever increased before in
our history. In 1916, that is a long time ago too, there was a man
named Hughes, and I first found out why Hughes was defeated in 1916 when
I went out to the Pacific Coast last month. A man came up to me in
California and \*\*\*\* said - "Isn't Senator Harding coming out here," and
I said I am afraid not. He said I wish he would come out here and
we would have a repetition of the "Aint it awful Mabel Campaign". \*\*
What do you means by the "Aint it awful Mabel Campaign", I asked. "Don'
you know about that - don't you know why the West want Democratic in
1916, and he said it was because while most of us were going to vote the Republican Ticket, Mr. Hughes came out and started in the second he got west of the Mississippi Valley, telling the people of the Country was a horrible thing it would be if we should have another four years of disastrous Democratic rule. And he got those audiences out there weeping and his own tears went down his face and wet his beard. He painted a picture of gloom - the same king of a thing Taft had done in 1912. - of closed factories, abandoned mines and farms gone to waste, bread-lines, bank failures, and got so on the nerves of the West they turned around and took a chance, because they had faith in something more than the Democratic Party, they had faith in the future of the American people, and they were willing enough to let the prosperity had run along for another four years. And today - but get out the files of the papers, if you do not believe me, the papers of 1912 and 1916 and see the same old shop-worn arguments about the tariff, the same old ghosts of the past. The candidates on the Old Guard Republican ticket. See them telling about the horrible future, telling you all the dire and dreadful things that are going to happen, and some are going to believe it.
Some people say, "Give us a change". I am in favor, myself, of a change next fourth of March, a change, yes, from the most ineffective, narrow, and unAmerican Congress we have ever had in our history.

My friends, one more point on it is tariff Senator Harding is trying to persuade the people of the United States that a high protective tariff is going to be the only this to keep us from the competition of cheap foreign labor. And it is is dishonest, that is the only word to call it. And he implies by that that Governor Cox and I are not in favor of letting cheap European labor come in and compete with ours. That is not square politics. That is not playing the game on the level. My friends, there is just one difference between Senator Harding's attitude and our own. Two words are enough to cover this. Senator Harding and Governor Cox are both good Americans. Harding and Cox and both believers that the American workman should be protected against cheap foreign labor, but the difference between the two is this: we believe in the kind of tariff we now have, a tariff which from time to time must be changed to meet changing conditions, must be changed in a scientific way, so as to be corrected for the benefit of all the people of the US and not for the members of a special class. Harding believes and we get this from his associates, in the kind of a tariff that this country had once, the kind of a tariff that gives special privilege to special friends, a handful of big men, so-called in this country, a special privilege to them to obtain a monopoly in the article which they have to produce, and the result of that monopoly, as you people out in this great manufacturing part of the country know, that kind of a monopoly supplies two things, it supplies unfair treatment of labor and it supplies also this, the prices can be fixed so high the prices of the necessities of life, prices of the things you and I need in our daily lives, can be fixed so high as to give abnormal profits to
the select handful, the select few who happened to have the ear down in Washington, the ear of the Penroses, the Lodges, the Smoots, the Brandegees and the Hardings. I do not have to talk tariff in this town. Give up, if you like, the present tariff - go back if you like to the high protective tariff, if you like, and if I come back here four years hence and you have had a high protective tariff in Wheeling, West Virginia, throughout that time, I want to see the kind of audience I will address. I wonder very much whether it would be a audience like this that shows prosperity, smiling out from every face in it. We have better prosperity today in this hall or in any hall in the United States tonight than we have ever had before in our life-time and it comes under Democracy.

