

Congressman Newland's Interview.

The San Francisco Examiner prints an interesting interview with Nevada's congressman, Francis G. Newlands. Mr. Newlands expressed satisfaction with the political situation. He said that he believed it is becoming clear to the minds of many citizens who have been identified with the republican party that that party is in behalf of monopoly or favored legislation for the few rather than by beneficent legislation for the masses. Mr. Newlands said that what the democrats required is harmony of sentiment in the party, rather than the apparent harmony that is produced by placating those who differ with us in our views, and thus attempting to secure votes. Nothing can be accomplished by endeavoring to secure the support of those who really prefer republican policies to our own.

He declared that the principal issues in the pending campaign were the Philippines, the trusts, domestic development as opposed to Philippine expansion and conquest, and the general tendency of the republican party to favor privilege and wealth at the expense of the producing masses. Asked if the trust question will be a prominent issue, Mr. Newlands replied:

"Yes, the most prominent. The republican party will go into the campaign this fall relying mainly upon the expressions of President Roosevelt in his message and his Pittsburg speech as indications of its anti-trust proclivities. But the question is not what Mr. Roosevelt's views are, but what the views of the republican party are on this question; and, above all, what the action of the republican party has been during its six years of power just passed.

"I regard Mr. Roosevelt as pre-eminent in the republican party for sincerity, earnestness and courage; but Mr. Roosevelt is not the platform of the republican party. He was never elected president of the United States. He was governor of the state of New York, and there he sought to bring the great wealth of that state into some reasonable degree of contribution to the state expenses. New York republicans forced Mr. Roosevelt into the vice presidency to get rid of a reform governor. Their action was not in the interest of reform, but against it. They hoped to put him in a position of absolute inaction. The action of the assassin, not the action of the republican party, put Mr. Roosevelt into the presidential chair; and outside of the radical question of party differences, democrats must concede that President Roosevelt has conducted himself well and that he is an American of whom every American should feel proud. The question is not whether Mr. Roosevelt is a reform president, but whether the republican party is a reform party. That is the issue this campaign. I contend that the republican party is against the president. So far as its action is concerned, whatever may be its verbal expressions, it is against the president and is not in sympathy with his reform views, though it will exploit them before the public for the purpose of securing an extension of power.

"Now what is the trust issue?" added Mr. Newlands. "Our contention is that the public utilities and the transportation facilities and the corporation laws of the country are being so perverted as to promote the formation of immense combinations of wealth, which on the one hand are escaping the burdens of taxation and on the other hand are obtaining an undue proportion of the profits of production. The anti-trust sentiment is not hostile to wealth as such. It recognizes the fact that there must be inequalities of fortune, arising from difference in ability and opportunity.

But it does seek to obliterate inequality so far as the law is concerned, and to prevent the machinery of the law from being used in such a way as to unduly promote the wealth of the few at the expense of the many. The anti-trust sentiment is not organized against law-abiding wealth, but against the lawless wealth of the country—the wealth which seeks exemption from taxation, which seeks special privileges; the wealth which evades and perverts the law in order to oppress the people.

"The republican party has been in power for six years, yet it has done nothing in the way of legislation to meet these evils. On the contrary, it has legislated to promote them. In the repeal of war revenue taxes the democratic party stood for an endeavor to prevent the repeal of the tax on the gross receipts of the oil refineries from which we were getting a total of \$1,000,000 annually. Recognizing the fact that all the great trusts should contribute something to the federal burden, and that the oil trust and the sugar trust were alone being taxed, we wanted to perfect this tax by reducing the percentage and extending it to all industrial corporations whose gross receipts exceeded \$1,000,000 annually. We sought in this connection, by our amendment, to compel publicity through public statements under oath as to the capital, debts, operating expenses, receipts, profits, wages paid, etc., of these industrial corporations, thus securing the very publicity for which Mr. Roosevelt subsequently contended in his message and in his Pittsburg speech.

"But the republicans stood together and repealed the tax altogether, so that these corporations contribute nothing to the federal treasury and an opportunity for trust-regulating was lost.

"Later on, when the census bill was pending in the senate, Senator Dubois offered an amendment providing that the inquiry should be extended to trusts, and that published statements of their affairs should be made. His amendment followed exactly the recommendation which President Roosevelt made in his message. Senator Qualess, a republican, who was in charge of the bill, appealed to Dubois to withdraw the amendment, saying it would endanger the bill; but Dubois insisted on a vote, and the republicans lined up against it and the democrats for it, so the amendment was beaten. The republican party protects the trusts. Of course, before the people, they will quote the sayings of the president, but when they want campaign funds from the trusts they will point to their congressional action.

"Then the Cuban reciprocity bill passed the house. But because it contained a provision in the interests of our own consumers as well as the Cuban producers, by repealing the additional duty on refined sugar, which the sugar trust wishes to be maintained, the republican senate refused to report the bill.

"Mr. Roosevelt had a splendid opportunity here to side with the anti-trust sentiment in both houses and possibly force the reporting of this bill; but he failed to avail himself of it. The bill as it passed the house gave relief to the sugar consumers of this country by the abolition of a tax which protected one of the most unpopular trusts in the country. Mr. Roosevelt evidently concluded that it was more important to maintain the protective tariff as a whole regardless of its abuses and inequalities, rather than to give relief to the Cuban sugar producers and to American consumers. The democratic party in caucus voted against adjournment until a trust bill and the Cuban reciprocity bill should be passed. But the repub-

lican party voted for an adjournment without action on these questions."

