

The Nebraska Independent.

The Wealth Makers and Lincoln Independent Consolidated.

VOL. IX.

LINCOLN, NEBR., THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1898

NO. 35

W. H. DeBarney

CARDINAL PRINCIPLES

Senator Allen's Speech in Defense of the Populist Party.

A GRAND TRIBUTE TO LABOR.

Pleads for An Inocorrupt and Intelligent Ballot as the Hope of the Nation.

Proud of the Great West.

The following is a speech delivered by Senator Allen at the annual banquet of the Massachusetts populists in Boston little more than a year ago. It has been printed in the Congressional Record as a part of the senator's remarks in favor of his resolution for the free coinage of silver. We reproduce it for the reason that it sets forth quite fully the aims and purposes of the Populist party. On that occasion Senator Allen said:

"Fellow-citizens: I think I ought to be permitted to congratulate myself on the fact that in making my first appearance at the commonwealth of Massachusetts in the historic and attractive city of Boston I do so as a populist attending an important meeting of the representative men of the party.

"I was born in the west and forty years of my life have been spent on that side of the Mississippi where the shadows of the setting sun are last to usher in the night and the songs of birds and the music of waters are first to greet the dawn, and it would be useless for me to attempt to disguise from you that I am deeply attached to that part of our common country.

"I have not enjoyed the privilege of making an extended tour of the east, but mingling, to any considerable extent, with its people, although I am associated with the principal events of its history, and as an American to that manner born, I rejoice with you that every great struggle to better the condition of the race the 'Old Bay State' has been in the very front rank and true to her only teachings.

"I must return my thanks for the honor conferred on me by your invitation to be present and address you on this occasion. I have, until now, declined to accept all invitations to deliver addresses beyond the confines of my own state, but yours was couched in language that left no doubt that you desired to hear and see one who has, for many years, endeavored to uphold in the new States the cause of the country against the encroachment of a powerful power and the deadly effect of its centralization.

"I will freely admit that in accepting this invitation I was actuated somewhat by a desire to visit this historic ground and learn more of the people by actual contact than I now know. In the early days of the nation there were those who doubted, as there are some who now doubt, the ability of the people to govern themselves, and who sought the establishment of what they were pleased to call a strong government by placing all real power in the hands of the few and nominal power in the hands of the masses; but, owing, in a large measure, to the wise counsels of Massachusetts, and to other illustrious and patriotic citizens, better judgment prevailed, and the government was finally established on the solid foundation of popular sovereignty. Nearly a century and a quarter have passed since the formation of the union, only to prove the wisdom of their action.

"I think it will be conceded everywhere that our country needs most at the present time a radical purification of the public service. Certainly permanent prosperity will not return to bless us until every department has been purified and until there is an upward tendency in public morals.

"I know of no reason why a person called to the administration of a public office should not discharge its duties with as great if not greater fidelity than those of private life, for in the one case the welfare of many is affected, while in the other the interests of a few only are concerned.

"A rigid public morality that will set a higher example to the present and to the future generations is greatly needed, but, after all, it is perhaps true, as politicians seem to think, that official intelligence and morality will not be of a higher character than the general intelligence and morality of the people who elect their public servants, and doubtless many men are guided in their conduct by a knowledge of this fact. The government is exactly what the people make it. They have it in their power to make it as they will, but they are, to a perfect extent, disorganized, isolated and divided, and working at cross purposes among themselves, while the monopolists and the ruling classes act in unison, employing the best talent and using the greatest ability in the accomplishment of their selfish ends, and filling public offices with men chosen by themselves, who do their bidding even to the injury of their fellow-men.

"It is said that during the reign of Charles I. and II. when great political liberties existed respecting the royal prerogatives and the rights of the people, those who supported the king in his claims were called Tories, and the advo-

cates of popular rights and parliamentary power over the crown and the toleration of dissenters were called Whigs. Liberal and radical have superseded Whig in English politics.

