

## THE NEW POMPEII

St. Pierre, Island of Martinique, French West Indies, Destroyed by Eruption of Mont Pelee—Many Thousand Lives Lost

Readers of The Independent who have access to the dailies have doubtless read the details of the eruption of Mont Pelee on the island of Martinique, French West Indies, one of the lesser Antilles, and the total destruction of St. Pierre, a city of something over 20,000 inhabitants. It is impossible to secure anything like accurate details of the number of lives lost, but as the dispatches say that the only ones who escaped death were those who left St. Pierre before 8 o'clock last Thursday morning (May 8), when the eruption began, the fatalities must be near the 20,000 mark. A dispatch from Fort de France, Island of Martinique, says:

"Strange to relate, in view of the number of inhabitants of St. Pierre who were swept to death by the volcanic waves from Mount Pelee on Thursday, very few corpses have been found by those engaged in the work of cremating the dead bodies. This is due to the fact that most of the people are buried under the thick layer of cinder and lava, which apparently entirely consumed the bodies of the victims."

Since the destruction of Pompeii, nearly 2,000 years ago, by the eruption of Vesuvius, no volcano has approached Mont Pelee in the destruction of human life. The Martinique disaster stands in the class with the destruction of Galveston, and the great tidal wave in the Pacific a good many years ago when hundreds of thousands of Pacific islanders lost their lives.

The eruption of Vesuvius threw out such an enormous amount of molten lava that the city of Pompeii was completely covered, but the inhabitants of St. Pierre lost their lives by inhaling the deadly gases thrown out by the volcano. Mont Pelee (pronounced Palay) was thought to be extinct; it has shown no signs of activity for over fifty years, and the crater was filled with water, forming a lake where the people boated and bathed. Since the Pelee eruption the volcano Soufriere on the island of St. Vincent, British West Indies, has been in a state of eruption and it is reported that 1,600 people have perished.

Congress has appropriated half a million dollars to aid the survivors of the great catastrophe, and President Roosevelt has issued a call for voluntary contributions from the American people. Cornelius N. Bliss of New York is made treasurer of the relief committee. Postmasters and presidents of all national banks will act as agents for the collection and forwarding of funds. John C. Wharton and Victor B. Caldwell of Omaha are named on the committee.

James Taylor, who was one of the officers of the steamer which was destroyed in the harbor of St. Pierre, gives a graphic story of the tragedy of last Thursday to the Herald from St. Kitts, island of St. Christopher, B. W. I.:

"I experienced the greatest difficulty in getting into port," said he. "Appalling sounds were issuing from the mountains behind the town, which was shrouded in darkness. All the passengers were up and some were trying to obtain photographs."

"Suddenly I heard a tremendous explosion. Ashes began to fall thick upon the deck, and I could see a black cloud sweeping down upon us. I dived below and, dragging with me Samuel Thomas, a gangway man and fellow countryman, I sprang into a room, shutting the door to keep out the heat that was already unbearable."

"The ship rocked, and I expected every moment that it would sink. Outside I heard a voice pleading for the door to be opened. It was Scott, the first officer, and I opened the door and dragged him into the room."

"It soon became unbearably hot and I went on deck, but even then could not swallow, so badly was his throat burned. He sank back unconscious and a few minutes later was dead. All aft the ship was afloat, and from the land came drafts of terrible heat. At last, when I could stand it no longer, I sprang overboard. The water was almost hot enough to parboil me, but a wave soon swept in from the ocean bringing with it cool water."

"I was caught in the receding wave, which was of tidal velocity, and was carried out to sea. Then on the second return of the wave I washed against an upturned sloop, to which I clung. A few minutes later I was joined by another man whom I learned was Captain Mughah of the Roraima. He was in dreadful agony and kept begging piteously to be put on board his ship."

"Picking up some wreckage and a tool chest, with five others who joined me, we succeeded in forming a rude raft, on which we placed the captain. Seeing an upturned boat I asked one of the five to swim out to it and bring it over so that Captain Mughah might have an opportunity to live. The man succeeded in getting the boat righted, but instead of returning he picked up two of his countrymen and went away in the direction of Fort de France."

