conquered them so completely that they have erected a tomb for him on the banks of the Hudson, grander than the mausoleum of any king, and millions of these "subjugated and conquered people" make yearly pilgrimages of love and gratitude to his last resting place.

Now, concerning the historical relations of this Democratic party to the great principles of the declaration of independence, a good deal might be said. The great solicitude the Democrats now feel lest some black people 10,000 miles away over in the Pacific ocean may not have the full benefit of all the principles of the declaration of independence, would be truly touching, perhaps, if we could forget their relations to another colored race nearer home. They tell us the Filipinos must not be governed "without their consent." But, happily, the democratic party have written their record upon the subject of human rights, in glaring deeds, and it is a record which cheap campaign talk cannot wipe out.

First, let me tell you that the man who wrote the declaration of independence was himself a slaveholder when he wrote it; and, although he lived 50 years from the time the immortal document was written, he died still a slaveholder. The author of the declaration of independence certainly did not, in his practice, apply its principles to people of color, and I propose to show you that none of his party followers have ever done so since. It took the declaration of independence a full century and a quarter to "strike in" on the democratic party, and Aguinaldo and his Tagal guerillas are now honored with their first application of its principles to a colored race. I am not saying its principles should not be applied, as far as practicable, to all men everywhere; I am simply showing up the hypocrisy of democratic statesmen.

When the declaration of independence was written every American colony held colored men in slavery, and from 1820 to 1865 it was the sole business of this democratic party to perpetuate and defend this institution of human slavery, and all the time they were doing this they were pretending great devotion to the principles of the declaration of independence. They in fact used up all their brains and statesmanship in the congenial pursuit of fortifying and spreading slavery, and have had none left to devote to anything else since that great effort failed.

A Dangerous Undertaking.

If at the time the declaration of independence was written, or at any time within 80 years after that time, any man had assembled a dozen black men in any democratic state, and read the declaration of independence to them, and told them its principles applied to them and that they were entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and should have a voice in the government under which they lived, a mob of furious democrats would have immediately gathered, and they would have taken that man out and murdered him and tanned his hide for drum-heads. I am telling you the literal truth.

That is not all. In those good old days a democratic justice of the supreme court made a decision to the effect that a colored man was entitled to none of the rights of citizenship under the constitution of the United States, and that he substantially had no rights which any white man was bound to respect. That passed for good law in the old democratic days; and I believe if I were a democrat about the last thing I would do would be to talk about the constitution and the Declaration of Independence. These democrats now tell us "the constitution follows the flag." Maybe it does. But it couldn't stay at home with the flag in the days when they controlled this government.

But there is still more: Away back in 1858, when Abraham Lincoln was debating with Stephen A. Douglas, the democratic champion of that time, the question whether human slavery should be kept out of the territories, one of the chief points of controversy was whether the Declaration of Independence had any application to anybody except white people. Lincoln insisted that it applied to "all men," and Douglas denounced him for saying so, from every stump in Illinois, as being in favor of "nigger equality," and all the democrats applauded his cruel words. The idea that Jefferson's great declaration included anybody except white people was almost a punishable crime among the democrats of 1860, and the situation has not improved much, as I shall show before I am done.

Note another thing: When Abraham Lincoln at length proclaimed freedom to the black man in order to save from utter destruction this constitution and the Declaration of Independence, the miserable old democratic party with one voice denounced the great act as usurpation and despotism. And when the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery at length came up for action at the close of the war, in the first place no solitary democrat in congress voted in favor of submitting that amendment to the states; and, in the second place, when the question of ratifying the amendment came before the legislatures of the several states, not a single democrat in any state legislature from Maine to California voted for that great amendment! Not one! The colored people of this country are free to-day, and are given "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in spite of the vote and voice of every American democrat who was in a position to act upon the question. No wonder the delegates in the Kansas City convention didn't recognize the Declaration of Independence when it was read to them, and declared the reader was "making too long a speech."

More of the Story.

But there is more of this pitiable story. Remember, I am only, for the present, trying to illustrate the historic relation of the democratic party to the principles, now so passionately asserted, that men of color, along with white ones, are entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." They have put these catch phrases in their platform, and it is perfectly proper to confront them with their infamous record.

You will remember that when the republican party, a few years ago introduced into a congress a bill to make effective the constitutional right of the colored men of the south to vote at national elections, every democrat in congress and out, north and south, denounced that proposed law as an unspeakable outrage. They called it the "infamous force bill," and even threatened revolution if the white democrats of the south should be abridged in their high privilege of driving voters from the polls with shotguns. This was, I suppose, done to illustrate their great devotion to the principle of the "consent of the governed."

To-day we see the colored voters totally disfranchised by democratic violence and fraud, in every southern state where their votes might affect the result. Democratic ingenuity has been taxed to devise state constitutions and election laws which will have the effect in practice to annul the fifteenth amendment to the constitution. North Carolina has just adopted a new patent process for despoiling the black man of his constitutional right to vote, but that state would be shocked, I daresay, at the prospect of "imperialism" for the colored people of the Philippines. "Pitchfork" Tillman, who read the platform to the Kansas City convention amid thunderous applause, has boasted from the seat in the United States senate which he disgraces, that the black men of South Carolina are not allowed to vote, and will be murdered if they insist upon exercising that right. Of course Tillman is much worried about the rights of the Filipinos.

