

The Nebraska Independent.

Wealth Makers and Lincoln Independent Consolidated.

VOL. IX.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, THURSDAY APRIL 14, 1898.

NO. 47.

A CONSISTENT RECORD

Senator Allen has Contended for Cuban Independence for Three Years.

SOME OF HIS RESOLUTIONS.

Freedom and Right of Self Government are Inalienable Rights.

Spain Must Leave American Soil

Senator Allen has been consistent in his advocacy of Cuban independence. He has spoken more times and introduced more resolutions to bring about the independence of that island than any other senator. He rejoices that he will soon see independence an accomplished fact. In the senate in his speech a few days ago he said:

Mr. President: My zeal for Cuban independence is not new born, nor the growth of a mere night. I spoke for the liberation of the Cuban people when it was by no means a popular thing to do, and I recall very distinctly at this time that several years ago the then senior senator from Florida (Mr. Call) and I were apparently the only persistent and outspoken friends of the Cuban people in this chamber. We were indefatigable in our advocacy of independence and intervention. We were so persistent that we incurred the displeasure of many senators, some of whom I am now glad to know have become the sincere and fearless advocates of independence. That I may prove the correctness of my statement, I will refer briefly to the record.

December 4, 1895, I introduced a resolution, of which this is a paragraph: "That the government of the United States of America should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba, who are now honestly struggling to secure their independence of the Spanish government, as composing an independent nation and possessing the rights thereof according to the law of nations."

And in speaking in its support at that time, I said, among other things: I am of the number who believe that this government should promptly recognize the revolutionists of Cuba and assist them in all lawful ways to secure their independence of the Spanish government and enable them to establish an independent republic.

Speaking to the same resolution December 11, 1895, I urged its adoption.

February 27, 1896, I said:

What is there to prohibit this government, by proper act of congress, whether it be in the form of a joint or concurrent resolution, from declaring the acknowledgment of the existence of the Cuban republic; and would not that be a recognition of the independence of that republic, although as a matter of fact it may not have yet succeeded in repelling the power that assails it?

Again, March 20, 1896, in combating the contention of the senator from Louisiana that the supreme court had jurisdiction to determine a question of belligerency, I declared:

That the power to recognize the belligerency or political independence of a people is a purely political question with which the supreme court has no concern.

February 24, 1897, I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the senate that the president should speedily and effectually protect the lives and liberties of peaceful American citizens residing or sojourning in Cuba, and that he should promptly insist that Spain in her war against her colonists in the island of Cuba should conduct the same on principles of civilized warfare, eliminating all unusual and unnecessary cruelty and barbarity; and for the enforcement of these reasonable and just requirements United States battleships should be sent without delay to Cuban waters.

December 5, 1897, I introduced this resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the senate that congress should, with all due and convenient speed, acknowledge by appropriate act the political independence of the republic of Cuba.

Senator Allen in his speech quoted from many other speeches showing that he had taken advantage of every opportunity for three years to declare and speak for Cuban independence. Continuing he said:

I have never wavered in my belief nor lost faith in the fact that ultimately Cuba, by force of the public sentiment of this country and the civilized world and by the gallantry of her soldiers, would win her freedom and add her name to the republics of this continent. I have at times been convinced that sooner or later she would stand forth, perhaps weak at first, but ultimately strong, a splendid young republic added to the grand galaxy of republics of the earth. In the hour of her deepest political night, when there did not seem a ray of hope or a gleam of light, I felt confident that in the providence of God she would wrest her liberty from Spain and proudly take her station in the ranks of self-governed peoples.

Mr. President, nations, like men, that would accomplish great results, must not grow weary; they must not hesitate; they must not turn back; they must not grow faint-hearted, but

persistently push on, determined to bide the time when an awakened sense of right in the enlightened world will aid them.

During the years of Cuba's gallant struggle for liberty—now happily, in my judgment, almost at an end—there were those who said that our government ought to tender its good offices for autonomy under the Spanish flag, while others favored merely the recognition of belligerency; but Cuba's true friends, penetrating the cloud of darkness, foresaw the outcome of the unhappy and unfortunate condition then prevailing.

Sir, we stand to Cuba as an elder brother. We owe her a duty we can not honestly escape. To desert her at this time would be base cowardice—a cowardice the people of the United States and the men of other generations will not palliate or excuse. We are the guardians of liberty on this continent. We must now do our duty without temporizing or hesitating, not in a swaggering manner like the bravo or the bully; not in a way that will indicate that we are moved by prejudice or by passion, but in a manner that will convince the world that we believe the time has come at last when every foot of American soil occupied by the hideous monarchy of Spain should be wrested from her and be henceforth dedicated to the cause of human freedom.