"Seeing the Roraima, which had arrived in port, we anchored, making for the Roraima. I said goodbye to Captain Mughah and swam to the Roraima. Before I could reach it

it burst into flames and put out to sea. I finally reached the Roraima about 2:30 in the afternoon and later was taken off by the cruiser Suchet."

Samuel Thomas, the gangway man whose life was saved by Taylor, described a woman who was burned to death while she held her baby in her arms, protecting it with her own body from the fire that filled the air. The child was alive long after its mother had ceased to suffer.

## "YOU'RE ANOTHER"

Republicans Trying to Divert Public Attention—Concealment First—Then Evasion—Now Justification

Washington, D. C., May 10, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The republicans in congress sadly need someone to advise them for their own good. Their much-vaunted defense and justification of the Philippine outrages proved to be merely a clumsy attempt to distract public attention by pretending that various exceptional cases of disorder and lawlessness in this country had anything to do with the principles at issue. It may be good policy in one sense, to try to divert public attention from the acts of our army in the Philippines, but the very attempt shows clearly that the republicans had no defense to make.

The democrats need have done nothing except let Lodge, Beveridge et al. talk. They are convicted out of their own mouths. If there is one thing which stands out more clearly than another in the republican muddle, it is that Roosevelt does not desire to shield those who have been guilty of permitting the "kill and burn" atrocities and the "water cure" method of benevolent assimilation. Yet Senator Lodge had no more sense than to attempt to justify these very atrocities, thus putting the responsibility for them upon the administration and the war department. "I am not here to excuse cruelty or torture," cries Lodge and then proceeds to do that very thing.

Roosevelt declares that no punishment can be too great for those who use inhuman methods of warfare and then Lodge proceeds to plead justification for the General Smith order and other brutalities. Doubtless the whole matter is first up to the war department and then to the administration and the party in power. There can be no shirking of responsibility, because the guilt is divided among these various departments. If Roosevelt has honesty and courage he can easily get rid of Secretary Root who has not only known of these outrages, but who has aided and abetted them. If the republican majority in congress expects to in any way justify itself with the people it will put itself on record as being ready to use its ability to put a stop to the outrages in the Philippines.

The puerile cry that any criticism is "an attack on the army" is hardly worthy of answer. When did the army get to be such a little god that it is expected to be immune from criticism? The individual soldier should be blamed far less for any participation in these cruelties than the war department and the administration and the republican majority in congress which permits and encourages such a policy. It is equally absurd for the republicans to do the baby act and cry out that the democrats are attacking the Philippines policy for humanitarian purposes. This might impose upon the Filipino children of ten whom General Smith claims are so ferocious that our troops must be permitted to shoot down the mothers of these children, but it will not impose upon the country at large.

The democratic minority stands as the guardian of the interests of the whole people. If it were not for the persistent efforts of the democrats the Philippines outrages would still be hidden in the archives of the war department and the killing and burning and reconcentration and water curing would be going merrily on in the Philippines. As it is only a very small portion of the real truth has been extracted. The republicans first tried concealment, then evasion and finally justification. Nothing can keep the country from registering its disapproval of the policy which has permitted our national honor to be disgraced. Our adoption of Weyerlerism in the Philippines is a lasting disgrace. One that can neither be wiped out nor forgotten.

Roosevelt finds himself in just the awkward position that was prophesied by the democrats. He is in a position—only more so. After all his bluster about what he will and what he will not do, he finds his congress so hopelessly rent by factions and dissensions that it is powerless to do anything that he wants—even if it desired to carry out his wishes—and it does not. Every day of such debasement as the senate has witnessed for the last ten days spells defeat for the republican party not only for the coming congressional election, but in the next presidential campaign. Yet the confusion is so great that Roosevelt has to threaten an extra session if his congress does not hurry up and pass the Philippine bill and the Cuban tariff bill. The record so far has not been a creditable one.

The alleged Chinese exclusion bill, which is one of the few pieces of domestic legislation, is a gold brick which should gladden the celestial heart of Wu Ting Fang and his friends. The law will only be operative until December, 1904, and then when the treaty falls we will be exposed to unrestricted Chinese immigration. The Philippine clause is worthless and even now the islands are to be made the gateway for an influx of Chinese labor. When you add to this that the "full dinner pail" is now without meat, there is nothing to entice the average citizen either with the doings of congress or the administration.—D. F. B.