"During the Revolutionary war those who were friendly and supported the cause of freedom were called Whigs. The word was used in contradistinction to Tory and Royalist, and was given in derision to a political party that existed from 1829 to 1856. In my limited search I have been unable to find that the word 'populist' has found a place in the dictionary, but I think it may properly be said to be derived from the Latin 'populus,' signifying, as the parent word signifies, the common people, the multitude, and comprehending within its definition all persons not distinguished by rank, office, education, or profession. The name was given the people's party in derision.

"The cardinal principles of the party are these: The free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, the issuance of all money by the general government as a full legal tender for public and private debts, without the use of banking corporations; an increase of the circulating medium to \$50 per capita; a graduated income tax; postal savings banks; a limitation of the national revenues to the necessary expenses of the government economically and honestly administered; government ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones; a reduction of lands now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs, to government ownership, and all lands owned by nonresident aliens to be reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlers.

"I think the judgment of the enlightened world is thoroughly convinced that there is not gold enough with which to perform adequately the work demanded of money. Thoughtful men recognize the necessity of an increase in the volume, not only in this country, but throughout the civilized world. The total gold put is limited, while the strain on basic money is daily growing, owing to the rapid increase of population and wealth. It may be truthfully said that the gold output for monetary uses is practically exhausted, for after deducting that necessary to the arts and in making full weight of abraded coins, there is not enough to add materially to the stock of money.

"How is metallic money to be increased except by the free and unlimited coinage of silver? The world's volume of silver money, as far as we can ascertain, does not exceed that of gold, each amounting, in round numbers, to about \$4,000,000,000; and until 1873 they had stood for twenty-seven centuries within three points of each other.

"But why, it is frequently asked, should we coin silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1? I answer: Because nature has not and cannot establish a ratio, and it must be done by man. Ratio is not a natural law; and 16 to 1 being the relation that was established by our government in 1837, no reason exists of which I have knowledge why it should at this time be changed. The relation of the coins must therefore, of necessity, be arbitrary, as no two things can, commercially speaking, be said at all times to be of equal value.

"I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver because, by the constitution, it is dedicated as money material, and because to deprive it of free coinage would be an open, flagrant, and inexcusable violation of the fundamental law to the great and permanent injury of the people. I am in favor of free and unlimited coinage because the commercial and industrial interests of the people demand it, and because the prosperity and progress of the country, the true aims of all just and humane governments, will not be compassed until our basic money has been increased. I am in favor of it because it would set all productive agencies at work and enlarge the scope of useful labor, increase wages, and produce contentment and happiness among the people. It would increase individual and national wealth and secure to the producer of the former a rightful portion of that which his hand and craft bring into existence. It would bring to the strikers homes of our country needed prosperity, and chase from their portals the gloom of despair and fill them once more with the sunshine of happiness and joy.

"It is not my purpose to discuss, fully or academically, the many objections made by the gold monometallists to the doctrine of free coinage, although it will be proper for me to notice some of them in a general way. It is said that open mints would flood us with silver from every part of the world, and under the operation of the Gresham law gold would be driven out and we would go to a silver basis. This is an unsound and selfish argument and contrary to the precedents of history. If silver were coined at the mints of the United States at the ratio of 16 to 1 on terms of equality with gold, the bullion value would immediately rise and meet the bullion value of the latter, for it must be known to correct reasons that the value of gold bullion is equivalent to the coin because of free gold coinage.

"If heavy restrictions were placed on the coinage of gold, and a part of it, like silver, were forced to seek employment in the channels of ordinary commerce and could not, under any circumstances, be admitted to the mint, it would be readily seen that the surplus, being the value of the total output, would immediately produce a disparity between the value of the bullion and the coin. But the moment the restriction was removed, the bullion and coin would meet and be equal. This rule holds true as respects silver. Silver bullion as estimated in gold is depreciated in the markets because of restricted coinage, by which a large part of the output is thrown on the market, as a mere commodity, and by that means the bullion value of the dollar is less than the face of the coin. But remove the restriction

and admit it to the mints on terms of exact equality with gold, and immediately gold and silver bullion and the coins would become equal in value in the markets of our own country and those of the world, and the volume of basic money would be increased 100 per cent.