And then last night I understand Senator Harding took up just once more aspect relating to home affairs. He spoke about some clause - a long section in the Treaty of Peace relating to an international council or congress of labor. I wish I could find it, but there are so many things in here. However, he was quoted as saying somewhere in this paper that the proposed/congress of labor would hurt the American workingman. In some way I could not follow the argument, but it was intended to show that this clause in the treaty of peace would work damage to our conditions of labor, would work damage to our scale of pay in this country, and it would bring some kind of a benefit at our expense to other Nations. My friends, it so happens I was in Paris in the Spring of 1919. I was over there when a delegation representing American labor turned up in Paris and it was due to the suggestions of this delegation and members of American labor that this great thing was put into the Treaty of Peace. It was put in there because labor in the United States has got the same big broad view about our duty to the rest of the world that all the rest of the Americans
have got. That international labor council is intended to do certain things that this country wants to see done. It wants to give labor in those places where it never has had a chance, a right to come forward. It wants to take up in the nations of the world where the rights and living conditions of the working men and women, where the factory conditions are like those of the dark ages. We want to bring them up, if we can, to some where near our standard, but still in many places in this country we have not anywhere near reached the standards we ought to maintain. Do not forget that millions of our fellow workmen are far worse off than we are, and we believe by joining around the table with the representatives of labor from the other parts of the world we will be able to help humanity. Or after all when you talk about humanity, somewhere between 97 and 98% of humanity, 97 or 98 men and women out of every hundred in all the world belong to the ranks of labor. I will give you an example how, from the selfish point of view, this great council is going to help the American workingman. You have heard about the Seamen's bill. You have heard how against the opposition of the reactionary element of the Republican Party there was passed the so-called La Follette Seamen's Law - a law which went further than any previous statute. A law providing that American sailors, or any sailors on American ships should have proper conditions under which to work and live; that they should not huddled three or four in a bunk, but that each should have a bunk of his own. Think of that boon - think of the conditions that made it necessary to have to legislate on a subject of that kind. And it provided that they should have a square meal, at least one square meal a day, that they should treated for the first time as human beings and not as animals. I have seen the conditions in the merchant marine of our own country in the old days, and conditions which exist in the
merchant marine of other countries at this day. We have taken the lead. Now some say we cannot operate and make a profit because it costs so much to give living conditions and food of the right sort to the sailors on the United States ships, and we have to do it because it is a law and the foreign nations are able to under-sell us and under-bid us in carrying goods through the seven seas because they can pay their seaman $10.00 or $12.00 per month and can feed them for $7.00 or $8.00 a month. We have been put out of business because of foreign competition, because of the necessity of protecting American workmen on the high seas, but, My Friends, has it been under the direction of a Merchant Democratic Administration that our Marine has become perishingly less than it was in 1912? They seem to be operating, to be carrying the American flag into the ports of the world, only instead of having one ship to do it as we had in 1912 we have twenty for every one then, and we are going to keep that flag on the seas and keep proper working conditions for the American sailor on every ship that sails every sea. But there is a difference - anybody can see it who can understand economics. There is a danger that when a slack period comes that the nations that can man their ships for quarter the cost it takes nations that can put their sailors in what we call pig-stys and feed them on stuff we would not give to our pet cat. It may be that in the future those people may be able to under-bid us on the ocean, and the great purpose of this international council in the Treaty of Peace is to bring pressure on the nations that allow rotten conditions like that to exist, so that they treat their sailors as men and not as beasts. Now I call it not merely sound economics but I call it also an extension of that great principle of that great unselfish moral purpose that the American people has had throughout its life history in dealing with the people of other nations.
And now I want to come down to my last topic, a topic I should not have to speak, a topic which no one should have to speak about. It is a subject which is American and not political. It is a subject that is worldwide that goes back to the deepest principle of our national faith and our religious faith, and I am ashamed tonight to have to be up here on this platform talking about a thing that is sacred, talking about the duty of the American people to join hands with the civilized nations of the world in that great task of eliminating the greatest remaining foe of civilization, the task of eliminating future war through the League of Nations. I want to take you back to about the same period you did before, about 1912, for it is about that year that people in this country began to discuss a thing called a League to Enforce Peace. It was about that time that Mr. Taft, on relinquishing the Presidency, became the leader of the movement looking toward a league to enforce peace, and we had discussions that were taken part in by all big men in the country and they were all in agreement, Ex-President Taft, Ex-President Roosevelt, President Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge and the other leaders of both parties. And they were all united in that common purpose, united in the belief that a league to enforce peace, a league or association of nations to be formed so effectively as to prevent war, and they went back and recited what we had accomplished without firing a shot, without sending a man overseas, how we have maintained The Monroe Doctrine for 99 years; how in 1830 Spain tried to re-gain control over her colonies in South America and how we told Spain to keep her hands off and Spain did. How in 1866 France sent an Army to Mexico; how we told France to take her troops off Mexican soil and she did. And then how a great Democrat, Grover Cleveland, in 1894 or 1895 had seen England reaching down into Venezuela over a
boundary dispute and about to take possession of a portion of the
territory of Venezuela, and Grover Cleveland sent a message to
Great Britain, the Venezuela message. He told England to keep out of
Venezuela and arbitrate, and England kept out and arbitrated; and they
old how in 1905, ten years later, Theo. Roosevelt, sent a message to
the Kaiser of Germany to take their ships back from their attempt to
size the port of La Guaira, to seize its customhouse to pay a debt, and
by Theo. Roosevelt sent for Admiral Dewey, told him to mobilize our
fleet, and how the Kaiser in response to the message and to the orders
of Admiral Dewey, took his ships back to Germany. We had this vision
before our eyes. Every nation, every man in Europe was engaged, en-
rossel in this great military struggle to get the biggest army and the
biggest navy it could, and two years before the war broke out, France
was trying to keep up with the Germany army plans, and Germany was trying
to catch up with England in building a navy. We over here were telling
the people of the country that we must have a bigger army and navy be-
cause all the other nations were increasing theirs and if we did not in-
crease our fleet and our army we would be caught napping and the
other fellow would jump on us before we could equip men or build ships.
ou remember the discussion at that time and in 1914, the thing that the
arm-seeing men had been predicting and that the pacifists back home, the
people who could not see beyond our own borders had laughed at. The
thing broke and the World War was on. But it would not have started ex-
cept for certain other things. Germany knew or thought we knew that all
he would have to do would be to go through Belgium, take Paris, police
ance and in the Spring throw her concentrated armies against Russia and
ou remember how two or three days latter, to the horror and astonishment
if Germany Great Britain went into the War too and on top of that Italy,
her former ally, went into the war against her and then Japan, and finally
in 1917 the bitterest blow of all, United States declared war too. But during the three years from 1914 to 1917 we had been doing a lot of thinking. We in this country had been thinking for ourselves and had carried a message to all the world that we were not thinking only in terms of military victories. We were not thinking in terms only of the lines of the armies as they swayed back and forth - we were not only thinking in the terms of the ships that were going down day after day and night after night, and in 1917, on that 6th day of April, when the President of the U.S. sent his message to the Congress of the U.S. telling them that we had reached the end of our patience, our endurance, and that the time had come when we must appeal to arms; he told them something more than that and this country rose as one man, though we cannot say that now, as one man and one woman to the support of the other thing that the President said for he made it clear then to all the nations we were going into this war to win a military victory and then to obtain this great thing we have been looking for, an association of the nations of the world to make a crime of that kind against humanity and incidentally us impossible in the generations to come, and now I am going to quote from last night, word for word. Senator Harding said; according to Press reports: "Congress never meant that we should go to war to make the world safe for democracy - nor even for Humanity's sake, but to protect the honor of America and American rights and citizens on land and sea". My Friends, if Senator Harding had said that on the 6th day of April 1917 on the floor of the Senate of the U.S. he would not have been merely ejected from the Senate of the U.S., he would have been tarred and feathered and ridden down the streets of Washington. How any American can say a thing like that just because
years have elapsed. Senator Harding did not think that then, and he would not have said it then. I have too much respect for his Americanism, and I have a mighty poor respect for his memory. But we know better, Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, Independents, Prohibitionists and every other person in this country. We know we did go into the war for the sake of humanity. We went into the war for a great high moral purpose.  