## LODGE THE DODGER

Republicans Exhibit Agility in Avoiding Discussion of Philippine Bill—Carmack Skins Dolliver—Judge Tibbets Scored

Washington, D. C., May 12, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The republicans in the senate are pursuing every method to avoid the discussion of the Philippine bill. Senator Lodge has tried and tried to get the minority to agree upon an early vote, but the disclosures from the Philippines are coming so thick and fast that the democrats, realizing that the facts should be presented to the American people, have refused to agree to any policy of suppression. Senator Tillman was forced into a discussion of the race problem by the senior senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Spooner, in order to give the republicans an opportunity to discuss that mooted question. In fact they are determined to avoid the real issue as much as possible. Senator Lodge, the republican chairman of the Philippines committee, really opened the debate for the majority on Monday last, when for three hours he dodged, and dived to keep away from the Philippine question, with all the agility of which he is a master, and we are given notice that today Senator Foraker will go through some more contortions to show his ability in "coming near, but not touching" the real question.

The democrats have brought many and serious charges concerning the condition of affairs in the Philippines, and they have proven them beyond the shadow of a doubt from the "government's witnesses," all of which makes the case stronger. From the witnesses summoned only by the majority, for they refuse to summon any of importance, which the minority want, they have heard of General Smith's Herod-like, Weyerler-like butcheries; they have been brought face to face with some of the most horrible instances of the water cure; they have been told vividly of such butcheries and atrocities which several years ago would have stirred the American people beyond the control of the administration. All this from the witnesses whom the government has summoned. If the minority could only be able to summon men of influence in the Philippine islands—men of power among the Filipinos themselves—the opposition, or the defense of the Philippine people, could be heard and their case justly tried. Here we have formed a plan of government—the senate and the house each presenting a radically different measure—each of which is the best possible. All this has been arranged by the committees of the senate and house without ever hearing a single native, without ever ascertaining the wishes or the desires of the people in the archipelago. Four years have elapsed and nothing has been done. We have shown to the world that we do not know how to manage colonies. We have nothing to show in the islands for our four years' work and for the millions spent, save razed towns, plundered villages and a terrorized people. We have given to the world a successor to Atilla, to Weyerler, our own General Smith, who murders babes, who would make a fair island a "lowing wilderness," and who boasts of "the lowing wilderness."

Yet, whenever the democrats in the senate begin to attack the butcheries and atrocities in the Philippines, the republicans come back at them with the cry, "Don't sling mud at the American soldier." That was the whole text of the "oleaginous" speech of Senator Lodge. Don't defile the proud name of the American soldier, let us kill and burn, let us apply the "water cures," let us "kill all over ten," but don't you throw mud at the American soldier. Does the republican party think the American people are going to be fooled longer by that siren cry? Do they think that when the other political party show to the American people that the islands have been ravaged and that we have another and a more horrible Weyerler, that they can fall back on their old deceptive cry of "Don't throw mud at the American soldier." Senator Beveridge, the pestiferous little grasshopper from Indiana, broke loose on Tuesday and before he had finished, came to be the butt end of all the wit and sarcasm of the senate. He charged the democrats with being dilatory in clearing up the situation, and the reports were immediately shown him that he, more than any other man, had taken up most of the time making little speeches as to why the witness should not be compelled to testify. If anyone had taken time, and uselessly as well as dilatorily, it was the "Wasp of the Wabash."

On Tuesday, Senator Turner, the lawyer of the senate, made a magnificent speech, able and rhetorical, in opposition to the passage of the pending bill. He gave the administration a good lambasting for its policies and declared that the policy of "kill or burn" must continue if we want to subjugate the Filipinos. It was a magnificent speech and, although not eloquently delivered, is a splendid piece of campaign literature and well worth reading.