Because President McKinley appointed a colored man postmaster at a small office in South Carolina, some of these democrats who are so wrought up about constitutional liberty over in the eastern hemisphere, proceeded, without provocation, to torture and murder that colored man and his helpless family, with a degree of fiendish cruelty which would have disgraced Geronimo and his Apaches in their palmiest days. But those South Carolina barbarians will all vote that "the constitution follows the flag" at the coming November election.

Now, in the light of all these facts, you will better appreciate, I hope, how the democratic heart is absolutely bleeding at the prospect that some Tagal rebels over in the Philippine islands may be deprived of the benefits of some of the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Would it not be awful to outrage the philanthropic sentiments of the democratic party by extending American rule over some colored people in the eastern hemisphere "without their consent?" Such effrontery and hypocrisy were perhaps never before exhibited before the eyes of an intelligent people, even by the democratic party, and that is putting the case very strongly.

Now, fellow-citizens, the Philippine question is really a very simple matter, when stripped of democratic rant and fustian. We fought a war with Spain in 1898, and, you will remember, the democrats were accustomed to boast that the war with Spain was their war, and that they literally took the president by the collar and forced him into the conflict. They know by experience the danger of opposing a popular war, and hastened to get into the band wagon. One of the results of that war was the seizure of the Philippine islands by the land and naval forces of the United States, accompanied by the complete destruction of all Spain's fleets, and of all her means and instrumentalities for ever again holding or governing those islands. The power of Spain, either for good or evil, in the Philippines, was obliterated, and the United States was left in charge with her fleet and with her army of occupation.

Such was the situation. And just at this point the democratic stump orator begins to falsify the record by saying that Spain had already lost her sovereignty over the islands before the Americans took possession, and that the inhabitants already had an organized government exercising sovereign powers. In this fairy tale there is not one word of truth. Spain lost her sovereignty over the Philippines to the United States in the hazard of war, and in no other way.

True, there had some time before been a rebellion, but it had ceased before the American occupation, and its head and leader, Aguinaldo, had accepted a Spanish bribe as the price of his virtue and devotion to his countrymen. A condition of his bribe was that he should quit the islands, and this he had done, and was living in a Chinese boarding house over at Hong-Kong, China. The battle of Manila was fought on May 1, 1898. Later on Aguinaldo took passage at Hong-Kong, China, on the United States cruiser McCulloch, and landed at Cavite May 18. Aguinaldo went ashore and assembled a little group of Tagal rebels, took out of his pocket a constitution which he had written at his cheap boarding house over in Hong-Kong, and called himself president of a purely imaginary Philippine republic. His government, if it deserves the name, had not the semblance of legal or rightful authority behind it. "Consent of the governed" was never thought of. Aguinaldo's authority was never established by any convention or election having power to bind the people of the Philippine islands, whole tribes of whom have perhaps never unto this day so much as heard the name of Emilio Aguinaldo. His attitude was unfriendly to United States authority from the day he landed. He was and is as pure a usurper as any democrat who has ever assumed to represent a disfranchised republican constituency in Mississippi or South Carolina, and stronger than this the case could never be put.

We were thus holding Manila and some other Philippine ports, when Spain cried enough and asked for peace. A treaty was then negotiated, wherein it was provided that Spain should cede to us the Philippine islands, and for doing so should receive $20,000,000. That treaty was pending before the senate for ratification, when the rabble command of this man Aguinaldo, lying in the mud about the city of Manila, having doubtless been told by some American democrat that a little bloodshed would probably shock the American people and defeat the ratification of the treaty, deliberately opened fire upon the American lines. I know Aguinaldo and some of his allies of the democratic party have said that it was the bad Americans who began the war, and I also know the evidence shows that when they say this they lie. Aguinaldo's Tagals had been trying for weeks to bring on hostilities before the clash came, and Gen. Otis, by express orders of the president, was doing everything in his power, short of cowardly surrender, to prevent bloodshed.

Shot Back, of Course.

When the Tagals fired upon our men, they shot back, of course; and then the American forces entered upon this awful career of conquest which now so grieves the democrats. The American soldiers showed a marked indisposition to stand still and be killed. In that spirit of pluck and daring which characterized their fathers, they proceeded not only to return the fire, but to absolutely blot out of existence the Tagal army. I suppose such men as Bryan and Stevenson would have our boys run away when they were fired upon. They would have had Dewey and Merritt abandon the occupation before a vote was taken upon the treaty, because, forsooth, some hostile natives had opened fire upon our lines. Thank God, such a sentiment finds no response in the hearts of true Americans.