After commenting on several other quotations from Senator Harding's speech, Mr. Roosevelt launched into a discussion of the League of Nations, declaring that when President Wilson returned from Europe, bearing with him the first draft of the Treaty of Peace and the League of Nations this country, Republicans and Democrats alike, were united behind him. It was this unity of action and of sentiment that called Mr. Will Hays, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee to hurry post haste to Washington for a secret conference with the leaders of the Republican Party in the Senate, telling them that if a Democratic President was allowed to get away with a thing like that the Republican Party would be defeated in the 1920 election. He declared that from this moment on a relentless war had been waged against the League by the Republican leaders and that every effort had been made to poison the minds of the public.
Mr. Chairman - Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am glad to get to Wheeling. I am glad to be here tonight because tonight is right after last night; and I am only embarrassed by one thing - I have never seen a hall shaped like this before. (Applause) Frankly, I am accustomed to speaking out of the front of my mouth; though I can conceive very readily that this hall was built on purpose for some candidates in this campaign. (Applause - Put that in your pipe). No, I have not got a speech to read either. I have not prepared anything - I never need to prepare anything - All I need to do is to read the morning papers. I have got in my hand a paper I only got two hours ago when I struck town - a copy of one of the Wheeling papers of this morning. Never mind which one - but it has got so much humor in it that I am going to give up my subscription to "Puck" and I am going to take this paper instead. I could talk all night about the humor in this paper. I do not know where to begin, but I suppose it is simple and at the beginning, and so I will begin best policy to begin with the first column story of this paper, which relates to the speech made in this "Both Sides of Your Mouth" Hall last
night; and I want to refer, first of all, to two subjects. I do not know whether they were part of the prepared portion or of the extemporaneous portion. I want to talk first about a dead friend of ours, a friend of ours that was buried seven years ago. You buried him here just as they buried him back in New York - just as the whole Country buried him in 1913, because that old friend, a political nuisance, kept cropping up every two years - every time there was a Congressional Election - every four years when there was a Presidential Election - and we got heartily sick of our old friend because no one understood him. He was one of those people you could not make head nor tail out of, and it required an expert doctor to find out what the matter with him. This old man of the same, figuring in politics all over the United States, was the tariff. Along about 1913 both parties - I will not say both parties, I will say the Democratic party plus the progressive element of the Republican party - got together. They got together down there in Congress in a sincere effort to carry out the American wishes of their American constituents. They had a magnificent funeral - a political funeral, for our old friend and they buried him just where he belonged, out of politics for all times. They turned him over - what was left of him, to the care of an undertaker called the Tariff Commission, a
non-political, non-partisan board made up of experts, made up of
trained men who could understand things called schedules. We were
all agreed on what the old boy died of. We were all agreed on what the
policy of this Nation should be, and yet though he was relegated to a
political grave