"Certainly no intelligent and disinterested man would imperil his standing as a logician by asserting that with our mints open to the free coinage of silver the European holder would consent to sell for less than its coin value, less, of course, the cost of transportation and insurance, because he could bring it to our mints and have it coined into standard silver dollars of equal purchasing and debt-paying power with gold.

"We are met here with the argument, or, more properly speaking, I should say subterfuge, because it does not rise to the dignity of argument, that free coinage would bring to the United States the surplus silver of Europe and gold would be driven out. This it is said would be due to the operation of the Gresham law, and notwithstanding it has been repeatedly met and shown to be unsound, it is persistently and dogmatically asserted. History is against the statement. We had free and unlimited coinage of silver from the foundation of the government to 1873, and silver bullion and silver coin were of equal value and worth 3 per cent more than gold at the time of demonetization.

"It is said again that up to that time we had coined not to exceed \$8,000,000, but this is only a half truth. We had coined a little more than \$8,000,000 in dollar pieces or disks, but we had altogether \$150,000,000 in silver coin, taking no account of the vast quantity of bullion that had been shipped to Europe to supply the demand there and of which we can obtain no reliable data. This bullion and even much of our coin went to European markets as a result of undervaluation here.

"Another fact of importance in refutation of the dumping argument, if I may be permitted to call it such, should not be forgotten, and that is, that after the passage in 1873 of the Bland-Allison act and during the precise time our mints were coining silver under the provisions of that act and the Sherman act of 1890, our supply of gold instead of diminishing and being expelled, as is now contended would be the case in the event of free silver coinage, actually increased about \$236,000,000. Gold monometallists overlook or ignore this in their eagerness to overthrow silver.

"But I would like to ask any intelligent man this question: From whence will the silver come that is to flood the country and drive away gold under a system of free silver coinage? I assert, without the slightest fear of being successfully contradicted, that outside the western hemisphere there are not in the world 20,000,000 ounces of free silver. The truth is that Europe is now, and for years has been, experiencing great difficulty and depression in consequence of not being able to procure an adequate supply of silver, and when we shall be possessed of reason and patriotism sufficient to induce us to retrace our steps and again resume the limitless coinage of silver, as a result of that fact alone, every civilized nation will be compelled in self defense to open its mints to the white metal.

"But suppose European silver should be thrown on us—dumped on us, as it is said—suppose it should be brought to our mints and coined into dollars of exact equality with our own, what would be the result? Surely it would be American money and the owner would be compelled to exchange it for American labor, or the products of American labor, and this would bring prosperity; this would afford our laboring people a much-needed and greatly desired opportunity to engage in unbroken labor at profit-making wages.

"But the gold monometallist, blindly pursuing his false logic as fatally as a night moth pursues a lighted taper, asserts that the European silver owner would exchange his bullion for American gold, and having reaped a large profit on his investment, would return to his own country to enjoy his gain. But can this be true? Let us for a moment examine the assertion, for it amounts to no more than an assertion. We have no law compelling a person to give another a gold dollar in exchange for a silver dollar. Such an agreement, if made between the holders of these forms of money, would be a matter of private contract, with which the government could not constitutionally interfere, but there is nothing in the law requiring the exchange to be made.

"So it is said that silver could be taken to the treasury and exchanged for gold; but this statement is likewise untrue. There is no law requiring or authorizing the secretary of the treasury to redeem silver coin in gold.

"Then what would the holder of silver coined at the mints from European bullion do with his money after obtaining it? I will tell you what he could do, and all he could do.

"He could return with it to his own country, in which event it would cease to be United States money and again become bullion, or he could purchase and ship American manufactured articles to be sold abroad; he could employ American laborers at high wages, or he could establish productive industries in our country and thereby increase the demand for American labor and advance wages; he could do any and all these things, and, there, no doubt, some laboring man who had been out of employment for many months would dump—if the dumping process is to be indulged in—a sack of flour into his home, or some other necessary articles of which it has been deprived for a long time under the gold standard. And I ask you, in all candor and seriousness, if this would not be a blessing rather than a curse? Would it not be a blessing to the manufacturer, to the farmer, to the laborer, to all who toil and those who depend on work?