Whether or not it was good policy to acquire the Philippine islands, in the first place, by treaty, and to assume the burden of reducing them to order, is a question about which there might be two opinions; but that question was decided, and decided irrevocably, when the treaty of peace was ratified. Certainly, if any American citizen was ever going to object to our assumption of sovereignty over the Philippines, the time to do it was when the treaty was presented to the senate for ratification. He who did not speak out then is estopped now. To say we should ratify the treaty, and pay Spain $20,000,000 for the islands, and then let a Tagal usurper drive us away like cattle, is a proposition involving so much stupidity, cowardice and disgrace, that nobody except a democrat in great straights for a political issue, would ever think of advocating it. Yet this is in substance what Bryan and his populistic aggregation are saying.

Let us now see how much consistency there is in Mr. Bryan's position. The country will not forget, when voting upon this question, that Col. Bryan assumed great responsibilities when the treaty of peace with Spain was pending in the senate. He hastily dropped the eagles from his shoulders down in Florida, flew to the city of Washington, and publicly advised his democratic friends and followers in the senate to vote for the treaty. Without Bryan's timely aid the treaty was going to fail for lack of votes. To Bryan belongs the honor or the dishonor of having secured for us by treaty the sovereignty of the Philippine islands at a cost of $20,000,000. It was Bryan's word of advice at that critical time which made that treaty the law of the land. If he had said to his friends in the senate that the treaty must be defeated, it would have been done. Now, don't, I pray, forget this great and decisive fact.

Congress the Sole Judge.

It is true the late treaty with Spain which Mr Bryan favored and procured to be ratified did not provide, as did previous treaties, that the territory ceded should be admitted to the union as states when in the judgment of congress the proper time for so doing should arrive. But such a clause, if inserted, would not in any degree have enlarged the power of congress over the subject. Congress is under the constitution the sole judge of the fitness of a territory for statehood. Treaties may impose a moral obligation upon congress, but nothing more. Part of the territory acquired from France in 1803 was only admitted as states a few years ago. That territory was subjected to nearly 100 years of "imperialism" notwithstanding the treaty stipulation, and yet the democratic party did not discover that the Declaration of Independence had been struck down. Part of the teritory acquired from Mexico, under a treaty stipulating for the right of statehood has never been admitted by congress as states. Why does not Mr. Bryan wrap the flag about him, and, seizing the constitution in one hand and the Declaration of Independence in the other, rush out into Arizona and New Mexico and stop the "imperialism" that has been going on there for more than 50 years?"

The democratic platform makes a declaration of policy concerning the Philippine islands, which is either a cowardly dodge or else it was written and adopted by men who had no appreciation of the meaning of language. The statement is a true democratic dog-fall. It devours itself. The platform says:

"The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization. They cannot be subjects without imperiling our form of government, and as we are unwilling to surrender our civilization or to convert the republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government, and, second, protection, etc."

"Now, to "give the Filipinos a stable form of government" is precisely what the republicans have been trying to do, and it is what the combined democratic party is afraid we will do, and is trying with all its might to keep us from doing. The administration has repeatedly declared its purpose to give to the Filipinos a stable form of government, and with it as large a measure of self-government as practicable. And but for the democratic fire in the rear it would long ago have succeeded. Those now in charge may be relied upon to accomplish that end much sooner than the broncho tamer from Nebraska could do it. Upon this question, as upon everything else, the democrats are simply conjuring up ghosts and specters in the forlorn hope of so far confusing the minds of voters that their own crimes and blunders may be forgotten, and that they may again be intrusted with power.

Militarism Scarecrow.

Another campaign scarecrow erected by the democratic ghost dancers is "militarism." A democratic politician likes to go out in some lonesome place of a dark night and agitate his diaphragm by yelling "militarism" in a shrill key. He thinks that will scare the German voters so they will forget the democratic scheme for confiscating credits by statute. A country of 80,000,000 inhabitants enlists 100,000 volunteers—one soldier for every 800 of the population—in time of serious trouble and fighting, with no legal provision for putting any man in the ranks except by his consent, and in this the democratic politicians discover a scheme for the destruction of the constitutional government! Are these men really alarmed, or are they trying to frighten voters for political effect?

Everybody knows this cry is sheer democratic humbug—the claque of irresponsible demagogues who mean no word of what they say. If you find an honest democrat who really thinks we are in danger of militarism, tell him that away back in 1810 the regular army of the United States was, in time of peace, larger in proportion to the population of the country, than the regular and volunteer army is in the year 1900. Those were the good old democratic days of James Madison, and the constitution is still alive and well, and the Declaration of Independence, though somewhat disfigured by a century of democratic assaults, is still able to be around and do duty to Mr. Bryan's campaign.

I own I have dwelt too long on these democratic cuibbles. They serve to emphasize the total incapacity of the democratic party for the duties of serious statesmanship. The democratic politician of 1900 is the guerrilla who shoots from ambush. He has nothing of value to propose, and if he had, we know by experience he would, if trusted, fail to perform his promise. When the grand army of progress and history is afoot, the democratic statesman is forever skulking on the flank. He peers out from behind stumps and trees, and makes faces at the commanding general. He always thinks the march should be reversed, and that the most desirable fields of conquest lie in the rear. Occasionally he grows bold and fires a rotten egg or a dead cat into the moving procession, and then runs away to meet his associate bandits in some congenial swamp on the Fourth of July, where they all howl in concert about the Declaration of Independence. Such is democratic statesmanship.