Last night we find right in this hall that my friend, Senator
Harding has gone and opened up that grave and he has taken out that
poor old corpse. He has dressed it up in a new suit of new store
clothes and he is asking the American people to believe it has the
breath of life in it once more. I won't go into a full quotation of
what he said about the tariff other than to tell you of the impression
which he attempted to convey, not merely to the audience which was here,
but to all the rest of the United States. He tried to convey the same
old impression that if the United States did not get rid of our
present tariff system - a non-political system, and if we did not go
back to the high protective tariff that took care of the special interests
of this Country in those palmy days that this nation
would go on the rocks in the next four years. Can you people think
as far back as 1912. It is a long while ago, and a lot of water has
passed over the dam since then, and in 1912 I can remember speeches that were made by another gentlemen from Ohio, a very dear soul, my old friend, Mr. Taft, and he was going up and down this Country talking the same old bogey of the high protective tariff and what a victory for the Democrats would mean. He was painting some old picture of closed shops, abandoned mines, bank failures, closed factories, bread lines, in case of a Democratic victory. That was in 1912 and what happened in the next four years? Well, curiously enough the American people did decide on a Democratic victory and during the next four years the wealth of this country, and wealth of the average citizen in this country increased faster than it had ever increased before in our history. In 1916, that is a long time ago too, there was a man named Hughes, and I first found out why Hughes was defeated in 1916 when I went out to the Pacific Coast last month. A man came up to me in California and said - "Isn't Senator Harding coming out here?" and I said I am afraid not. He said I wish he would come out here and we would have a repetition of the "Aint it awful Mabel Campaign". What do you means by the "Aint it awful Mabel Campaign", I asked. "Don't you know about that - don't you know why the West want Democratic in
and he said it was because while most of us were going to
vote the Republican Ticket, Mr. Hughes came out and started in the
second he got west of the Mississippi Valley, telling the people of
the Country was a horrible thing it would be if we should have an-
other four years of disastrous Democratic rule. And
he got those audiences out there weeping and his own tears went down
his face and wet his beard. He painted a picture of gloom - the
same king of a thing Taft had done in 1912 — of closed factories,
abandoned mines and farms gone to waste, bread-lines, bank failures,
and got so on the nerves of the West they turned around and took a
chance, because they had faith in something more than the Democratic
Party, they had faith in the future of the American people, and they
were willing enough to let the prosperity had run along for another
four years: And today — but get out the files of the papers, if
you do not believe me, the papers of 1912 and 1916 and see the same
old shop-worn arguments about the tariff, the same old ghosts of the
past, the candidates on the Old Guard Republican ticket. See them
telling about the horrible future, telling you all the dire and dreadful
things that are going to happen, and some are going to believe it.
Some people say, "Give us a change". I am in favor, myself, of a change next fourth of March, a change, yes, from the most ineffective, narrow, and unAmerican Congress we have ever had in our history.

My friends, one more point on the tariff. Senator Harding is trying to persuade the people of the United States that a high protective tariff is going to be the only thing to keep us from the competition of cheap foreign labor. And this is dishonest, that is the only word to call it. And he implies by that that Governor Cox and I are xxx in favor of letting cheap European labor come in and compete with ours. That is not square politics. That is not playing the game on the level. My friends, there is just one difference between Senator Harding's attitude and ours. Two words are enough to cover this. Senator Harding and Governor Cox are both good Americans. Harding and Cox and both believers that the American workman should be protected against cheap foreign labor, but the difference between the two is this: we believe in the kind of tariff we now have, a tariff which from time to time must be changed to meet changing conditions, must be changed in a scientific way, so as to be corrected for the benefit of all the people of the US and not for the members of a special class. Harding believes and we get this from his associates, in the kind of a tariff that this country had once, the kind of a tariff that gives special privilege to special friends, a handful of big men, so-called in this country, a special privilege to them to obtain a monopoly in the article which they have to produce, and the result of that monopoly, as you people out in this great manufacturing part of the country know, that kind of a monopoly supplies two things, it supplies unfair treatment of labor and it supplies also this, the prices can be fixed so high the prices of the necessities of life, prices of the things you and I need in our daily lives, can be fixed so high as to give abnormal...
the select handful, the select few who happened to have the ear down in Washington, the ear of the Penroses, the Lodges, the Smoots, the Brandegees and the Hardings. I do not have to talk tariff in this town. Give up, if you like, the present tariff - go back if you like to the high protective tariff, if you like, and if I come back here four years hence and you have had a high protective tariff in Wheeling, West Virginia, throughout that time, I want to see the kind of audience I will address. I wonder very much whether it would be an audience like this that shows prosperity, smiling out from every face in it. We have better prosperity today in this hall or in any hall in the United States tonight than we have ever had before in our life-time and it comes under Democracy.

