

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 2. No. 4.

Lincoln, Nebraska, February 14, 1902.

\$1.00 a Year.

An Invitation to Kruger.

Congressman Cochran of Missouri has introduced into the house the following resolution:

Resolved, by the senate and the house, that the Honorable Paul Kruger, president of the South African republic, is hereby invited to visit the United States as the guest of the country, at such a time as may suit his convenience. For the defrayment of the expenses incurred in his entertainment while in this country the sum of \$25,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby appropriated out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Will congress adopt the resolution and extend the invitation? It is to be hoped that Congressman Cochran and his democratic associates will compel action upon the resolution. The republicans are willing to spend money to entertain the brother of an emperor; they are willing to spend money to send special envoys to attend the crowning of a king—will they refuse an invitation to the president of a republic?

The committee may try to ignore Mr. Cochran's resolution, but the democrats can join in a petition to the committee on rules to set a time for its report and consideration. If the republicans refuse to join in the petition they will go on record; if the committee on rules refuses to consider the petition, a majority of the house can compel its consideration. If the resolution is passed and Kruger comes Europe will find out where the sympathies of the American people are; if, on the other hand, the resolution is rejected by the republicans, the American people will inquire why the republican party is so quick to show courtesy to a king, but so indifferent to a conspicuous representative of self-government.

An Affirmative Policy.

The democrats of the senate are doing excellent service to the party when they present a positive and affirmative policy for dealing with the Philippine situation. They propose to strike out all of the Philippine revenue bill after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

(1) That the United States relinquish all claim to sovereignty over the Philippines, "subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth."

(2) That from and after the passage of this act the Philippine islands shall be foreign territory, and all goods entering the United States therefrom shall be subject to the same duties, customs, and imposts as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for goods entered from other foreign countries; provided, that during the temporary occupation of the islands all trade between them and the United States shall be free.

(3) That the United States shall continue to occupy the archipelago until the Filipinos have formed for themselves a stable government, and until sufficient guarantees have been obtained for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain, and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States.

(4) That as soon as these results have been accomplished, it is declared to be the purpose of the United States to withdraw from the Philippines, and leave the government, control, and sovereignty thereof to the inhabitants, retaining only such military, naval, and coaling stations as may be designated by the government of the United States."

It is safe to say that a large proportion, if not more than half, of the republican voters would, if their real convictions could be ascertained, com-

mend this settlement of the Philippine question. It is an honest, just and peaceful settlement. It gives us all that we need and yet gives the Filipinos all that they desire. It puts our relations with the Filipinos upon a basis of fairness. It saves us from a policy which is rapidly undermining our ideas of free government and free speech.

The Schurman incident illustrates what may be expected under militarism. The republicans in the senate will find it difficult to justify their policy of taxation without representation and government without the consent of the governed when so easy, so natural and so American a way as that presented by the democrats is within reach.

Fusion in 1892.

Some weeks ago The Commoner published an editorial in which reference was made to the fact that in the campaign of 1892 the democratic national committee advised the democrats of Nebraska to vote for the populist electors. My attention has been called to the fact that the statement has been challenged in some quarters and proof demanded. For the benefit of those who are skeptical, the following extract is published from a letter sent out by James E. Boyd, then governor of the state of Nebraska, since then one of the prominent members of the gold contingent of the democratic party:

Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 17.—(Personal and confidential.)—Dear Sir: I have just returned from the east where I was honored by a consultation with the national committee and leading men of our party, with regard to the best policy to be pursued in Nebraska this fall in dealing with the electoral ticket; and they agreed with me that the wisest course would be for democrats to support the Weaver electors; the object being to take Nebraska out of her accustomed place in the republican column.

Information has reached me that a number of independents who were formerly republicans contemplate voting for the Harrison electors. With the republican strength thus augmented it would be impossible for the democrats to carry their own electors' ticket to victory. It is therefore the part of good judgment and wise action for democrats to support the Weaver electors in as large numbers as possible. For democrats to do this is no abandonment of principle; on the contrary, it is a definite step toward victory, and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson, and the principles they represent.

It may be added that in the spring of 1893 the committee of United States senators intrusted with the oversight of the senatorial contests in the various states approved of the combination which resulted in the election of Senator W. V. Allen, a Nebraska populist.

It was not until the populists came to the rescue of the democratic party in 1896 that they became so odious to the gold democrats, and the reason for this antipathy is found in the fact that the populists supported the democratic ticket when the gold democrats went over to the republican party.

Danish Treaty Needs Amendment.

The treaty for the purchase of the Danish islands should be so amended as to provide that the inhabitants shall, if they wish, become citizens of the United States, and not merely subjects. This amendment should assure them of the full protection of the constitution of the United States and

of incorporation into some state in which they can enjoy the advantages of self-government and participation in the nation's destiny.

Another amendment should provide that the treaty shall take effect when a majority of the inhabitants of the islands give their consent to the change of sovereignty. The sale of the islands to the United States was about to be consummated in 1867, but at that time Denmark insisted that the formal consent of the people should be obtained, and the reputation of our nation was so good as a republic that only twenty-three votes out of twelve hundred were cast against the sale. We have acquired such a bad reputation as an empire during the last three years that the inhabitants of the island are now petitioning against the sale, but there is no doubt that their prejudice would be removed if they were assured that they were to be treated as American citizens.

The purchase of the islands is wise and the price satisfactory, provided always that we can purchase them without violating American principles and without making unwilling citizens of the inhabitants. The democrats in the senate can well afford to take their stand upon democratic ground and, as far as their votes will go, administer a rebuke to the republicans who are falling into the monarchical habit of buying people without regard to their wishes and then dealing with them without regard to the constitution.

Raising Judicial Salaries.

The bill increasing the salaries of United States supreme court judges has already passed the senate, and, as might have been expected, the journals which are owned and controlled by corporations or corporation magnates are all shouting for "better pay for our judges!" The St. Paul Globe, which is a fair representative of this class of papers, says:

On all theories of public employment, consonant with representative systems, public servants should be paid the highest price available for their services, where those services involve continuous labor. The measure now under discussion at Washington for an increase in the pay of the judges of the supreme court is a just one. No lawyer of high standing and experience in his calling would regard \$10,000 as an entirely satisfactory rate of compensation. Many lawyers not qualified to serve on the highest appellate bench of the country can make five times the amount of the salary allowed to a supreme court judge.

It is well to examine the subject and weigh the arguments submitted. The judges of the supreme court hold office for life; the salary of ten thousand dollars is a net income, nothing having to be deducted for office expenses or library. If a lawyer's gross income is twenty-five thousand dollars, his net income is from fifteen to twenty thousand. What lawyer having a net income of fifteen to twenty thousand dollars would not gladly surrender it for a net income of ten thousand dollars for life? The honor, too, is one which may form a fitting crown to a great lawyer's achievements, and a lawyer who would regard honor as more valuable than any money, compensation would be more apt to be a good judge than a man who took the position merely for the money that there was in it.

A supreme court judge can live comfortably on ten thousand a year and save something besides. United States senators and members of congress