"But gold monometallists raise the

cry of 'sound money,' which means of course, the gold standard. They assert that we must have the 'best money,' which means, in their vocabulary, gold, and many who have long ago ceased thinking for themselves, if indeed they ever indulged in the luxury, join in the senseless clamor and stigmatize all desiring the free coinage of silver as repudiators, cranks, and dishonest men. The most dishonest money that can be foisted on an unsuspecting people is the single gold standard. Gold has been appreciated fully 100 per cent above its nominal value by demonetization of silver and a short volume of currency.

"It has produced depressions, panics, enforced idleness, want and equalor. The populist party insists that we shall have honest money consisting of gold, silver, and redeemable paper, issued by the government in sufficient quantity to restore permanent prosperity, develop industry to its greatest capacity, and afford all employment at remunerative wages, that they may discharge their duties to the country and their families in an efficient manner and earn enough by honest toil to lay the foundation of a fortune. A money that will enable them to do this is honest; a money that will not is not only unsound, but rankly dishonest.

"But I have not the time to discuss the principles of populism as fully as I would like under ordinary circumstances to do. I cannot ask you for the time, and I must content myself with general statements: I think that it will be entirely proper to direct attention to some things the ignorant have supposed and the vicious have asserted to be populist doctrines, and that have no relation to the party. Populists are not socialists, the party is not paternalistic. It believes that scientific socialism is a Utopian dream incapable of realization, and it has no sympathy with that kind of socialism that borders on anarchy, and it has supreme contempt for anarchists, foreign or native-born.

"This element of society must be restrained by the strong arm of the law if the republic is to stand. The populist is a party of enlightened and just individualism. It believes in the equality of all before the law and demands the enactment and enforcement of just laws in an honest manner for the advancement of society. Of course all government is, in a comprehensive sense, socialistic, for no government could otherwise exist, but ours must not be socialistic in the ordinary acceptance of the term.

"Nor does the populist party believe in a limitless volume of irredeemable paper money. It believes in the free coinage of gold and silver the money of the constitution, supplemented by sufficient paper money, issued by the government without the intervention of corporations, just as now exists, or as would exist if silver were coined on terms of equality with gold, and in a limited volume of full legal tender paper money, anticipatory of and redeemable in the revenues. To these ends and for these purposes its members of congress have incessantly labored. They have labored to better the condition of all, and they have at no time advocated defenseless measures, or those that could properly be characterized as utopian or impracticable.

"The constitution confers on the congress the exclusive power to coin money. It is a sovereign power and one in its nature calculated to advance or retard the interests of all, according to the manner of its exercise. Throughout our history no administration had the temerity to permit private corporations to issue and circulate their notes as money until after the beginning of the civil war. It was permitted then only as a war measure, and with the distinct understanding that at the restoration of peace they would disappear, but, the promise not being kept, the volume of national bank currency has been permitted to increase.

"The populist party is arrayed in solid phalanx against national bank notes and the usurpation of the power vested in congress by the constitution to issue money. It is in every conceivable respect objectionable. It is an abandonment of congressional duty to the people, the notes issued cannot be made legal tender, and the system turns over to the corporations the monetary affairs of the nation, thus placing in their hands the people's well or woe.

"National banks can, under the law, issue or retire their notes at will; they can contract or expand the currency at pleasure, and always promotive of their own interest and to the detriment of the people. The power of contraction and expansion is of vital importance. A sudden expansion may inflate prices beyond the point of permanent prosperity, while a radical and sharp contraction should be equally certain to bring in its train loss of property, depression in prices, if not panics and general bankruptcy. The power to issue money is of necessity, therefore, one that should be exercised by the government in the interest of all, just as the sovereign power to impose taxes should be exercised by the government in the interest of the people. As well might congress learn out to private corporations the right to make judicial decisions in cases now committed by our form of government to the judiciary, or the right to levy and impose taxes, or the discharge of any other constitutional duty that is by its nature and the language and policy of the constitution committed to the government.

"Seeing evil accumulating and wrong and oppression resulting as consequences, and the republican and democratic parties were committed to their continuance, and were taking no steps to remove them, the populist party, made necessary by the exigencies of the times, came into existence, calling loudly for a return to constitutional government in the interest of all.