I will not weary the senate with lengthy remarks. I stand now where I stood the first moment the war began—in favor of prompt, unconditional recognition of the political independence of the republic of Cuba.

Our ancestors declared to the world that all men are by nature free and equal and entitled to certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. They did not confine themselves to the inhabitants of the colonies; they did not limit the declaration to the people of the Western Hemisphere; but they held that all men, under whatever sun they might be born or on whatever soil they might live, were created free and equal and entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Sir, I hold human freedom and the right of self-government to be as inalienable as the right to breathe the air or to enjoy the sunlight, or any of the manifold gifts of God to his people. My right to govern myself, if capable of doing so; to believe and act as I will, not interfering with the like right of others, and to worship the supreme being in my own way is as inseparable from my existence as life itself. The right of self-government is God-given and inalienable, and whoever violates it flies in the face of providence and wrests from the individual the most precious gift of all.

We have heard from the senator from Vermont (Mr. Proctor), from the senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Gallinger), from my colleague (Mr. Thurston), and from the senator from Mississippi (Mr. Money), vivid relations of the sad story of death and devastation. In all history a more hideous and cruel character than Weyler can not be found. Cortez, Pizarro, the Duke of Alva, and Weyler will stand forth in all ages as typical Spanish soldiers, and Weyler will be regarded as the most inhuman of them all. They are the butchers of the past and present age. The sea-green Robespierre in the palmiest days of the French revolution, when heads were falling daily by the hundreds, was not more malicious or more fiendish than Weyler in Cuba, but 90 miles from our shores.

Is it to be supposed that the American people, the Christian conscience of the world, will longer submit to this wholesale murder and assassination? Weyler's rule was absolutism, tempered alone by murder and modified by assassination. The aim was total extermination of the inhabitants of the island and a re-peopling of that from Spain and other servile countries.

Mr. President, I pass for a moment only to the sinking of the battleship Maine. According to the recent custom of nations an armed vessel is permitted to enter the port of a friendly power and anchor at such place as may be designated by competent authority. The anchorage may be changed at the instance of the nation owning the port. It is an act of courtesy recognized by civilized governments. It can not be doubted that when an armed vessel of one nation enters the port of another and casts anchor in her waters at a place designated by her authorities there is at least an implied guarantee that the place of anchorage is reasonably safe and that no mine or outside explosive is concealed beneath the waves to send her to the bottom and the souls of her inmates to eternity.

I am not disposed to discuss the painful circumstances of the destruction of the Maine and the loss of life incident thereto. It is humiliating, it is mortifying, to say nothing of the inhumanity attending the act. I fully concur in the opinion that Spain must be made to atone for this wholesale murder, not by the payment of money, for she does not possess gold enough to compensate the insult offered this nation, or for one precious human life lost in the disaster of February 15. But she must compensate by freeing Cuba, by furling her dirty flag and leaving the Western Hemisphere never to return again; ever, at last, while the government of the United States exists and exercises a controlling influence in the politics of this continent.

Mr. President, I am the jingo of jingos. From the time the war broke out between Spain and Cuba I have been the steadfast and uncompromising advocate of independence. I have

never doubted that it would be won, although at times it looked dark; but that ultimately the Cubans would be able to wrest their freedom from the Spanish throne I have always thought certain, and they stand today within hailing distance of a new and more perfect civilization. Whatever adjustment is made of the Maine disaster, one thing must be definitely understood—it must not be submitted to the arbitrament of foreign powers. Spain must reckon with the American people alone.

I rejoice to know that the American people have become aroused to the extent that they will no longer listen to Spanish lying or give ear to Spanish threats. We are not a nation of braggarts; we do not seek war with Spain or with any other country. We will resort to arms only when our cause is just and when the enlightened judgment of the American people and of the world will approve our conduct. But, sir, because we are peace loving it must not be thought we are unmindful of the duties imposed on us or that our people are lacking in spirit. We at all times seek peace rather than war, but not that kind of peace that is to be purchased at any price, nor the peace with Cuba in chains. In the language of the English ballad—

We don't want to fight, but by jingo if we do.

We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money, too.

If Spain will hunt down and execute the deadly assassin who, under cover of darkness, sunk the battle ship Maine and sent, without warning 266 souls into the presence of their maker; if she will relinquish her occupation of Cuba, take down her flag from this continent—a flag whose only claim to public attention it that it is stained with blood, cruelty and crime—and leave American soil forever, we will be content. We have no greed for Spanish territory nor for Spanish gold. Our policy is that of a contented, domestic people. We do not want Cuba. We do not even want to be her guardian. But we are determined that she shall be free and that for all time we will be rid of the close proximity of a nation whose chief occupation is the shedding of innocent blood.