Proud of Illinois.

But, my friends, while all of us rejoice in the prosperous condition of the country at large, and in the new glories that have come to it through the valor of our matchless sea warriors and soldiers of Illinois, we are doubly proud of the rank our own state has attained among her sister states of this great republic in helping to bring about the new honors the nation has recently earned and is still achieving. What giant strides Illinois has made within the memory of many of you! There are yet cabins standing in many parts of the state which were built by the pioneers, some of whom are yet living and are as exultant to-day as are you, over the wonderful advance which Illinois has made within a lifetime, from almost a trackless wilderness to a grand state teeming with a population of nearly 5,000,000 of people, and foremost in agriculture, manufactures, mining, and the many industries whose development has made the United States first among the nations of the world. Yet lingering on the shores of time, contentedly spending the evening of their lives here, but looking for the dawn of the new day beyond, are some of those pioneers who built those cabins, which they keep standing as a pleasant memory of the early days when it was not an uncommon occurrence for the native Indians to stride over the doorsill and ask for entertainment. Not a few of you who are assembled here to-day, are the sons and daughters of those pioneers. You were born in those primitive cabins and have vivid knowledge of the great change, the amazing progress, that Illinois has made within your memory and experience. Having knowledge of the state's present importance and the commanding position it occupies in the galaxy of states that make up this "land of the free and home of the brave," it is not surprising that you rejoice when a time of plenty, peace and prosperity comes to you, such as is being enjoyed in Illinois to-day by all of its people.

It is through good government, honestly and wisely administered, that the people of any state are enabled to reap most benefit from the natural advantages they possess. Nature has been generous with Illinois, and it is pertinent to ask under which political party's management has Illinois and her people thrived most and best.

I approach this subject with some diffidence, as in dealing with it I cannot eliminate myself as a factor, occupying the position of governor with which the people of Illinois honored me four years ago, but I refer to it without hesitancy or apology, having the knowledge within me that I have striven to be a faithful servant to the people who thus honored and trusted me, and the record of my stewardship will bear their closest scrutiny. The book is open for all to examine, whether he be friend or foe, republican, democrat, prohibitionist or populist. No legerdemain has been practiced in making up the record; it will show no juggling with figures, nor fictitious arithmetic. Where a dollar of revenue has been received the record will show it, and every cent of that dollar will be so clearly accounted for that none may be deceived who investigate the record.

To Whom Praise Is Due.

But, fellow-citizens of Illinois, let me say to you with candor and with much gratification that the smallest part of the credit due for this unsullied record should be awarded to your humble servant. The praise is due to those in charge of the various departments of the present state administration, superiors and subordinates, chiefs and assistants, in the numerous state institutions, all of whom have vied with one another to keep the record clean. To me it is a great personal pleasure, in this public manner, to acknowledge the able and faithful support which the administration has received from these officials and employes, and to thank them for making it possible for me to unfold this record and defy our political opponents to detect in it any scandal, any speculation, any thimble-rigging with figures, or aught that would deceive anyone who investigates the record.

Unhappily for the people of Illinois, there have been instances where the administration of the state's affairs was not kept untarnished, but the knowledge is gratifying to republicans that in not a single case has the escutcheon of a republican administration been blurred with robbery, defalcation or dishonesty of any description.

You will remember, my friends, how the first republican administration the state ever had, dating back 44 years ago, succeeded that of a democratic administration smirched with scandal. But more distinctly you will recall how, less than four years ago, another democratic administration, at the demand of the people, relinquished control of the state government, leaving behind it as an inheritance to the present administration, a record grimed over with debt, defalcations and insidious roguery and rascality on every page. I took occasion during the campaign of two years ago to expose some of the crookedness and the rottenness of this last democratic administration. I then stated that "it was the most corrupt administration that this state has ever had since it was admitted to the union." I stand by that statement now, and repeat it. Here are the figures as I gave them two years ago, and they have not gorwn less.

The aggregate amount of money plundered and stolen from the state of Illinois by Gov. Altgeld's employes during his administration in the following seven institutions of the state, foots up $982,078.34, divided as follows:

University of Illinois	$549,662 29
West park board	318,000 00
Chester penitentiary	30,000 00
Industrial home for the blind	5,000 00
Geneva home for girls	8,594 30
Grain inspection department	10,785 00
	$922,041 59
By thievery and ignorance at Peoria	60,036 75
	$982,078 34

I then pointed out in detail some of the most glaring debaucheries of that administration, showing how the state treasury had been plundered, and how theft and rascality had been practiced in nearly every one of the state institutions, and I want to ask you now, fellow citizens, whether any one of you ever has heard any one of these specific charges I then made denied or refuted? They have not been, and they cannot be, because truth is irrefutable. I spoke from the record, and to-day, inside the walls of the penitentiary and on the dockets of the criminal courts of the state, you will find confirmation of the accusations I then made.