On Thursday Senator Dolliver, the egotistic senator from Iowa, toyed with the wrong cage and as usual came out of the short end of the horn. Your correspondent, Mr. Risley, came into my office a short while after and said, "Carmack has made the greatest speech delivered this session in the senate." Risley was enthusiastic over it and repeatedly laughed heartily over "poor Dolliver." The junior senator from Iowa had taken occasion to give a bitterly attack Carmack for his speech and, in closing, read an editorial from the newspaper which Mr. Carmack formerly edited, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which, although speaking

of Mr. Carmack in very pleasant terms, denounced his speech on the Philippines. Dolliver took occasion to sarcastically chide the junior senator from Tennessee about it. In reply, Senator Carmack took the opportunity to floor Senator Dolliver in a few well chosen words, in reference to the editorial from the Commercial Appeal. Senator Carmack said that personally it was very complimentary, and politically, it was as fair as could be expected from a paper whose owner was Governor Luke E. Wright, now holding the position of acting governor in the Philippines under the administration. The floor broke out into a roar at Dolliver's expense and it was several minutes before the chairman could restore order. But here Mr. Carmack did not stop. Dolliver thought he could be sarcastic, but Carmack thought he could go one better and no wonder Risley said "poor Dolliver." It is a habit of Dolliver's, in making a speech, to use the personalities that had been thrown at Carmack, and he would not attempt to imitate him because he had not the necessary "control of his abdominal muscles." He described Dolliver as hanging by his "prehensile tail" and making "simian gestures," which every one knew to mean that he was comparing the senator to an ape. And in conclusion, he spoke of the personalities that had been thrown by Dolliver. "If I were to object," called Carmack, "at each instance that the senate violated the rules of decency in debate, I should have to rise and condemn him to absolute silence for the rest of his life." Here Senator Hoar rose and called Carmack to order, but as he had finished, the laugh was on Hoar. No wonder Risley was enthusiastic. It was the master battle between the two masters of sarcasm, Dolliver and Carmack, and the latter proved that he is not only the master of the senate in eloquence, in logic and in ability, but the master of the senate in hurling the most biting sarcasm. Dolliver has been taught a lesson, and won't monkey with the machine again.

Today Senator Lodge will make another attempt to fix a time for a vote upon the bill, but as usual this will prove without effect. He will then attempt to have the senate meet one hour earlier each day. This the democrats are willing to do upon one condition, and that is that the republican senators be compelled to attend the sessions. Each day that the bill is discussed and the democrats are determined that they shall be compelled to attend or otherwise they will not agree to any earlier sessions. There are but few of the republicans who have attended the daily sessions and they are Lodge, Spooner, Beveridge, Dolliver and McComas. Senator Foraker will speak today. Mr. Bailey finally withdrew and Senator Spooner on Wednesday. On Thursday the democrats will open again with Senators Clay, Bacon, Money, Patterson and Bailey. A vote on the bill will not be reached for two weeks yet and perhaps longer.

On Saturday Senator Bailey of Texas made a brilliant speech against the embassy to the coronation of Edward. The senate on the consideration of the appropriation bill, he offered an amendment to the effect that no money appropriated by this bill should be used to pay the expenses of envoys to the coronation of Edward. "If," said Mr. Bailey, "we are to send a special embassy to the coronation of this monarch in Great Britain, we must hereafter send to every monarch, or else give affront to the nation concerned." Continuing, he said: "If it be true that we have sent embassies to the coronation of European rulers, I ask if special embassies ever have been sent to the inauguration of the president of the United States? Are they entitled at our hands to what they do not give us?" Mr. Bailey finally withdrew his coronation amendment and in its place offered a resolution declaring that it is beyond the power of the president to appoint special embassies without the consent of the senate, the resolution went over. The senate then passed the army appropriation bill.

The president has named Hon. Herbert G. Squires, who is now secretary to the legation of the United States in Cuba, which is launched to the world on Wednesday, May 20. He has also appointed Ewell S. Bragg of Wisconsin to be consul general at Havana, Cuba.

The house has passed the bills to admit the territories of Oklahoma, New Mexico and Arizona into the statehood of the United States, a measure considered by the house during the past week. The first proposition was to unite Arizona and New Mexico into one territory and then admit it into statehood as the state of Montezuma. But this amendment was beaten and in its stead the bill admitting each of them was passed.

