

# SENATOR TILLMAN "STIRS UP THE ANIMALS"

Washington, D. C., Jan. 1.—Before congress had been in session three days Senator Tillman opened his guns on the enemy in a manner the republicans will not forget in many a long year. The South Carolinian is held in high personal esteem by nearly every political opponent in the chamber. They recognize in the man both ability and rugged honesty, and he is given credit for the absolute sincerity of his actions in public life. That the speeches of Senator Tillman have greatly worried the republicans there cannot be the slightest doubt. The animated debate primarily stirred up by him on two occasions since the new congress assembled, and the pertinent statements bearing on campaign contributions made by insurance companies and other corporations which Mr. Tillman has caused to be printed in the Record, will furnish during the next contests for control of the house some of the most valuable literature ever put in circulation for the edification and enlightenment of voters.

Mr. Tillman found a means of precipitating the first debate of the session in which he engaged by introducing a resolution calling upon the secretary of the treasury for information as to whether any of the examinations of national banks showed that the officers of these institutions had paid out money to be used for political purposes.

Of such a searching mind is Mr. Tillman, although not a lawyer, that it remained for this farmer-senator to discover, and to call vividly to the attention of his fellow senators, a provision in the act creating the department of commerce and labor giving the right to the corporation bureau to practically regulate insurance companies engaging in interstate business. As shrewd and watchful a statesman as Mr. Hale, of Maine, was forced to his feet and had to acknowledge plainly that the clause quoted by Mr. Tillman was not originally in the bill. Mr. Hale confessed that he was puzzled and did not know how the provision crept into the measure, and did not realize that he was either voting for a bill or allowing a bill to pass without protest that gave to any department of the government the authority to take in charge the business of insurance companies as a part of the interstate commerce. Mr. Hale further said that he did not feel that the senate or any senator was bound by the fact that in the hurry of legislation upon a subject not thoroughly investigated

a clause crept in giving authority to investigate insurance matters.

In his flash-like quickness Mr. Tillman went back at Mr. Hale with this answer: "It is there all the same! It is a law passed by both branches of congress and approved by the president, and is law until repealed."

Mr. Tillman has not only this session introduced a short bill for the regulation of railroad rates but immediately after offering it obtained recognition and made a speech on his bill that brought into the discussion Mr. Foraker, of Ohio, Mr. Knox, of Pennsylvania, until recently attorney general in the cabinet of President Roosevelt; Mr. Gallinger, of New Hampshire and other shining lights on the republican side of the chamber.

Mr. Tillman's bill provides that whenever the interstate commerce commission shall, upon complaint and hearing, decide that any charge made for such service is unreasonable, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to fix a maximum and reasonable rate for such service, and to make an order specifying the time, which shall be within thirty days after the date of such order, when such rate shall take effect; and thereafter such rate shall be the only lawful rate which the carrier may collect until changed by further order of the commission.

In vain did the republicans try to confuse and disconcert Senator Tillman by insisting that his sole aim was to give the commission power to fix rates and that there could be no appeal to the courts. He very promptly replied that the railways should have the right to go into the courts to seek redress. It was a right, he said, guaranteed to them by the constitution itself.

Mr. Tillman has also taken an active part in the discussions this session on the Panama canal matter appropriation, and no senator receives closer attention than he from his fellow legislators, or is more pleasing to the intelligent men and women who come from all portions of the United States to listen to the debates from the ample and luxurious galleries provided for visitors.

The candor and fearlessness of Senator Tillman are generally recognized by those who have watched his career both as governor of his state and as senator. A wrong committed by any prominent man of his own party is condemned as

quickly by him as if the offender belonged to the republican party which he has been valiantly fighting for so many years. While the Panama canal emergency appropriation was under consideration in the senate, Mr. Allison, the veteran chairman of the appropriations committee, was pressed hard by the South Carolinian to explain the system under which the contracts for the work on the isthmus are being let. It embarrassed Mr. Allison no little bit to have to answer the rapid questions of inquiry fired at him by Mr. Tillman. For instance, Mr. Tillman forced the admission that a provision in the original canal bill limits the total cost to \$135,000,000, and yet Mr. Tillman said there was no telling but what the entire amount might be spent and the enterprise be not half completed. Driving Mr. Allison still further Mr. Tillman brought a reluctant confession from the Iowa statesman that unless the practice of letting the contracts by piecemeal was suspended, and a contract for the whole work given to some responsible man or firm, the enterprise would be in the clouds or the air somewhere. As there is much rain down in Panama Mr. Tillman suggested that "in the mud" was more appropriate.