The torch that has lighted Cuba so long must be extinguished, the shrieks of dying women and children must be hushed, broken hearts must be bound up, wounds be healed, the prison pens be opened, and the people made free. Cuba, now draped in mourning, must once more become the gem of the Caribbean sea, and when all these shall have been accomplished, speedily, let us hope, the American people can well afford to announce to the world that their account with the Spanish kingdom is forever closed.

Sir, if I could have my own way, I would promptly recall our minister from Madrid and give Spain's minister at Washington his passport. I would close forever the political, financial and commercial relations of the two nations, and not again permit an armed Spaniard to set foot on American soil.

Mr. President, it is well known that I am thoroughly and unalterably opposed to the president in most of his policies. It would be impossible for us to be brought together unless he should cease to be a republican and become a populist, a thing he probably will not do. I have no faith that any country can ever become permanently prosperous by an application of the domestic policies he would enforce.

But in this time of great national anxiety, when there is an impending cloud of war, as one of the senators of one of the greatest and best states of the union, I am willing to give him my support and encouragement and aid him in the solution of this troublesome question. In the presence of the grave circumstances now confronting the American people all mere party differences must for the time be laid aside, and all American citizens, regardless of political affiliations, stand together for the honor and glory of their country.

Monstrous and Inhuman.

Suppose when the slaves were emancipated, it had been made a condition of their freedom that they should pay the expenses that the Southern Confederacy had incurred in trying to keep them in bondage. What would you have said to the proposition? It would have been equivalent to keeping them in slavery, of course. The burden of the debt would have been greater than they could possibly bear. It would have been to mock them with the name of freedom while plunging them into a servitude more galling than before. Of course, no one for a moment thought of attaching any such conditions to abolition, and I only suggest the idea now to illustrate how the proposal to make the Cubans, who have struggled so long and so valiantly for liberty, pay the Spaniards for trying to re-enslave them, strikes me. It is monstrous and inhuman to ask that the yoke that they have thrown off shall be pressed down again upon their bleeding necks, and the labor of generations unborn mortgaged to keep up the incomes of the heirs to beat them. If the government of the United States attempts to impose upon the Cubans we ought to write "lehabol" on our national monuments and benam our business and degeneracy in sack-cloth and ashes.—Star and Kansan.

Mrs. J. M. Sanford of Fairfield was a Lincoln visitor this week.

Get your neighbor to subscribe.

TO REDUCE THE RATES

Secretaries of the State Board of Transportation Begin the Battle Anew.

ALL ROADS ARE REPRESENTED

Contend that Law is Unconstitutional and that the Injunction is in Force.

What the Secretaries Will do.

The hearing in the Tibbles case was commenced before the secretaries of the state board of transportation on Wednesday of last week. The complainant appeared in person and by his attorneys, Morning & Berge. The various roads were represented by Mr. Kelby of the B. and M., M. A. Low of Topeka, representing the Rock Island; J. W. Orr of Atchison, representing the Missouri Pacific; M. A. Reed of St. Joe, representing the St. Joe and Grand Island; B. F. White of Omaha, representing the Fremont, Elkhorn and Missouri Valley, and Mr. Carroll, representing the Union Pacific.

All the roads filed through their attorneys supplemental answers to the complaint, and the attorneys for complainant asked a reasonable time to prepare and file denials, which was granted.

The answers filed denied the jurisdiction of the board, denied that they were a constitutional body and alleging that they were enjoined under the decree of the federal court from proceeding.

In the afternoon session General Manderson, on behalf of the Burlington road, filed the following motion: "Before the Board of Transportation of Nebraska.

T. H. Tibbles, Complainant, vs. Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Defendants.—Motion to Dismiss Complaint.

"Now comes the defendants, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad company, and the Burlington and Missouri River Railroad company in Nebraska, and move the state board of transportation to dismiss this complaint and cause, for the reasons following:

"1. That the state board of transportation is without jurisdiction or power to entertain this complaint.

"2. That the complaint and cause should be dismissed because of facts appearing upon the record.

"3. That the state board of transportation and the defendants herein have been and are enjoined by the mandate and decree of a United States circuit court in and for the district of Nebraska, which order of injunction has been affirmed the supreme court of the United States, and of which injunction the state board of transportation have all cognizance and knowledge and which said injunction is now in full force and effect.