"Populists urge that money shall be increased sufficiently to bring permanent individual and national prosperity; not that there shall be a sudden expansion or a limitless volume of paper money

put in circulation; nor that anything radical shall be done, but that the government, profiting by experience, shall cause a steady and healthy expansion of the money volume to a point where the greatest prosperity can be produced. We have in our own country, as an example, the time immediately following the close of the war, when the circulating medium was over \$52 per capita. Never in the history of our country had there been more material prosperity and general happiness than then, notwithstanding we had just emerged from a bloody and devastating war. It is the hope of populists that the volume of money will be increased, and that it will keep even pace with the increase of wealth and population, and that every dollar will at all times be of equal purchasing and debt-paying power and perform its proper office in the commerce and industry of the world.

"I have not the time to discuss these questions extendedly or minutely, nor you the patience to listen, but I may be permitted in passing to note a misstatement frequently made that the populist party favors a limitless volume of irredeemable paper money. The assertion is unfounded and made through ignorance or mendacity. There is nothing in the platform or traditions or teachings of the party that can lead honest men to that conclusion. On the contrary, we repel the thought of a limitless paper money. We favor a paper currency issued directly by the government, increasing the circulating medium by safe and healthful means to a point productive of the highest individual and national prosperity.

"The populist party favors the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people; this is a cardinal article of its faith. Certainly no man conversant with the methods employed in debauching legislatures in the election of United States senators will deny that there should be a change for the better. Legislative elections are foreign to the spirit of our institutions and the rights of the masses whose interests are directly involved. On every line of our national history, in every tradition, in every provision of the constitution speaking of elections, the fact is apparent that the people are supreme and have the primary right to select their rulers. It may be noted with pride that the present senate committee on privileges and elections have reported favorably a proposed constitutional amendment requiring the election of senators by popular vote.

"Government ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones is a doctrine of the party. That such ownership is necessary I think none conversant with the history of railroading will soberly deny. Of course those interested in private ownership, their press, their agents, and their attorneys, will deny the doctrine and use the influence they possess, or purchase, to defeat the accomplishment. But I think no disinterested person will deny the necessity. A railway is an improved highway, and highways belong to the sovereign power in this and in other countries. Railroad, telegraph and telephone companies have power to take private property for their own by virtue of the constitutional doctrine of eminent domain.

"If they were not quasi public corporations they could not do so, notwithstanding they might be willing to pay more than it is worth. It is on account of the public service they are supposed to render that they are authorized to construct their lines from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific sea board. They are in their nature monopolies; they are few in number and competition is unknown among them. They are indispensable to all, promotive of civilization, and it is truly within the power, as it is within the line of true policy, for the government to reduce them to ownership. No one will deny that congress possesses these agencies, but those not familiar with the doctrine of eminent domain or the necessity of its application.

"We are asked by what right the government can reduce these public agencies to its ownership. I answer, by the same power they exercised in securing private property on which to construct their lines—the right of eminent domain. When it shall be made to appear to congress that public ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones is essential to the general welfare and happiness of the people, that body will be found to have ample power under the constitution to enact laws to that end, and obtain title by paying the owners the fair value, to be ascertained in an authentic manner.

"But it is sometimes urged that government ownership is paternalistic and is a step toward a patriarchy, and government ownership is nowhere considered paternalistic. It finds its similitude in turpikes, plank roads, canals, and other public works built, owned and operated by the states. Many states built and operated railroads, and Georgia now owns and operates a railway profitably. It is not to be forgotten that 60 per cent of the nations of the world now own and operate the railroads, telegraphs and telephones in the interests of the people and to their great advantage and profit. Government ownership is by no means a new or untried fact. It has existed since the earliest period of railway construction.

"It is said again that government ownership would result in introducing into the public service 800,000 men, that would be a menace to the government, inasmuch as they would use their vote and influence to continue in power the party from whom they received their appointment. But this statement has no substance. There would be no greater danger from this source than is experienced from the army and navy, the postal, or any other government department employing large bodies of men, and a judicious and honestly administered civil service would reduce the danger to a minimum.

