

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 3. No. 1.

Lincoln, Nebraska, Jan. 23, 1903.

Whole No. 105.

FRAUD OF ULTRA-PROTECTIONISTS.

The revolt among the rank and file of the republican party against ultra-protection found expression in the speech delivered in the senate by Mr. Dolliver of Iowa on January 13.

The spirited retort made by Mr. Aldrich, who is recognized more as the representative of the tariff barons than as a senator from Rhode Island, indicates that, however weary the republicans may have become of bearing the burden of special interests, the men whom Mr. Aldrich represents do not intend to yield any of the privileges that they now enjoy.

Mr. Dolliver indorsed the statement that had been previously made and fairly established by democratic senators to the effect that the tariff schedules in the Dingley law were purposely placed high so as to provide a margin in order that they might be reduced as a basis for reciprocity treaties. Mr. Dolliver said that he stood for the policies of James G. Blaine and for the policies advocated by William McKinley in his last speech. He said: "I do not intend to sit quiet in this chamber while it is said to be infamy that anybody should have the notion that tariff schedules once framed could not be honorably modified by sensible trade negotiations with the world." And he added: "I for one have made up my mind that the time has come when somebody whose convictions do not lie along the path of silence and quietude and ease in our political science should declare here that the whole future of the protective system in the United States depends upon the wisdom with which the congress of the United States fulfills the aspirations which found an expression so lofty in the last public utterance of William McKinley."

Some idea of the disposition of the ultra-protectionists may be obtained by those who are yet strangely ignorant as to that disposition from a statement made by Mr. Aldrich in reply to Mr. Carmack. Mr. Aldrich said: "I imagine that the senator from Tennessee and myself would never agree as to whether the protective duties in any bill were placed too high." In other words, perhaps, if the tariff rates were even higher than they are in the present exorbitant tariff schedules, Mr. Aldrich would not be willing to agree with Mr. Carmack that the rates were excessive.

Newspapers generally are complimenting Mr. Dolliver upon his speech and are referring to the "fine courage" displayed by the senator from Iowa. Does it not seem strange that when a senator from the big state of Iowa rises in his place to cross words with the senator from the little state of Rhode Island, giving expression to views which he believes are entertained by the people of Iowa, this should necessarily be referred to as a display of "fine courage?"

Senator Dolliver is an orator and a man of more than ordinary ability. If he possesses any traits of cowardice his intimate friends have so far failed to discover it; and yet there is justification for the statement that Mr. Dolliver displayed "fine courage." The justification is found in the fact that the thing he pleaded for was justice for the people at the hands of the powerful

interests that control our federal government, and that are represented in the senate by Mr. Aldrich and his associates.

It was not a display of fine courage for Dolliver to cross swords with Aldrich the man, because Dolliver in debate is Aldrich's superior. But the interests which Aldrich represents dominate the party to which Dolliver belongs, control the senate of which Dolliver is a member, and have a firm grasp upon all the machinery of the federal government. These interests, so we have been told and if we mistake not Mr. Dolliver has on several occasions been our informant, are the "business interests" of the country; they represent the "intelligence and patriotism" of the land; their wisdom should control the judgment of the people and their choice for public officials should be the people's choice. Even though Dolliver merely pleaded for the fulfillment of an explicit pledge made by the republican party, although he did not ask the representatives of his party to go so far as a real tariff reformer would desire, he knew that he was placing himself in the attitude of defying the decree of men who having provided the republican party with its campaign funds expect at the hands of that party and its leaders prompt and complete submission in return for those favors.

Mr. Dolliver's speech is simply an index to the growing sentiment among the rank and file of republicans in opposition to ultra-protection. Mr. Dolliver's argument shows that the high protectionists practice fraud upon republicans as well as upon the people generally; they secure a higher tariff than they even claim to need by promising a reduction through reciprocity treaties; and after securing these exorbitant rates they refuse to lower the duties even for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity. This, too, in face of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt referred to reciprocity as "the handmaiden of protection" and the republican national convention of 1896 said: "Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of republican policy and go hand in hand."

The Commoner Cartoon.

The Commoner cartoon for this week provides a hint of the "power for evil in private monopoly in public necessities." The experience which the coal consumers of this country are today undergoing with respect to the impositions of the coal trust is simply the experience they must undergo with respect to the impositions of all trusts whose managers seek to control the people's necessities.

The Kansas City platform gave to the people a timely warning on this subject. In that platform it was said: "Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of all material, and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof, and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and unless their insatiate greed is checked all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the republic destroyed."

In that platform the republican party was arraigned for its "dishonest paltering with the trust evil." Those who did not then believe that that arraignment was deserved have no reason, in this day, to be ignorant of the fact that, as it was stated in the Kansas City platform, "trusts are a legitimate product of republican policies; they are fostered by republican laws and they are protected by the republican administration in return for campaign subscriptions and political support."

OKLAHOMA AND STATEHOOD.

My recent visit to Oklahoma convinced me, first, that the interests of Oklahoma imperatively demand immediate statehood, and, second, that the people of the territory fear that admittance to statehood may be prevented by the differences of opinion which exist as to the propriety of incorporating the Indian territory. The situation may be summed up as follows: The arguments in favor of single statehood for the two territories are, first, that either territory alone would be small in area, compared with other western states, and small in population, compared with most of the states of the union; second, that the two territories supplement each other in products and resources; third, that there is no natural boundary line between the two territories, while the two together are compact and shapely. Arguments in favor of separate statehood are, first, that Oklahoma, having organized counties, a large area of well improved land, and an admirable school system in operation, is better prepared for statehood than the Indian territory. Second, that the school fund of Oklahoma would have to be divided with the Indian territory, and, third, that the expense of enforcing the criminal law in the Indian territory would be a burden to the people of Oklahoma.

Besides these arguments there are arguments of a political nature and others of a local character. For instance, some republicans favor single statehood because they prefer to have two democratic senators from one large state rather than four democratic senators from two small states—admitting that both territories are democratic; while other republicans favor double statehood with the hope of saving Oklahoma to the republicans. Some democrats, too, favor double statehood with the belief that it would give the party four senators, while others think that it is necessary to include the Indian territory in order to make Oklahoma surely democratic. The location of the capital also affects opinions to some extent, some towns hoping for the capital under single statehood while others expect it under double statehood.

So numerous are the conflicting interests and opinions that it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the wish of the majority of the people. In the late election the republican candidate for congressional delegate ran on a platform declaring for the immediate admission of Oklahoma, leaving for future decision the question of adding the Indian territory, while the democratic candidate was committed to single statehood for both territories, but the result was not decisive because many on both sides placed their political preferences above their opinions on statehood and, besides, there is a contest over the seat. The republican received the certificate, but the democrat demands the counting of several thousand ballots which were thrown out because marked twice.

In view of the impossibility of deciding certainly as to the desire of the majority and in view of the further fact that each side claims a majority in support of its position it would