And then last night I understand Senator Harding took up just once more aspect relating to home affairs. He spoke about some clause - a long section in the Treaty of Peace relating to an international council or congress of labor. I wish I could find it, but there are so many things in here. However, he was quoted as saying somewhere in international this paper that the proposed congress of labor would hurt the American workingman. In some way I could not follow the argument, but it was intended to show that this clause in the treaty of peace would work damage to our country conditions of labor, would work damage to our scale of pay in this country, and it would bring some kind of a benefit at our expense to other Nations. My friends, it so happens I was in Paris in the Spring of 1919. I was over there when a delegation representing American labor turned up in Paris and it was due to the suggestions of this delegation and members of American labor that this great thing was put into the Treaty of Peace. It was put in there because labor in the United States has got the same big broad view about our duty to the rest of the world that all the rest of the Americans
have got. That international labor council is intended to do cer-
tain things that this country wants to see done. It wants to
give labor in those places where it never has had a chance, a right
to come forward. It wants to take up in the nations of the world
where the rights and living conditions of the working men and women,
where the factory conditions are like those of the dark ages. We
want to bring them up, if we can, to some where near our standard,
but still in many places in this country we have not anywhere near
reached the standards we ought to maintain. Do not forget that
millions of our fellow workmen are far worse off than we are, and we
believe by joining around the table with the representatives of labor
from the other parts of the world we will be able to help humanity.
or after all when you talk about humanity, somewhere between 97 and
98% of humanity, 97 or 98 men and women out of every hundred in all
the world belong to the ranks of labor. I will give you an example
how, from the selfish point of view, this great council is going to
help the American workingman. You have heard about the Seamen's bill.
You have heard how against the opposition of the reactionary element
of the Republican Party there was passed the so-called La Follette
Seamen's Law - a law which went further than any previous statute. A
law providing that American sailors, or any sailors on American
ships should have proper conditions under which to work and live; that
they should not huddled three or four in a bunk, but that each should
have a bunk of his own. Think of that boon - think of the conditions
that made it necessary to have to legislate on a subject of that kind.
And it provided that they should have a square meal, at least one square
meal a day, that they should treated for the first time as human beings
and not as animals. I have seen the conditions in the merchant marine
of our own country in the old days, and conditions which exist in the
merchant marines of other countries at this day. We have taken the lead. Now some say we cannot operate and make a profit because it costs so much to give living conditions and food of the right sort to the sailors on the United States ships, and we have to do it because it is a law and the foreign nations are able to under-sell us and under-bid us in carrying goods through the seven seas because they can pay their seaman $10.00 or $12.00 per month and can feed them for $7.00 or $8.00 a month. We have been put out of business because of foreign competition, because of the necessity of protecting American workmen on the high seas, but, My Friends, has it been under the direction of a Democratic Administration that our/Marine has become perishably less than it was in 1912? They seem to be operating, to be carrying the American flag into the ports of the world, only instead of having one ship to do it as we had in 1912 we have twenty for every one then, and we are going to keep that flag on the seas and keep proper working conditions for the American sailor on every ship that sails every sea. But there is a difference - anybody can see it who can understand economics. There is a danger that when a slack period comes that the nations that can man their ships for quarter the cost it takes nations that can put their sailors in what we call pig-stys and feed them on stuff we would not give to our pet cat. It may be that in the future those people may be able to under-bid us on the ocean, and the great purpose of this international council in the Treaty of Peace is to bring pressure on the nations that allow rotten conditions like that to exist, so that they treat their sailors as men and not as beasts. Now I call it not merely sound economics but I call it also an extension of that great principle of that great unselfish moral purpose that the American people has had throughout its life history in dealing with the people of other nations.
And now I want to come down to my last topic, a topic I should not have to speak, a topic which no one should have to speak about. It is a subject which is American and not political. It is a subject that is worldwide that goes back to the deepest principle of our national faith and our religious faith, and I am ashamed tonight to have to be up here on this platform talking about a thing that is sacred, talking about the duty of the American people to join hands with the civilized nations of the world in that great task of eliminating the greatest remaining foe of civilization, the task of eliminating future war through the League of Nations. I want to take you back to about the same period you did before, about 1912, for it is about that year that people in this country began to discuss a thing called a League to Enforce Peace. It was about that time that Mr. Taft, on relinquishing the Presidency, became the leader of the movement looking toward a league to enforce peace, and we had discussions that were taken part in by all big men in the country and they were all in agreement, Ex-President Taft, Ex-President Roosevelt, President Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge and the other leaders of both parties. And they were all united in that common purpose, united in the belief that a league to enforce peace, a league or association of nations to be formed so effectively as to prevent war, and they went back and recited what we had accomplished without firing a shot, without sending a man overseas, how we have maintained The Monroe Doctrine for 99 years; how in 1830 Spain tried to regain control over her colonies in South America and how we told Spain to keep her hands off and Spain did. How in 1866 France sent an Army to Mexico; how we told France to take her troops off Mexican soil and she did. And then how a great Democrat, Mr. Grover Cleveland, in 1894 or 1895 had seen England reaching down into Venezuela over a
boundary dispute and about to take possession of a portion of the territory of Venezuela, and Grover Cleveland sent a message to Great Britain, the Venezuela message. He told England to keep out of Venezuela and arbitrate, and England kept out and arbitrated; and they told how in 1905, ten years later, Theo. Roosevelt, sent a message to the Kaiser of Germany to take their ships back from their attempt to seize the port of Laguira, to seize its customhouse to pay a debt, and how Theo. Roosevelt sent for Admiral Dewey, told him to mobilize our fleet, and how the Kaiser in response to the message and to the orders to Admiral Dewey, took his ships back to Germany. We had this vision before our eyes. Every nation, every man in Europe was engaged, engrossed in this great military struggle to get the biggest army and the biggest navy it could, and two years before the war broke out, France was trying to keep up with the Germany army plans, and Germany was trying to catch up with England in building a navy. We over here were telling the people of the country that we must have a bigger army and navy because all the other nations were increasing theirs and if we did not increase our fleet and our army we would be caught napping and the other fellow would jump on us before we could equip men or build ships. You remember the discussion at that time and in 1914, the thing that the far-seeing men had been predicting and that the pacifists back home, the people who could not see beyond our own borders had laughed at. The thing broke and the World War was on. But it would not have started except for certain other things. Germany knew or thought we knew that all she would have to do would be to go through Belgium, take Paris, police France and in the Spring throw her concentrated armies against Russia and you remember how two or three days latter, to the horror and astonishment of Germany Great Britain went into the War too and on top of that Italy, her former ally, went into the war against her and then Japan, and finally
in 1917 the bitterest blow of all, United States declared war too. But during the three years from 1914 to 1917 we had been doing a lot of thinking. We in this country had been thinking for ourselves and had carried a message to all the world that we were not thinking only in terms of military victories. We were not thinking in terms only of the lines of the armies as they swayed back and forth - we were not only thinking in the terms of the ships that were going down day after day and night after night, and in 1917, on that 6th day of April, when the President of the U.S. sent his message to the Congress of the U.S. telling them that we had reached the end of our patience, our endurance, and that the time had come when we must appeal to arms; he told them something more than that and this country rose as one man, though we cannot say that now, as one man and one woman to the support of the other thing that the President said for he made it clear then to all the nations we were going into this war to win a military victory and then to obtain this great thing we have been looking for, an association of the nations of the world to make a crime of that kind against humanity and incidentally make it impossible in the generations to come, and now I am going to quote from last night, word for word. Senator Harding said; according to Press reports: "Congress never meant that we should go to war to make the world safe for democracy - nor even for Humanity's sake, but to protect the honor of America and American rights and citizens on land and sea". My Friends, if Senator Harding had said that on the 6th day of April 1917 on the floor of the Senate of the U.S. he would not have been merely ejected from the Senate of the U.S., he would have been tarred and feathered and ridden down the streets of Washington. How any American can say a thing like that just because 3
years have elapsed. Senator Harding did not think that then, and he would not have said it then. I have too much respect for his Americanism, and I have a mighty poor respect for his memory. But we know better, Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, independents, Prohibitionists and every other person in this country. We know we did go into the war for the sake of humanity. We went into the war for a great high moral purpose.  