Funds Not Properly Accounted For.

Perhaps I ought to qualify the statement that there has been no scandal connected with appointees of the present administration, for it is true that funds belonging to the hospital for the incurable insane at Peoria, amounting to about $3,000, have not been properly accounted for by former trustees of that institution whom I appointed to the positions they seem to have dishonored. The money may be recovered, but the men, if guilty, will be punished in any event, and the task of meting out to them such punishment as they deserve has not been left to my successor. It was my fixed determination, upon assuming the responsibilities of the office with which you honored me, to hold every official subject to my immediate supervision and control, to a strict accountability for all of his official acts, and, in each instance where there has been intimation or suspicion of wrong doing, I have caused swift and searching investigation to be made and have promptly removed from office any suspected official who failed to immediately free himself of guilt or suspicion of guilt.

When the irregularities were discovered at Peoria I sent for the trustees, advised them of the discoveries and confronted them with the evidence. The explanation of the two guilty trustees was not satisfactory and I promptly removed them from office and turned their case, with the evidence, over to the state's attorney and grand jury of Peoria county for investigation. On the hearing one of the trustees was indicted and is now awaiting trial. The other trustee, although having confessed his guilt, escaped indictment on a mere technicality, viz., because the money he wrongfully received and appropriated to his own use was not handed to him in Peoria county.

This, my friends, is the sum of all the wrongdoing that anyone can lay at the door of this administration or charge up against any of the officials under it, and it dwindles into almost nothingness when compared with the wholesale rascality of the Altgeld administration. Indeed, there was so much of crime perpetrated by the officials of that adminisration that the subject is too unsavory to be inflicted on this audience in extenso, and I will confine myself merely to some of the most glaring frauds and thefts, and allusion to those officials of the Altgeld regime whose wholesale thievery has finally landed them either in the penitentiary or in jail, or has placed them on the rogues' list with indictments pending against them.

Charles W. Spaulding.

First of all, I may mention Charles W. Spaulding, president of the defunct Globe savings bank of Chicago, who now wears a convict's garb and is incarcerated in the penitentiary at Joliet. I am forced to sympathize to some degree with Spaulding, for it seems that he was led into temptation and had not strength of character sufficient to withstand it. He was president of the Glove savings bank, a tottering financial institution with which Gov. John P. Altgeld was associated as a stockholder and vice president. The records of the board of trustees of the University of Illinois show that Spaulding was made treasurer of that institution and custodian of its large endowment fund by the board when it was composed of nine democrats and three republicans, and that the worthless bond he gave was accepted "on the advice and direction of Gov. Altgeld." Three days after this bond was accepted Spaulding drew $178,850 from the state treasury on warrants approved by Gov. Altgeld in violation of the provisions of the law governing the case, and subsequently drew other large amounts, all of which were used in a vain effort to bolster up the insolvent Globe savings bank. After the present administration assumed control of the state's affairs, demand was made on Spaulding for the money belonging to the university, $549,662.29. He failed to pay it. Part of this money was afterwards recovered by suit, but the remainder has gone, no one knows where, unless it be Spaulding, and, perhaps, his former business associate. Spaulding is paying the penalty for the commission of the crime in the Joliet penitentiary. Whether he alone was morally responsible for it, or only shared in committing it, is a hidden mystery.

Another of Altgeld's great defrauders was his treasurer of the west park board of Chicago, E. S. Dreyer, who failed to turn over to his successor $318,000 park funds. Judgment for that amount and accrued interest has been obtained against the National bank of Illinois, the defaulting treasurer has been tried and convicted of the theft, and is now in jail awaiting transmission to the penitentiary.

Of the funds belonging to the Chester penitentiary, $30,000 was stolen during the Altgeld administration. Judgments have been secured against both wardens implicated, one of which judgments has been collected.

In the grain inspector's office at Chicago another large theft was committed. As compared with a grand total of about $1,000,000 known to have been stolen from the state by this band of plunderers, the Chief Grain Inspector, Dwight Andrews' steal of upwards of $10,000 appears diminutive; but the saltiest bit of rascality practiced by any act of officials during that reign of plunder was that of this same Andrews and those who coached him in it and shared with him in a division of the spoils. On this Altgeld grain inspectors' pay-roll was a whole phalanx of political heelers and ward "bummers," who performed no service whatever, and who were not known and never were seen about the department except on pay-day, when the only requirement made of them was to keep "mum" and draw their pay. By such proceedings as were available and could be instituted, since the present administration assumed control of the grain inspection department, Andrews was made to disgorge several thousand dollars of the stolen state funds. He was indicted and tried, but the chief clerk of the office, who was likewise implicated but had agreed to turn state's evidence, was kidnaped by those whom his testimony would have convicted and landed in prison, and was spirited away so that his testimony could not be used at the trial, and the jury failed to agree on a verdict, thus, for the time being, leaving Andrews unconvicted.

State Tax Levies.