The senate on Saturday passed a bill appropriating one hundred thousand dollars for the relief of the sufferers on the island of Martinique, who have suffered one of the worst calamities of the modern times. From present reports the eruptions are progressing all over the Indies and the loss of life is estimated in Martinique alone to be about forty thousand lives. The whole city of St. Pierre, containing about twenty-five thousand souls, has been destroyed in a space of three minutes by eruptions from Mount Pelee. This volcano was believed by all to be entirely extinct, but in the space of three minutes it burst forth and engulfed the whole section of the island. Ashes from the eruption have been found over a hundred miles away and it is impossible as yet to reach the island. The United States consul and family, it is believed, lost their lives. Further reports show that a volcano on the island of St. Vincent is in

(Continued on Page 5.)

## WHERE IS BRYAN?

The Gold Democrats on the Tariff and the Meat Trust—What is Mr. Bryan's Position Asks Mr. DeHart

Gold democrats, as they call themselves in this part of the country, are teaching that the protective tariff raises prices. The New York Journal, New York World, New York Herald and other democratic papers are teaching this doctrine. They believe in free trade or a tariff for revenue only, and whether they are free traders or revenue tariffers, they are opposed to protective tariffs on the ground that they raise the prices of the necessities of life. At the present time they are pointing to the exceptionally high price of meat and saying that the tariff duty on foreign meat is the cause of the high price of all meat produced in this country. They say, for instance, that the duty of 2 cents a pound on foreign beef is the cause of the high price of beef produced here and the cause of the high price of veal produced in this country. They say that the tariff duty of 2 cents a pound on foreign veal. They say the same thing with respect to pork and mutton.

The truth is, that whenever this country can produce any commodity, not only in sufficient quantities to supply our own people, but can send a portion of the supply abroad, then the price here does not depend upon the duty on the similar foreign article. For instance, if we can produce all the meat we want here, and can send meat abroad then the price of meat here does not depend upon the price abroad or the duty on similar foreign meat. If, for instance, we can supply all the beef we want and can send beef abroad, then the price of beef here does not depend upon the duty on foreign beef. The same is true of mutton and pork. This being true, it is a gross misrepresentation for gold democrats, or any one else, to say that the high price of meat is due to a duty of 2 cents a pound on foreign beef, veal, mutton and pork.

With respect to commodities which we can produce, but are not producing in sufficient quantities to satisfy our own demands, then the price may be affected by the duty on similar foreign commodities. Sugar is a commodity of this class. We are producing it, but not in sufficient quantities to satisfy our own demands. If there is a duty on foreign sugar and we are obliged to go to foreign countries for sugar, then the duty will have a tendency to raise the price in this country. The same is true of sugar here, which has to pay no duty, but of all sugar. It would certainly have a tendency to raise the price of foreign sugar, because the price of foreign sugar, when brought here, depends upon the price abroad, plus transportation, plus duty. This has a tendency to make a high price of foreign sugar, when brought here, and, as a combination or trust among our sugar producers, they can raise the price of all sugar produced here to the level of foreign sugar. But, when the price of domestic sugar is thus raised, it is done not by the tariff duty alone or by the trust alone, but by the two combined. The remedy in such cases is either to remove the tariff duty or the trust. If we wish to protect our own sugar producers, we should combine the production of sugar in this country by a duty on foreign sugar, then the proper remedy is to keep the duty on foreign sugar and break up the unlawful trust or combination and compel them to sell their sugar to the highest bidder or what the market will fetch. If we think that our own sugar producers, the beet men for instance, ought to have some protection against foreign beet sugar, fed by a bounty abroad, then we keep the duty on foreign sugar and watch for a combination among our own beet sugar producers. At the present time, there might, with propriety, be an argument as to whether or not the price of domestic sugar is affected by the duty on foreign sugar, but there is no room for argument as to whether or not the price of domestic meat is affected by the duty on foreign meat. Therefore, if we find the price of meat unusually high, we must look for the cause in some other direction than the tariff law. The gold democrats, in pointing to the tariff duty on meat, as the cause of the high price of meat, are making no distinction between meat and sugar, which latter commodity is very different from the former, because we have to go abroad for a part of our sugar and do not have to go abroad for any part of our meat. If democrats could only keep in their minds that this country can produce more than we want of some commodities and not as much as we want of another class of commodities, it would help them to understand the practical working of a tariff law.