After commenting on several more quotations from Senator Harding's speech, Mr. Roosevelt launched into a discussion of the League of Nations, declaring that when President Wilson returned from Europe, bearing with him the first draft of the Treaty of Peace and the League of Nations this country, Republicans and Democrats alike, were united behind him. It was this unity of action and sentiment that called Mr. Will Hays, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee to, hurry post haste to Washington for a secret conference with the leaders of the Republican Party in the Senate, telling them that if a Democratic President was allowed to get away with a thing like that the Republican Party would be defeated in the 1920 election. He declared that from this moment on a relentless war had been waged against the League by the Republican leaders and that every effort had been made to poison the minds of the public.
I wish that Senator Harding would speak every day and every night. Every address emphasizes the true shallowness of the Republican campaign—a combination of trite, time-worn generalities with equally time-worn flings at anything and everything ever done by Democrats or the Democratic Party in our National Life, instead of talking about the real issues of this campaign.

For instance, last night at Wheeling he tried once more to re-vamp the old tariff question. Personally, I think it fair to tell the whole story. Senator Harding, on the other hand, spent his time talking about the dangers to our industries of having a Democratic President or a Democratic Congress during the next four years—while he carefully avoided all reference to the fact that under a present Democratic President the Nation has not suffered in its industries from the competition of foreign countries, but that the Country, on the other hand, has enjoyed the most remarkable period of prosperity in its whole history. I wonder how many thinking voters are really influenced by the gloomy picture which he draws of the flooding of American markets with the products of cheap European labor. I wonder how many people really believe that the Democratic Party want to see or would be willing to allow the closing down of our steel, iron, oil, mining and agricultural activities, or even the hampering of their operation, through foreign competition. In the face of the splendid prosperity which the Country is now enjoying, is it honorable or even wise to condemn the Democratic Party for this prosperity, or to assume that only the Republican Party wants to see it continue?
Now there is such a thing as a tariff question in this Country, but it is a scientific question and one which, by the common consent of the great mass of the voters, has been taken out of politics and placed on the scientific basis to which it belongs. The tariff must, of course, be changed from time to time, and should be handled by non-political, scientific body such as the present Tariff Commission constituted several years ago with the assistance of purely patriotic members of the Senate and House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats. Here is the fundamental difference between Senator Harding's tariff stand and that of Governor Cox. Both are equally in favor of preventing any injury to honest American industry by cheap foreign labor, but Governor Cox and I are firmly convinced that this must be done for the broad good of the Nation by non-partisan experts. Senator Harding believes that it must be accomplished by a reversion to the discredited methods of the past, by which certain special, highly favored, political manufacturing interests were given such high protection that it constituted more than a complete monopoly in their own special lines of production. Many of the products thus given a special privilege were products which enter into the cost of living of the average American citizen. This special privilege enabled the special interests controlling them to place the price of their articles at any figure they chose, thereby forcing the consuming public to pay out of their own pockets abnormal profits - constituting what we would call today profiteers of the most shameless kind.