"4. That the only jurisdiction and tribunal for hearing the complaint herein, or any similar complaint, is in the United States court, according to the effect and in the manner prescribed by the supreme court of the United States in the case of Constantine J. Smyth, attorney general et al., constituting the board of transportation of Nebraska et al., appellants, vs. Oliver Ames, et al., decided at the October term, 1897, by the supreme court of the United States.

CHARLES F. MANDERSON, J. E. KELBY, Attorneys for Defendants.

General Solicitor of Defendants, and of Counsel."

Gen. Manderson then made a long oral argument in support of his motion, insisting that the law creating the board of transportation was in violation of the state constitution, that rates were as low as they should be, and that under the decision of the supreme court of the United States, the roads were enjoined from reducing rates below those in force at the time the decree was rendered, and also that the injunction reached the State Board of Transportation and prevented them from taking any action in the matter.

The argument became general, all the attorneys representing complainant and the defendant roads taking part in the same. Some two hours were consumed in argument.

J. W. Edgerton, speaking for the board of secretaries, in passing upon the motion, said:

"The secretaries are placed in rather an awkward situation. It seems to be the contemplation of the law that they shall act as attorneys as well as court, and they are certainly allowed a great deal of latitude or it is necessary that they should take a great deal in order to accomplish anything, so I may differ a little in my views from the attorneys.

"As to this motion, the law creating the State Board of Transportation was passed in 1887. I do not know at whose instigation it was whispered at the time that it was a railroad bill introduced and passed to ally the feeling existing at that time for anti-railroad legislation and as a kind of a makeshift. It seems that when something is to be done the roads are not exactly satisfied with the claim at once is made that it is unconstitutional, and we have that proposition flung in our faces now. Personally I want to know whether it is or not, want to know whether the State

Board of Transportation has any power to do anything that the railroads do not want done, and the sooner a test case is made in the supreme court and it is fought out to a finish and finally decided the better it will be for the people.

Now as to the right of the secretaries to pass upon the motion, the secretaries, of course, are supposed to have power to decide any matter that is brought before them and this is not a final termination of a controversy; because when it comes to making an order which is final, that has to be by the state officers. But as this is not a final order, and as it would be rather a strange proceeding for the board to hold that it had no existence, to hold that it had no power, that it was illegal and unconstitutionally created, I do not think that the board will take that position and I hardly think the secretaries will."

Gen. Manderson: "I don't think any one would, and the ground we raise in the motion is that you are enjoined."

Mr. Edgerton: "Now as to that, the decree of the federal court which was affirmed by the supreme court enjoins the railroads from putting in effect the maximum rate law or reducing the rates below the rates existing at the time of entering that decree, which the railroads themselves have nullified and are in contempt of the federal court; it does not, however, enjoin the board of secretaries from investigating or making an order."

Gen. Manderson: "Have you read the decision?"

Mr. Edgerton: "I have read it and that is my interpretation; it is also the attorney general's. It enjoins the board from attempting to put in force the maximum rate law, and that is as far as the injunction runs to them. It enjoins the railroads from putting in effect the maximum rate law or any rate lower than the rate existing at the time the decree was entered. Now, I will say here, because I always think it best to deal fairly and squarely and above board, that at a meeting of the board it was decided that we were instructed to proceed with the investigation and taking of testimony under this complaint, realizing that the roads were enjoined from putting into effect any rate lower than the rate in effect at the time the injunction was entered, and if it was found that the rates were too high the attorney general would apply to the federal court for a modification of the injunction, because I do not think, I can not conceive how a court would recognize as Justice Harlan did in his opinion, that the state board has the power to make orders, would ever affirm a decree and prevent an investigation at all and to tie the hands absolutely of the state and its officers."

"Now I will say that what we propose to do under this complaint is this: at least, we think we will. We will proceed with the investigation, we will gather all the testimony we can in all fairness to all parties. If, after we are through with the investigation, it is found that the rates are low enough, that the rates can not reasonably stand a reduction, we will frankly say so in our findings. If we find that they are five per cent too high on some commodities, or ten per cent too high on some commodities, and that decree can be modified, we will make an order to that effect, and if we find from the investigation that the maximum rate law can be enforced now, then we will make the proper effort in the federal court."

"Now I do not want it to go out that we are just simply loitering here without a purpose because I do not like to work well enough to work for nothing. I always like to do what I do with a definite object, and this is the object. If there can not be a modification of that decree, if we find that we cannot do anything, we will have followed the instructions of the board so far anyhow."

"The order on the motion is that it will be overruled, and we will proceed with the taking of the testimony."

It was then agreed between the attorneys for the complainant and the attorneys for the defendant roads that the documentary testimony that would be required should be furnished in reply to a list of questions furnished the various roads by the secretaries, and as this would require considerable time a continuance was agreed on until the 27th of April, at which time the hearing will proceed.