Now I want to say a word about state tax levies and the rate which from time to time has been used under different administrations, and the methods adopted in determining the rate to meet these levies. In reality, to determine each year what the tax rate shall be, is simply a mathematical proposition, and all Illinois governors have so considered it and acted accordingly, until by a freak of Illinois politics, John P. Altgeld became governor. Until then it had been left to the bookkeepers, the accountants, to figure out what rate was necessary to raise the required amount of taxes.

For 16 years prior to Altgeld's incumbency the average tax rate had been 37 cents, but no two years the same. With the fortuitous circumstances that favored him, Fifer got the rate down to 31 cents, and there Altgeld declared it should remain for two years, and the other state officials were compelled to abide by his edict. What was the result? As every republican administration before him had done, and as common sense suggests should be done, Fifer left a "working balance" in the treasury, which, with the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1, after Altgeld had been installed, amounted to $1,068,905.24. It was altgeldian sophistry that this "working balance" should be wiped out. The wiping-out process began promptly, was kept up assiduously, and successfully accomplished. Instead of that $1,068,905.24 which the Altgeld administration inherited from the Fifer administration being handed down to the present administration, it was my unhappy lot to receive as a legacy from Altgeld a deficit of $2,059,225.29, while the state had been subjected to a net loss of $3,128,130.53.

Meantime Mr. Altgeld continued to insist on a flat 31-cent tax rate. He worked it two years; used up all of the Fifer surplus; made his tax levies just half what they should have been to meet the appropriations made by the legislature; borrowed money right and left with which to run the state institutions; paid exorbitant rates of interest and piled up a debt which subsequently had to be provided for by the present administration or be repudiated. I take it, fellow citizens, that none of you would have been content to say that Illinois should repudiate her debts, although they may have been made unnecessarily and because of methods that stand to-day as the foulest blot upon the history of the state.

And what did it avail either to Altgeld or the democratic party? Notwithstanding all of the trickery and financial juggling that was resorted to; the "kiting" of requisitions on the state treasury and using up the surplus which was in the treasury when the Altgeld administration began its career of despoliation and defalcation, during the final two years of this infamous administration, the tax levy, for revenue purposes, was double-increased from $3,000,000 to $6,000,000, and the tax rate raised from 31 cents to 52 cents in 1895 and 55 cents in 1896. I want to say to you, my friends, and the record will sustain us, that if the Altgeld administration had left intact the necessary "working balance" in the treasury which the Fifer administration had bequeathed to it, and had met its own appropriations instead of handing down a mountain of deficit, debt and defalcation to the present administration to contend with and liquidate, its tax levies and its tax rates would have greatly exceeded any in the history of the state.

Rate Was Only 37 Cents.

It may be a revelation to you, that for 16 years prior to and up to the beginning of the Altgeld administration, the average tax rate was only 37 cents, while with all of its boasted economy the Altgeld administration employed a tax rate that for the four years averaged greater than that of 1900. Again I ask you to turn to the record and you will find the average Altgeld tax rate to be 42¼ cents, while last year it was only 42 cents. Perhaps I have dwelt longer than I should on this subject. You are well advised why a high rate had to be resorted to during the first and second years of my administration. The Altgeld deficits, debts and defalcations had to be provided for. It was no fault of my administration that they were created or existed, but to keep the good name of Illinois unsullied they had to be paid, blotted out, and the state's record given a new, clean page. Besides this, the mobilization of troops during the war with Spain equalizing the pay of the Illinois soldiers from date of enlistment until muster into the United States service, and the heavy expenses incurred during the unfortunate labor disturbances of '98 and '99, made it necessary for large sums of money to be raised in excess of the requirements of the preceding administration.

I will now leave this subject of tax rates with this further explanation, which the most of you doubtless well understand, that the size of the tax rate is proportioned to the aggregate amount of taxable property in the state as returned by the assessors and the appropriations made by the legislature. If the assessment is large, the rate is relatively small. To illustrate: If ten dollars of taxes is to be raised and the assessment is $10,000, the rate you will readily perceive, should be a ten cent rate, or ten cents on each one hundred of the assessment. For many years past, as you are aware, the tendencies have been toward lower assessments, and hence the tax rate has proportionately grown, but it does not follow at all that taxation is greater merely because the rate is higher. You all know that Illinois has much more taxable property than it had 27 years ago, but it is a fact that in 1873 the assessment amounted to $1,355,401,317, while last year, even under our new revenue law, which showed an increase in the assessment of nearly $200,000,000 over that of 1898, the assessment was only $953,099,468, or $402,301,849 less than it was in 1873.

The assessment in 1873 was the largest ever made by the assessors of the state, it amounting to $1,355,401,317. It is not reasonable to suppose that there was more taxable property in Illinois that year than there was last year, but it was assessed at nearer its actual value. Now, if you will do a little figuring, you will find that a tax rate of less than 29 cents on the hundred dollars, applied to the big assessment of 1873, would produce the $3,500,000 tax levy as made that year by the legislature. But suppose that the assessment for 1873 had been only $953,099,468, as was the case in 1899, and the same rate had been applied, it would have produced only $1,763,958 taxes, instead of $3,500,000. Thus you see, my friends, that this democratic bugaboo of a tax rate cuts but little figure in determining the extent of the taxes you are required to pay. As I have already pointed out, the tax rate is relatively higher or lower in proportion to the assessment. In 1873 there was a high assessment and consequently a low tax rate. In later years the assessments have been low, and to produce the same amount of taxes higher rates have been unavoidable.