Senator Harding's associates in the Senate of the United States are men of the type of Senator Penrose, men who seek the good
of a small number of their own special friends, men who would give
additional and enormous wealth to the privileged few, men who have
no interest in the question of whether that abnormal wealth comes
out of the pocket of the average citizen or not. I want it clearly
understood that if Senator Harding's tariff policy should prevail,
it would serve only to create a greater concentration of wealth in
the hands of the few and to start the now declining cost of living of
the average citizen once more on the upgrade.

One other point in this same connection: Senator Harding
makes a false appeal to the labor of the United States when he raises
another cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" in regard to the splendid provisions
for the recognition of the interests of labor in the Treaty of Peace.
It is purely campaign buncombe to talk about control of American labor
by the labor of any other nations. The great purpose of the provisions
for labor in the Treaty of Peace is to give justice to the laboring
classes of nations who in the past have been downtrodden and exploited
by the governing class of certain Old World Nations. No American
workingman will hesitate in this great policy of helping the working-
man in every nation of the world where he needs help. Do not forget
the big, basic fact that if the conditions of labor improve in the
other Nations of the World, such an improvement must and will help the
workingman of America. We are opposed to the exploitation of labor
anywhere - The higher the standards throughout the World, the higher
will be the leadership which American labor can continue to take. This
cry of Senator Harding sounds like a despairing appeal to win back a
labor vote which he knows he has lost, the support of which he knows
he has no right to claim.
I invite a comparison between the records of Senator Harding and Governor Cox, and I further invite a comparison between the records of the other two candidates, Governor Collidge of Massachusetts and myself. Governor Cox and I do not need to make special appeals. During the past eight years both of us have been confronted on many occasions with countless labor problems, and we glory in the fact that our decisions have been based on fairness to both sides and on honest efforts to see that justice was done under the broad application of the best American spirit.
I wish that Senator Harding would speak every day and every night. Every address emphasizes the true shallowness of the Republican campaign—a combination of trite, time-worn generalities with equally time-worn slings at anything and everything ever done by Democrats or the Democratic Party in our National Life, instead of talking about the real issues of this campaign.

For instance, last night at Wheeling he tried once more to re-vamp the old tariff question. Personally, I think it fair to tell the whole story. Senator Harding, on the other hand, spent his time talking about the dangers to our industries of having a Democratic President or a Democratic Congress during the next four years—while he carefully avoided all reference to the fact that under a present Democratic President the Nation has not suffered in its industries from the competition of foreign countries, but that the Country, on the other hand, has enjoyed the most remarkable period of prosperity in its whole history. I wonder how many thinking voters are really influenced by the gloomy picture which he draws of the flooding of American markets with the products of cheap European labor. I wonder how many people really believe that the Democratic Party want to see or would be willing to allow the closing down of our steel, iron, oil, mining and agricultural activities, or even the hampering of their operation, through foreign competition. In the face of the splendid prosperity which the Country is now enjoying, is it honorable or even wise to condemn the Democratic Party for this prosperity, or to assume that only the Republican Party wants to see it continue?
Now there is such a thing as a tariff question in this Country, but it is a scientific question and one which, by the common consent of the great mass of the voters, has been taken out of politics and placed on the scientific basis to which it belongs. The tariff must, of course, be changed from time to time, and should be handled by non-political, scientific body such as the present Tariff Commission constituted several years ago with the assistance of purely patriotic members of the Senate and House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats. Here is the fundamental difference between Senator Harding's tariff stand and that of Governor Cox. Both are equally in favor of preventing any injury to honest American industry by cheap foreign labor, but Governor Cox and I are firmly convinced that this must be done for the broad good of the Nation by non-partisan experts. Senator Harding believes that it must be accomplished by a reversion to the discredited methods of the past, by which certain special, highly favored, political manufacturing interests were given such high protection that it constituted more than a complete monopoly in their own special lines of production. Many of the products thus given a special privilege were products which enter into the cost of living of the average American citizen. This special privilege enabled the special interests controlling them to place the prices of their articles at any figure they chose, thereby forcing the consuming public to pay out of their own pocket abnormal profits — constituting what we would call today profiteers of the most shameless kind.

Senator Harding's associates in the Senate of the United States are men of the type of Senator Farnace, men who seek the good
of a small number of their own special friends, men who would give
the rest the same fate, and further limit a comparison between the
additional and enormous wealth to the privileged few, men who have
no interest in the question of whether that abnormal wealth comes
out of the pocket of the average citizen or not. I want it clearly
understood that if Senator Harding's tariff policy should prevail,
it would serve only to create a greater concentration of wealth in
the hands of the few and to start the now declining cost of living of
the average citizen once more on the upgrade.