"But, my fellow citizens, after all has

(Continued on 10th Page.)

TOLL GATE NUISANCE

A Few of These Antiquated Obstacles Still Remaining.

EXAMPLES OF ANOTHER KIND.

Capitalists Who Have Their Toll Gates and Tax The People.

High-ways Belong to the People. Text—"Caesar would not be a wolf, if Romans were not sheep."—Shakespeare.

Only half a century ago toll-gates were almost as common as log cabins, and all pious and conservative settlers declared them to be as necessary as the roads. Thirty years back every bridge over the Connecticut river, was a toll-bridge, maintained for private profit. There are men still living in Massachusetts who can remember when there were toll-gates every ten miles on all the great high-ways in the State.

There are, at the present time, a few of these antiquated obstacles left in the United States and Canada, but public sentiment is overwhelmingly against them, as the toll-gate riots in Kentucky prove.

Toll-gates were never necessary. Private individuals should never have been allowed to own the roads. No man has a right, for the sake of private profit, to tie a knot in the veins of commerce.

It is very fortunate, in these days of McKinley prosperity, that the roads have become public property, for they are the only part of American soil that the unemployed and exploited wage-workers can call their own.

Fifty years ago the capitalists said: "If it were not for us there would be no roads," and they sat still and levied a tax on all who moved about. But as soon as the people became wise enough they took possession of the roads, without any bloodshed or dynamite, and another remnant of barbarism was removed.

The wooden toll-gates are gone, but the human toll-gates remain. Any man who taxes the labor and activity of others is nothing more than a toll-gate. He may call himself a manufacturer, a landlord or banker, or any other fair-sounding name, but if he receives money without rendering any personal service, he is a toll-gate.

Rockefeller stands between the whole nation and the oil fields, and takes toll on every gallon. Whoever you buy a pound of sugar you have to pass through Haysmeyer's toll-gate, and in front of nearly every railroad depot Pierpont Morgan's toll-gate stands.

Every capitalist has his toll-gate, and stands behind it like a mendicant friar, holding out his hat for that compulsory charity which he calls rent, profits and interest. The self-importance of these obstructionists would be amusing if it were not so fatal to the nation's welfare. They imagine there would be no business if it were not for the obstacles they put in the road. They think a steamer is propelled, not by steam and machinery, but by the barnacles that stick to the bottom.

The human toll-gates claim to "provide us with work," but a freelog could claim the same virtue. Capitalists make work and so does a naughty baby. If work is a good thing, why do they try to escape it? If it is a bad thing why do they try to make more? They claim to have "superior ability." So did slave drivers.

There is nothing else for it, comrades, THE PRIVATE CAPITALIST MUST GO! Just now the monopolists are rejoicing at their capture of America, but unless some of us are greatly mistaken, before ten years they will be imploring Europe to send over some Hessians and help them get loose. Clear the roads for the human race is marching! AWAY WITH THE TOLL-GATES AND MARCH ON!—Herbert N. Casson, in Coming Nation.

Favors the Initiative and Referendum.

"In this country for more than six years our party has platformed the initiative and referendum. We have explained the doctrine in meetings until the matter is fairly understood. Personally, I am convinced that it is the fundamental reform. Our political campaigns are but 'Wars of the Roses.' Jefferson was right: 'Trust the people.' Lincoln was right: 'A government of, for and by the people.' I am for any proper plan to enlarge the rights of the people and curtail the powers of office-holders. I will be glad to do anything I can to forward the initiative and referendum, as I consider it one of the greatest reforms of our time.—Congressman W. L. Stark in the New Times.

The World Herald Year Book.

The World Herald Year Book and quarterly review for 1898 is better than ever before. It contains more than 500 pages and is handsomely and substantially bound. It is an invaluable compilation of general information and statistics, condensed and indexed for ready reference. A copy of this year's book should be in every home in Nebraska. If you have not already bought a copy you shall send 25 cents to the World Herald and get a copy before the supply is exhausted.

Senator M. A. Hanna was sworn in as a United States Senator from the state of Ohio, on Monday of this week. He was the recipient of many congratulations.