A Convenient Arrangement.

During the Altgeld administration there was one official—the treasurer of one of the state institutions at Jacksonville—who also happened to be a private banker. It was a convenient arrangement by which the funds of that state institution and the two others located at Jacksonville, were deposited in the bank of which this official was the senior member. His bank got the benefit of those deposits, but that did not satisfy the cravings of the Jacksonville banker. Presently it was determined that the balances in his bank, standing to the credit of the state institutions at Jacksonville, were running too low and should be increased. But the full amount of the appropriations allotted by the legislature to those institutions could not be drawn from the state treasury, as the treasury was out of funds and more money from the same source could not be obtained. In this dilemma all three of the state institutions were prevailed on to make loans of this bank, or, more craftily still, were induced to overdraw their accounts and give as security requisitions on the auditor and approved by Altgeld. Between September 26, 1895, and March 25, 1896, the asylum for the blind borrowed $43,468.96 of Dunlap, Russell & Co., bankers of Jacksonville, paying $1,037.43 interest at the rate of six per cent. The bank, with great consideration, doubtless, for the trustees of the institution, did not demand payment of the interest on this loan until after the election had been held in November, and then, when the bill for $1,037.43 was presented, it read: "For interest on overdrafts." No intimation of such loan having been made appear on the account books or reports of the trustees, and a table of the daily balances, drawn from the reports of the treasurer of the institution shows that the interest of six per cent. on the bank's money actually used, should have been only $223.82, instead of $1,037.43, as demanded and paid to Dunlap, Russell & Co.

At the deaf and dumb institution the same sort of chicanery was practiced, and the institution's bank account at Dunlap, Russell & Co.'s bank, from September 11, 1895, to March 5, 1896, was swelled to the extent of $86,216.19, and an interest account was permitted to run until after the November elections, when it reached the handsome proportions of $2,202.19, that amount being added to the bank's assets.

Same Process Worked.

This was an experience which seems to have whetted Mr. Dunlap's appetite for acquiring wealth at the expense of the tax-payers of Illinois for the same process was worked at the hospital for the insane, where an item of interest, amounting to $1,380.19, was created through the borrowing of $101,819.39 from Andrew Russell, Dunlap's partner, between September 30, 1895, and March 31, 1896. Of this institution H. F. Dunlap was treasurer, which may account for the fact that Mr. Russell, in his individual capacity, was as courteous to the trustees or treasurer of the insane hospital as the Dunlap, Russell & Co.'s bank had been to the other institutions, and did not present his bill for intyrest until after the election in the fall.

It was an experience, too, which seems to have inspired Mr. Dunlap with an ambition to become state treasurer. He secured from his party the nomination two years ago, but the voters of the state seem not to have been in sympathy with his aspirations, and rolled up a majority against him of 48,000. Nothing daunted, Banker Dunlap still had longings to manipulate Illinois' cash pile. Again he has been made his party's candidate, and no doubt will have the hearty support of Dunlap, Russell & Co., Jacksonville bankers. But I have a very faulty conception of the sentiments of the voters of Illinois this year if they intrust the holding of the funds of the state to one who has shown himself to be so dexterous in handling public moneys for his own gain, as this Jacksonville banker was while he was treasurer of the hospital for the insane under the Altgeld administration.

As there are no possible means of obtaining accurate figures showing the receipts and disbursements at the various institutions while in charge of Altgeld's officials, it would be impossible to make a comparison of the per capita cost of sustaining the inmates of those institutions while under democratic control with their present cost, and I will not tax your patience by attempting it. I am disposed to believe that with efficient management and honest application of the appropriations, and yet with generous and just treatment of the inmates of those institutions, the Altgeld officials could have sustained them at a less per capita cost than they now can be sustained, for the reason that nearly all commodities necessary for their sustenance are higher in price now than they were during the Altgeld administration. You know, my friends, why prices are higher, and you are as pleased as I am that it is so. You are glad of the present prosperity and know that good times always stimulate prices. But while you are enjoying these good times I know you do not want the unfortunate wards of the state inhumanly treated. You do not want their rations cut down because prices have increased.

To Make a Good Showing.

Such were the methods employed by these democratic officials in order to make a showing of a pretended low per capita cost in sustaining the inmates of the state institutions. Let their party have all the benefit it can get from such practices. They never will be resorted to under the present administration, if I can prevent it. What you should most care for, fellow-Illinoisans, is that there shall be honest and just application of the funds appropriated for the maintenance of the state institutions, and, with that done, it will be unnecessary for any manipulation of figures to be indulged in to show that per capita costs have gone up or down. Once more these institutions are in a healthy, flourishing condition, a condition extremely gratifying when comparison is made with the condition in which they were left by the late, and it is to be hoped, the last democratic administration the state will ever have inflicted upon it.