In speaking of western questions Mr. Newlands said:

"As for the west, the democratic party stood solid for the admission of New Mexico, Oklahoma and Arizona, but the republican senate tied the bill up.

"On the irrigation bill, although the president was strongly with the west and supported the measure, he failed to get the support of the republican leaders in the house, and the result was that, though the republicans were largely in the majority and the republicans from the arid regions made a splendid fight for the bill, the majority of the votes cast for this measure were democratic. Of the 55 who voted against the bill 13 only were democrats, the remainder were republicans. Prior to the vote the democratic congressional campaign committee passed a resolution favoring the bill. The friendliness of the democratic leaders toward the west was in marked contrast with the hostility of the republican leaders. In every way the democratic party showed its sympathy with the west.

"This tendency of the democratic party means much for San Francisco. Her development depends on the growth in population and wealth of the states and territories to the east of her. These are the people who will raise the products that go to the Orient and will consume the products that come from the Orient, of which products, coming and going, San Francisco will make the exchanges. There can be no great expansion of San Francisco trade without the expansion of her trade in the adjoining states and territories. Nevada's decline contributed much to San Francisco's depression. Her growth will mean to San Francisco more than a hundred Philippines.

"We have spent over three hundred million dollars in the Philippines in the past four years, and our trade has amounted in that time to less than twenty million. Assuming that 10 per cent of this is profit, we have received a profit in trade of \$2,000,000 and have expended \$300,000,000. As a business proposition this does not look well, and it will never look better if the present policy is pursued. Then, as a matter of prestige and sentiment we have gained nothing. There is no glory in sending thousands of big Americans 9,000 miles over the sea to kill a lot of little brown men who are afflicted with the same mad desire for independence that characterized our people in the revolution.

"I can understand why the expansion sentiment should be stronger here than elsewhere," continued Mr. Newlands, "for San Francisco has been pre-eminently the beneficiary of this war, as a large portion of the supplies were bought here. This, coming at the end of a long period of depression, naturally turned the tide. But I submit that in the long run San Francisco will gain more from a policy of peace in the Orient than from a policy of war. The democratic contention is that we should not withdraw immediately from the Philippines, but that we should give them the assurance that in ten years, during which time a stable system of self-government could be gradually organized, we would withdraw. During this time trade would take the place of war and we would tie these people to us by the bonds of mutual trade advantage instead of driving them into every form of hatred and retaliation by attempted conquest and subjugation. What we want is the friendship of the Orient; not its hostility. A few naval and coaling stations will be much more serviceable to us as part of the machinery of commerce than the subjugation of a country eager to pursue its own line of national life."

Speaking of the money question, Mr. Newlands said:

"The action of the republican party

on the money question was characteristic. We have always insisted that after they succeeded in stopping the coinage of silver they would start in to dispense with the existing stock. This they proposed to do by the Hill bill, which was passed in the house by the republicans and opposed by the democrats, which is now pending in the senate. Under existing conditions we have about \$600,000,000 of silver, represented by silver certificates and in general circulation. They form one-third of our metallic money, and are indispensable to the transaction of business. These certificates are backed by full legal tender silver dollars in the treasury. The bill which passed the house gives the secretary of the treasury the power to melt up all these silver dollars, thus retiring the certificates, and recoin the dollars into small coin—10-cent pieces, quarters and half-dollars—which will not be a full legal tender and of which only a small amount is needed. If this is done we will then have a cry that this silver can be put to no use, and then the proposition will be to sell it, like old junk, as bullion, thus further depressing the silver market and producing at the same time a contraction of our volume of money."

On the question of organized labor, Mr. Newlands said:

"I believe that the organization of the laborers of the country in unions and federations is doing much to turn the labor of the country, on which all wealth is based, to a proper comprehension of a rational system of government. In the meetings of these unions and federations and in their newspapers and periodicals all questions relating to social science, the relations of capital to labor and the relations of government to the happiness and prosperity of the people are being more thoroughly discussed and considered than anywhere else.

"I believe it should be the policy of the democratic party to co-operate with and seek the support of these great organizations, and thus make itself what it has always claimed to be—the party of the people."

Items of Interest.

The offspring of two rabbits might in ten years number 70,000,000.

Canada's yield of cereals this year is estimated at 300,000,000 bushels.

Nearly 90 per cent of Germany's railways belong to the government.

Taking the world as a whole 25 per cent die before they reach the age of 17.

Emigrants to South Africa are officially warned to wait until land can be secured for them.

The population of Damascus, reputed the oldest city in the world, is calculated at 225,000 souls.

San Francisco leads American cities with the largest ratio of suicides, or 39.1 per 100,000 of population.

In a recent number of the Scottish Medical and Surgical Journal Sir Arthur Mitchell holds that dreamless sleep is a myth.

The two American cities in which the number of colored inhabitants is increasing most largely are Washington and Philadelphia.

A summer loan exhibition of Japanese art at the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London, was visited by 90,000 people, chiefly of the poorer classes.

Berlin has its first female barbers—the wife and daughter of a hairdresser. In Bohemia, Hungary and Scandinavia there are many women barbers.

Transplanted eyelashes and eyebrows are said to be the latest things in the way of personal adornment. Only the brave and rich can patronize the new method at present, for, besides being painful and costly, it takes a long time to accomplish it.—Pittsburg Dispatch.