With respect to commodities which we do not produce at all, such as tea and coffee, the price here depends upon the price abroad, plus transportation, plus duty. With respect to all such commodities, the duty has a tendency to raise the price to the consumer, as much as the duty at least, if not more, because these commodities cannot be had without paying the price abroad, in addition to transportation and import duty, as well as an export duty in the foreign country from which these goods come, if there happens to be an export duty. There is no room open for argument as to the practical effect of a tariff duty on these commodities. If the gold democrats would take into consideration the fact that there are at least three kinds of commodities, namely, those we cannot or do not want to produce at all, those that we can produce, but not in sufficient quantities to supply our demands at home, and those that we can produce in such quantities as to supply not only our home markets, but to send a surplus abroad, it would

help them to understand the practical working of a tariff law, especially as regards prices. It would also enable them to see that there is such a thing as a science of tariff taxation. Tariff taxation, as a science, is no new thing. It has been known a long time. Among some statesmen it has been considered only as a fine art to get money out of the pockets of the people without their knowing it, or, if they knew it, without their feeling it. Our fathers understood it well. They considered that a tariff law might be used not only for getting money for the support of the federal government, but for encouraging domestic industries and building up the country rapidly. This policy was commenced at the beginning of the federal government and continued, by the consent of all political parties, until 1846, when the south got control of the treasury department at Washington and made a law on the lines of "tariff-for-revenue-only." This is what the gold democrats want to do now, but in these times we want statesmen who can look upon tariff laws, not merely as a means of getting money out of the people, without their knowing it, for the support of the federal government, but who can look upon tariff taxation as a science. McKinley studied the tariff during his whole public life. If not before, as a science, Henry Clay devoted his life to the same subject and educated a school of statesmen. Abraham Lincoln was a pupil of Henry Clay, and, in the early part of his political career, was as much absorbed in the tariff as he afterwards was in the slavery question. John C. Calhoun devoted a large part of his life to tariff, the other part being devoted to slavery and how the tariff and slavery were connected; and the result of his work and study was a school of statesmen who believed in the tariff-for-revenue-only. There has never been a school of statesmen in this country (Henry George excepted) who believed in free trade with respect to all kinds of commodities. The school of the protectionists, founded by Clay, advocated more free trade than the school of Calhoun, because the former believed in free trade with respect to all commodities the country could not produce, while the latter believed in putting duties on all commodities, whether we could produce them or not.

The democratic party in 1846 adopted the Calhoun plan of tariff, as appears by the tariff law of that year. At that time the whigs were the opposition party. They were divided on the subject, some believing in Henry Clay and some in Calhoun. Ten years later (1856) when the republican party was formed, all republicans were believers in Henry Clay and all democrats were believers in Calhoun. This was the case four years later (1860) when Lincoln was elected president against two democrats, who each believed in tariff for revenue only. For twenty years on this subject, I think the people here in the east would like to hear what Mr. Bryan has to say on the issue as now presented by the gold democrats? He hasn't talked tariff since 1894, when the Wilson bill was before the country. The gold democrats are evidently preparing to elect the next house of representatives on the tariff question, and the republicans are evidently very willing to join is-sues with them on this subject. I think the people here in the east would like to hear what Mr. Bryan has to say on the issue as now presented between the gold democrats and the republicans.

The great defect of the republicans is, not that they favor protective tariffs, but that they do not favor an income tax. The great defect of the republicans is, the silver issue, revenue tariffs or free trade in all commodities and do not favor an income tax. In opposing the income tax the republicans and gold democrats are agreed.

JNO. S. DE HART.  
Jersey City, N. J.

POPS EXTEND THEIR SYMPATHY

The miserable creatures, who edit the great dailies have given another exhibition of their contemptible funkyness. Until the terrific assault began by the opposition in the senate generally, they were all for the policies adopted in the Philippines and sending special representatives to help crown kings in Europe. As to the Philippines they are all "lying low," but as to coronation embassies they have "fopped" and are all down on it now. The Chicago Tribune says: "The United States should not take special notice of coronations," and that senators "either because they have thought the matter out for themselves or because they perceive the displeasure of the people at the departure from republican principles involved in dancing attendance by the United States at purely monarchical functions, are desirous that the bad precedent of officially recognizing coronations shall not be established."

