national form. Those who stand upon the Chicago platform are prepared to make known and to defend every motive which influences them, every purpose which animates them, and every body to which they belong. They understand the causes of our institutions. They are staunch supporters of the idea of government upon which we live, and they hold their faith upon the foundation laid by the fathers.

"Andrew Jackson has stated with affirmative emphasis and with an emphasis which cannot be surpassed, both the duty and the morality of government. He said: 'Individuals in money will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education or of worth is impossible to be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law.'

"We yield to none in our devotion to the doctrine just enunciated. Our campaign has not for its object the reconstruction of society. We cannot repeal the mistakes that have marked the course of legislation during the last three or four years. We would not invade the homes of our previous to carry to supply the wants of the spendthrift, nor would we propose to transfer the rewards of industry to the idle or indolent. Property is and will remain the stimulus of industry and the reward of industry for all. We believe, as asserted in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, and that that does not mean that all men are or can be equal in possession, in ability or in merit; it simply means that all men are equal before the law, and that government officials shall not, in making legislation or enforcing the law, make distinctions among citizens. I assert that property rights as well as the rights of persons are safe in the hands of the common people.

"Abraham Lincoln in his message sent to Congress in December, 1862, said: 'We must frame our measures so as to be traitor, than those who fall up from poverty; none less inclined to take of form caught which they have not honestly earned.'

"I repeat his language with unqualified approval, and join with him in the warning which he added, namely: 'Let them beware of surrendering a political power which they already possess, and which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement against such as they, and to fix new distinctions and barriers on those who remain outside.'

"Those who daily follow the information of the owners of the trusts have ears cry loud,' are now, as they ever have been, the instrument of law and order, and the source of our statesmen's greatness in time of peace and his surest defender in time of war.

"But I have only stated a part of Jackson's utterance—he not give a full statement. 'But when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions, to grant to the favored a monopoly of privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful—the humble members of society, the farmers, mechanics and the day laborers who have neither time nor the means of securing the favors bestowed, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government.'

"Those who support the Chicago platform believe all of the quotations from Jackson—the latter part as well as the former.

"WHO ARE THE OPPONENTS.

"We are not surprised to find arrayed against us those who are the beneficiaries of government favoritism; they have read our platform. Nor are we surprised to learn that we meet in this campaign just the hostility of those who find a peculiarly advantageous in advocating the doctrine of monopolistic, or class legislation, and in advocating the great aggregations of wealth overlooking upon the rights of individuals. We welcome such opposition—it is the highest indorsement which could be bestowed upon us. We are content to have our opponents, if they wish, to have the government similar to our fear or favor.

"It is not the wish of the general public that trusts should spring into existence and overlook the weaker competitors of society; it is not the wish of the general public that these trusts should destroy competition and then robbed such men as they may find fault who are at their mercy; nor is it the wish of the general public that the functionality of the government has lost so often prostituted to the private gain. Those who stand upon the Chicago platform believe that the government should not encourage or wrongdoing, for that it should also prevent wrong-doing, and they believe that the law should be enforced alike against all the enemies of the public weal.

"Ever do not narrow self-interest, but they believe that a great larger is equity a virtue; they do not believe the companies of a highwayman who, the monopolizing tactics, but they believe equity of the Nazarene, who, through the mere public and less fortunate, seeks to legislate, appropriate to their selfish ends the proceeds of the toil of others. The commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal' introduced from Sinai and reiterated in the legislation of all nations, is as binding upon the rich as it is upon the poor, and it should be applied to the great as well as the small, to the strong as well as the weak, to the corporate person as well as to the individual. The person of Bob and Steel created by the Almighty. No government is worthy of the name which is not able to protect both every one equally, and which is not able to every citizen, rich or poor, alike beneath the flag.

"It follows as a necessary conclusion that certain legislation must be enacted by the people who neither have the efforts of our opponents, and not by those who enjoy its benefits.

"ON THE TARIFF.

The Chicago platform has been criticised by many because it dissents from an opinion rendered by the Supreme Court declaring the income tax law unconstitutional. Our critics would go so far as to apply the income tax law so far as to apply the entire 'wherefore' to those who stood up in the days of the fathers. It must be remembered that we express sentiment not looking back of the Constitution as long as it is in force, but looking forward to the time when the Supreme Court of the United States shall be so constituted as to reverse the decision in question. We are pledged to the call for a constitutional power which reverses after the decision, or what may come from the reversal by the court as it may be constituted? Is there any reason why we should not be pledged to the Supreme Court of the United States has reversed its decisions in many cases, which, without a dissenting voice, it has not law almost immediately after the new member qualified.

"We are not surprised to find the new recently overthrown. We are not surprised to find the Supreme Court of the United States reversed a unanimous as the present, or, let us rather say, the majority of the court, as it is now constituted. Nor are we surprised to find the new decisions appear in the law as was formerly in a party of which we are a member.

"Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 10 were appointed by Republican Presidents and 5 by Democratic Presidents. Of the 10 appointed by Republican Presidents, 4 were appointed by Democrats who were Republicans at the time of their appointment. Of the 5 appointed by Democratic Presidents, 2 were appointed by Republicans who were Democrats at the time of their appointment. Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 6 were Democrats when appointed, and 9 were Republicans when appointed. Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 12 were appointed by Democrats, and 3 by Republicans.

"Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 12 were appointed by Democrats, and 3 by Republicans. Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 9 were Republicans when appointed, and 6 were Democrats when appointed. Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 10 were appointed by Republicans, and 5 by Democrats.

"Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 6 were Democrats when appointed, and 9 were Republicans when appointed. Of the 15 members composing the present Supreme Court, 12 were appointed by Democrats, and 3 by Republicans.

"