If the people of the state could thoroughly understand and comprehend the difficulties that the State Board of Transportation are laboring under there would be no murmuring or complaint against the board. The present board has done more than any board since the law was enacted, a vast amount of relief has been afforded localities and individuals that the general public seem to know nothing of. A personal or last report would satisfy any one that there is no room for fault finding.

In the order compelling the roads to restore the car load rate on live stock hundreds of thousands of dollars have been saved the shippers of the state. In all matters where they have had power to act they have acted promptly and to the satisfaction of the people.

As to general freight rates, the state officers decided that no action should be taken until after the final decision was handed down from the United States supreme court. As soon as this decision was rendered, the board met and decided to take up the investigation in the Tibbles case, realizing that they do that the fight might be a hopeless one.

The decrees of record which was affirmed by the supreme court, reads as

(Continued on Fifth Page.)

PEOPLE'S OWNERSHIP

Steady Progress of the Idea Throughout the Country Continues.

GAINS IN CITY ELECTIONS.

Practical Results in Western Cities and Towns Very Encouraging.

Interesting Facts and Figures.

The cause of peoples ownership is marching on. Supreme courts may tie up the regulation of monopolies and annul the acts of state legislatures which are designed to control corporations. The effect of these decisions is precisely as it was in the anti-slavery struggle, when courts and congress conspired against freedom to black human beings. The eyes of the people are being opened at the same time to the failure of efforts to control corporations in the interest of the people and to the absurdity of permitting corporations to carry on public business.

The spring elections emphasize the growth of this spirit. In Des Moines the republican nominee for mayor ran on a platform and a record favoring city ownership of public utilities. Notwithstanding he was opposed by a large and influential wing of his own party, he was elected by a large majority. In Milwaukee the populists and democrats joined forces on a platform favoring absolute ownership of the public monopolies in that city. Their ticket was elected by majorities ranging from 4,000 to 8,000. The issue was clear cut and distinct. Reports from there say that the causes for the landslide were many. There is a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction among the people with the manner in which they claimed the corporation wing of the republican party had shaped things in the common council and out of it. With a democratic mayor and full control of the common council the democrats and populists will have every opportunity to carry out the municipal reforms to which they are pledged. It is said silver really cut very little, if any, figure in the campaign, many republicans voting against their party ticket.

Along with the cheering news of the growth of public sentiment in favor of ending the era of corporatism in public service comes still more cheering news of the practical success of peoples ownership where it has been fairly tried. Among the cities to adopt public ownership is Anderson, Ind., one of the most energetic cities in that region of wonderful development—the natural gas belt of Indiana and Ohio. Report was recently made by the city authorities here of the results of the experiment during the past year. An account from there says that Anderson's municipal ownership experiment was given an additional boom and many opponents of municipal ownership were at least partially won over to a favorable view of the extensive experimenting by the city. Officials in charge of the latest acquired property—the commercial electric light plant—made a report showing that during the first year of city ownership the plant had yielded a net earning, under adverse conditions, of 20 per cent. on the \$48,000 investment.

Aside from this individual advantage to every person tapping the lines, inasmuch as the city has given earlier, better and later service. The incandescent lights have been turned on a half hour earlier than they were formerly. This showing in winter months is most remarkable, inasmuch as the long evenings and nights, and dark mornings, necessitated more hours of operation than will be the case in the spring and summer. Then, too, in a section where natural gas costs only 60 cents a light per annum, many of the electric lights are cut off in winter months. This materially decreases the amount of cash taken in by the lighting plant, while the operating expenses remain practically the same at all times. It is thought that during the next six months the plant will return 25 per cent. interest on the \$48,000 investment.

The commercial electric plant is operated in connection with the city street lighting plant and therefore reduces the cost of that department about one-half, which has not been considered. Cities all through the central states have been investigating the Anderson experiments and have been surprised at the remarkable degree of success that can be attained in this new branch of public service. Among the Indiana cities that have examined the plant and whose people are now demanding similar steps are Wabash, Peru, Marion, Muncie, Alexandria, Elwood, Hartford City, Albany, Richmond and Lafayette.

The first commercial light report, just issued, will increase the interest and demand for experiments in the cities named. Their investigation has revealed the fact also that the Anderson municipal commercial water plant is now saving and earning for the city 800,000 annually and that all other experiments have proved most successful. They are inclined to believe the statement made by Anderson advocates that if the city gains control of the street railway system the time will soon come when it will not be necessary to levy 1 cent of tax to maintain

(Continued on Page Eight.)