On this subject as well as on several others the administration has been forced to adopt the populist view and act accordingly. It seems now that Whitelaw Reid will have to pay his own expenses and when he arrives at King Edward's court he will have no credentials. Poor Whitelaw Reid! The pops extend their sympathy to him in his awful distress.

For three years our flag has been in the Philippines as the symbol of subjugation, and Roosevelt says "it must stay put."

## PRESIDENT CARMACK

Our Washington Correspondent Suggests Senator Carmack for President—Expense of Government—War Expenses

Washington, D. C., May 14, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—The democracy of the United States senate has developed a new leader—none other than Senator Carmack of Tennessee. The ability and force with which he has managed the minority side of the Philippine debate has been a source of great pride to his friends and of material benefit to his party. As a quick and ready debater, he has no equal on the floor of the senate. "Carmack for president" has a pleasant sound—and if one time in our history the south may have a nominee, the Tennessee senator would bring to the executive office the same high character that has established his senatorial leadership.

The old soldiers have another objection before them of the extreme love felt for them (?) by the party in power. H. Clay Evans, pension commissioner, has come in for unlimited condemnation from the old soldiers for years, yet President McKinley failed to remove him from office. While Roosevelt has been compelled to do so, he has appointed him to the consul generalship at London at \$5,000 a year. In the meantime, paying job under the administration—as a reward for his pension bureau services. It is a good vindication for Evans, but a little rough on the G. A. R.

The president has signed the oleo bill and the law is now in full force and effect.

Nebraska reform workers who have for years advocated the initiative and referendum will be glad to know a light is breaking in the east on this very subject. The Chicago Record-Herald, in a recent editorial headed "Shall We have the Referendum?" said:

"The referendum is a remedy for the greatest evils of democracy, such as corrupt legislation and government by bosses. It is a remedy more serious in discussion at this time than ever before. A growing disposition on the part of the people to test its efficacy in rescuing the principles of self-government is manifest in nearly every state."

"This, of course, is due to the popular realization of the fact that we are losing the power to control legislation. So far as the selection of the men who do the governing is concerned, we have comparatively little power. That is a matter that is largely controlled by bosses and party machines. They do the nominating and we ratify the nominations. The question is, Shall the bosses also be permitted to control issues and general policies? Shall the American people have the option of defeating now and then a measure which party contributors or managers have with much difficulty and expense forced through the legislative body?"

The Record-Herald is the leading republican organ of the west and yet its argument for the plan urged by the reform forces as being any democratic or populist reform. This outburst from the republican paper was induced by the corruption involved in the municipal politics of many of our great cities.

"In this day 'the machine' or 'the organization' is everything. In order to maintain its power, the army of employees must be increased and fed. City and county offices are honey-combed with a useless number of clerks and subordinates. Extravagant and reckless expenditure of public moneys everywhere. The appetite grows more and more insatiable. Improvements of streets, parks, water-works, and what not, must be made. The taxation limit has been reached, and the next thing is a resort to the legislature for an issue of bonds. And the mountain of indebtedness goes on piling up. And 'the machine' methods have so developed that the legislature has become a necessary part of its existence."

And, in many cases, it is this sort of legislatures who are called upon to choose United States senators. Is it any wonder that the same persuasive influence that can force a franchise grab through a legislature can have much the same influence when it comes to choosing a senator of the United States?

To demonstrate the corruption prevailing in municipal politics, it is well to submit some figures. For the year 1900 the per capita cost of maintaining and operating the federal government, including maintenance of the army and navy, for every man, woman and child in the United States, was \$6.39.

For operating the state government of Ohio for the same year, the per capita cost was but \$1.59. The per capita cost for a number of prominent American cities ranged from \$21.50 per capita in the case of New York city down to \$11.49 in the case of Chicago. With the enormous cost of the American army and navy engaged in the prosecution of a foreign war of conquest, still the per capita cost of maintaining New York city was six times greater.

There is but one remedy for such a condition—municipal control of all public utilities and the initiative and referendum vote for the settlement of all public questions. In this sketch of the workings of "the machine" and its extravagances, I do not condemn organization for party purposes. Organization is absolutely indispensable in the control of party politics, and this fact should be brought closely home to the reform forces of Nebraska. There we are lax in our methods. We have the votes to control state politics—what is most needed is organization.—(Continued on Page 5.)