One other point in this same connection: Senator Harding
makes a false appeal to the labor of the United States when he raises
another cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" in regard to the splendid provisions
for the recognition of the interests of labor in the Treaty of Peace.
It is purely campaign buncombe to talk about control of American labor
by the labor of any other nation. The great purpose of the provisions
for labor in the Treaty of Peace is to give justice to the laboring
classes of nations who in the past have been downtrodden and exploited
by the governing class of certain Old World Nations. No American
workingman will hesitate in this great policy of helping the working-
man in every nation of the world where he needs help. Do not forget
the big basic fact that if the conditions of labor improve in the
other Nations of the World, such an improvement must and will help the
workingman of America. We are opposed to the exploitation of labor
anywhere - The higher the standards throughout the world, the higher
will be the leadership which American labor can continue to take. This
cry of Senator Harding sounds like a despairing appeal to win back a
labor vote which he knows he has lost, the support of which he knows
he has no right to claim.
I invite a comparison between the records of Senator Harding and Governor Cox, and I further invite a comparison between the records of the other two candidates, Governor Callidge of Massachusetts and myself. Governor Cox and I do not need to make special appeals. During the past eight years both of us have been confronted on many occasions with countless labor problems, and we glory in the fact that our decisions have been based on fairness to both sides and on honest efforts to see that justice was done under the broad application of the best American spirit.
I wish that Senator Harding would speak every day and every night. Every address emphasizes the true shallowness of the Republican campaign - a combination of trite, time-worn generalities with equally time-worn flings at anything and everything ever done by Democrats or the Democratic Party in our National Life, instead of talking about the real issues of this campaign.

For instance, last night at Wheeling he tried once more to re-vamp the old tariff question. Personally, I think it fair to tell the whole story. Senator Harding, on the other hand, spent his time talking about the dangers to our industries of having a Democratic President or a Democratic Congress during the next four years - while he carefully avoided all reference to the fact that under a present Democratic President the Nation has not suffered in its industries from the competition of foreign countries, but that the Country, on the other hand, has enjoyed the most remarkable period of prosperity in its whole history. I wonder how many thinking voters are really influenced by the glibly picture which he draws of the flooding of American markets with the products of cheap European labor. I wonder how many people really believe that the Democratic Party want to see or would be willing to allow the closing down of our steel, iron, oil, mining and agricultural activities, or even the hampering of their operation, through foreign competition. In the face of the splendid prosperity which the Country is now enjoying, is it honorable or even wise to condemn the Democratic Party for this prosperity, or to assume that only the Republican Party wants to see it continue.
Now there is such a thing as a tariff question in this country, but it is a scientific question and one which, by the common consent of the great mass of the voters, has been taken out of politics and placed on the scientific basis to which it belongs. The tariff must, of course, be changed from time to time, and should be handled by a non-political, scientific body such as the present Tariff Commission constituted several years ago with the assistance of purely patriotic members of the Senate and House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats. Here is the fundamental difference between Senator Harding's tariff stand and that of Governor Cox. Both are equally in favor of preventing any injury to honest American industry by cheap foreign labor, but Governor Cox and I are firmly convinced that this must be done for the broad good of the Nation by non-partisan experts. Senator Harding believes that it must be accomplished by a reversion to the discredited method of the past, by which certain special, highly favored, political manufacturing interests were given such high protection that it constituted more than a complete monopoly in their own special lines of production. Many of the products thus given a special privilege were products which enter into the cost of living of the average American citizen. This special privilege enabled the special interests controlling them to place the price of their articles at any figure they chose, thereby forcing the consuming public to pay out of their own pockets abnormal profits - constituting what we would call today profiteers of the most shameless kind.

Senator Harding's associates in the Senate of the United States are men of the type of Senator Penrose, men who seek the good
of a small number of their own special friends, men who would give

the added interest of the question of whether that abnormal wealth comes
out of the pocket of the average citizen or not. I want it clearly
understood that if Senator Harding's tariff policy should prevail,
it would serve only to create a greater concentration of wealth in
the hands of the few and to start the new declining cost of living of
the average citizen once more on the upgrade.

One other point in this same connection: Senator Harding
makes a false appeal to the labor of the United States when he raises
another cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" in regard to the splendid provisions
for the recognition of the interests of labor in the Treaty of Peace.
It is purely campaign buncombe to talk about control of American labor
by the labor of any other nation. The great purpose of the provisions
for labor in the Treaty of Peace is to give justice to the laboring
classes of nations who in the past have been downtrodden and exploited
by the governing class of certain Old World Nations. No American
workingman will hesitate in this great policy of helping the working-
man in every nation of the world where he needs help. Do not forget
the big basic fact that if the conditions of labor improve in the
other Nations of the World, such an improvement must and will help the
workingman of America. We are opposed to the exploitation of labor
anywhere - The higher the standards throughout the World, the higher
will be the leadership which American labor can continue to take. This
cry of Senator Harding sounds like a despairing appeal to win back a
labor vote which he knows he has lost, the support of which he knows
he has no right to claim.
I invite a comparison between the records of Senator Harding and Governor Cox, and I further invite a comparison between the records of the other two candidates, Governor Collier of Massachusetts and myself. Governor Cox and I do not need to make special appeals. During the past eight years both of us have been confronted on many occasions with countless labor problems, and we glory in the fact that our decisions have been based on fairness to both sides and on honest efforts to see that justice was done under the broad application of the best American spirit.