When the democrats took charge in 1893, these institutions had on hand a total cash balance in ordinary expense funds, of $135,745.21, and an outstanding indebtedness of $58,575.19, showing a surplus of $77,170.02.

When they returned them to their republican successor in 1897, the same institutions had a cash balance of $56,341, and an outstanding indebtedness of $231,370.30, showing all of them with a deficit amounting in the aggregate to $175,029.15.

During the present administration the total debt of $231,370.30 has been reduced to $56,224.35, and all of the institutions now have a surplus in their ordinary expense funds over liabilities amounting in the aggregate to $161,412.03.

The legislature at its last session made somewhat extensive appropriations, but in the main they were needful, and, as I believe, wise ones. In a few instances I deemed them excessive, or rather, inexpedient, under existing circumstances, and exercised the discretion imposed by the constitution in the chief executive by vetoing some of them, or parts of them, aggregating something over a quarter of a million dollars. But, as I have already stated, I considered most of them to be necessary and reasonable. It will be a part of the democratic plan of campaign to attack these appropriations and wail dolefully over the wasteful extravagance of a republican legislature. This is to be expected, for nothing seems to be so comforting to our democratic friends as misery. They are happiest when wringing their hands and lamenting over something that somebody else has done which they had not opportunity of doing. But they will fail to make any impression on the sensible people of Illinois when they attempt to show that the apporpriations of the forty-first general assembly were unwarrantably large or needlessly extravagant.

Money for Monuments.

Something like $200,000 was apporpriated for monuments. It is true that monuments can be dispensed with, but, my friends, the monuments which a nation or a state build are badges of enlightenment. They reflect the purest and best sentiments with which mankind is imbued. The last legislature appropriated $65,000 for erecting monuments on Shiloh's battlefield, in memory of the Illinois soldiers who gave up their lives there, and $5,000 for defraying the expenses of dedicating similar monuments on the battlefield of Chickamauga, where the Illinois troops won imperishable fame. Will our democratic friends dare to say that these appropriations were unjustifiable and wasteful? Dare they tell you that the $100,0000 for rebuilding the decayed monument which had been erected over the tomb of Abraham Lincoln was an extravagance? Will you permit them to tell you that the legislature was prodigal with the taxes you had contributed when it voted $9,000 for a monument to the memory of that peerless woman, a produce of Illinois, Frances E. Willard? And you, republicans, have you any complaint to make of the legislature because it voted $2,000 toward building a monument at Alton in commemoration of Elijah P. Lovejoy?

Now, fellow-citizens, one word in relation to our state ticket, and I am done. The republican party has been fortunate in the selection of a state ticket this year. Your candidate for governor, while a young man, is by no means inexperienced in business and public affairs. In the city of Jacksonville and county of Morgan, where he is best known, he is the most popular. He is a gentleman of ability and splendid character, a son of the second republican governor of Illinois, known in his day—from 1861 to 1865—as the great war governor of the country. No republican in Illinois can give an intelligent reason for voting against Judge Yates.

Gov. Northcott, Secretary Rose and Auditor McCullough have served the people faithfully and well, and merit a re-election.

Mr. Williamson, your candidate for treasurer, has served the people of his county for many years, in a public capacity, and enjoys the confidence and respect of that people to a high degree.

Mr. Hamlin, your candidate for attorney general, a man in the very prime of life, is one of the best lawyers in our state, and, you will find before the campaign closes, one of the best compaign speakers.

Taken in its entirety, it is a splendid ticket, and ought, and I believe will, carry Illinois by 100,000 majority.

Now, one word about Mr. Lorimer, your candidate for congress. It is urged that because when a child, a small boy, he sold newspapers on the streets of Chicago, and afterwards drove a street car and performed other "undignified labor" to support his aged, widowed mother and his brothers and sisters, that he is unfit to represent the Second district in congress. I will admit that from the standpoint of his critics Mr. Lorimer's education was seriously neglected. He never had time to learn to loaf or swear or drink or gamble, and is not contaminated with such influences. Mr. Lorimer is able and clean in mind and habit and speech. I have known him intimately and well for many years, and know him to be an honest man who dares to tell the truth. His word is as good as any man's bond, hard sometimes to obtain, but when given is never broken. Such is his well known record. Mr. Lorimer is quite domestic in his habits. When his day's work is done he is never found on the street corners or in saloons loafing. He is always found at his home, where he spends his evenings with his good wife and children. Mr. Lorimer has served your district three terms in congress, and in that short time he has taken his place high among the leaders there. The interests of every business man and every laboring man living in the Second congressional district demand Mr. Lorimer's return to congress in November, and I hope and believe that the business men and laboring men of his district will see to it that he is elected.

Fellow-citizens, I feel that the common sense and sagacity so often displayed by American voters under like circumstances is a guaranty against democratic success in 1900. Let us close up our ranks and keep our faces to the front, and we shall soon be out of sight and hearing of the little noisy men who would, if they could, obstruct our march and delay our progress.

Lord Salisbury has issued a manifesto calling for a parliamentary majority to teach the Boers that resistance is useless.