Few senators could take the stand Mr. Tillman does with reference to the canal without being suspected of indirectly playing into the hands of several of the gigantic railway corporations, and so far as the officers of which are concerned the failure of the canal would be both a pleasure and a blessing. No one would ever think of charging Mr. Tillman with an alliance with any sort of corporation. There are, of course, senators in Mr. Tillman's own party just as honest, just as sincere and just as loyal democrats, who may be depended upon to bluntly speak their sentiments in the interesting discussions that are constantly coming up with reference to the Panama canal. Some senators have admitted privately that Senator Tillman has an incisive, open way of getting at the very heart of things, and he probes until he brings out what he goes after. If they should take a similar stand on the canal question they would not only be accused, they say, of voting and working in the interest of the railroads and other corporations, but the cry would be heard that they were placing obstacles in the way in order to prevent the completion of the canal.

ALFRED J. STOFER.

## WHAT ABOUT 1904?

The Portland Oregonian has an editorial entitled "The Crisis of 1896" in which it seeks to justify the contributions by insurance magnates to republican campaign funds. The Oregonian contends that had free coinage of silver carried there would have been general ruin. The Oregonian adds:

The defeat of Bryan was necessary to the safety of the insurance companies of the country, and of those who held policies in them. And nine-tenths of all who were interested in insurance knew it, and voted accordingly.

Let us, for the sake of argument, admit all for which the Oregonian contends. But how will the Oregonian justify the contributions of these policyholders' money to the republican campaign fund in 1904 when, the democratic platform being silent on the money question, the democratic nominee declared himself unequivocally in favor of the single gold standard?

Even though these republican editors convince themselves that the republican national committee was justified in its participation with the embezzlement of the policyholders' money in 1896 and in 1900, with what reason will they reject the now very popular demand "put it back" as applied to the participation by the republican national committee in the embezzlement of policyholders' money in the campaign of 1904.

## STILL EMPHASIZING THE DIFFERENCE

Nebraska has a very rigid anti-cigarette law, enacted by the last legislature, and an effort is being made to enforce it. Recently a poor and friendless young man in Lincoln was arrested while in the act of rolling a cigarette for himself, and was arrested on the charge of violating that section of the law forbidding the manufacture of the paper pipes. The young man was a day laborer, and having been in Lincoln but a

week or two had no friends. He was tried and convicted and sentenced to pay a fine of \$50. Having no money he was sent to jail to "board out the fine."

The Commoner is in hearty sympathy with the purposes of the framers of the anti-cigarette law, and is not criticising the officers for their arrest, nor the judge for the punishment inflicted. But it calls attention to this case for the purpose of contrasting it with a case mentioned a week or two ago. Bartlett Richards, a wealthy cattleman, was convicted of illegally fencing 212,000 acres of government land, and was sentenced to pay a fine of \$300 and remain in the custody of the United States marshal for six hours. In other words it is less expensive to steal 35,000 acres of government land than it is to make a cigarette in Nebraska. It costs a fraction over 1 cent an acre and imprisonment for about twenty seconds for a wealthy man to steal an acre of government land, but it costs a poor and friendless young man \$50 or thirty days in jail to make a cigarette. These two cases emphasize the difference between the treatment accorded to the rich cattleman and the treatment accorded to a friendless person. Yet there are those who wonder why so many people have lost respect for some of the courts.

## WHY THEY SHOULD HAVE IT

The Minneapolis Journal declares that "The Filipinos ought to have free trade with the United States, but not because the beet sugar industry is not important." The Journal then discusses the beet sugar industry, but fails utterly to tell why the Filipinos should have free trade with the United States. They should have it as a matter of right and justice. If they are a part and parcel of the United States they are entitled to all the rights, privileges and immunities. If the flag of the United States is their flag, then they are entitled to equal rights with all others living under that flag. If they are citizens they should not be discriminated against. If they are subjects, then the flag is a waving lie and our boasted republic

is a sham. The Filipinos ought to have free trade with the United States, or else any sub-division of the United States should be allowed to enforce tariffs against any or all other sub-divisions. In order to satisfy the ambitions and greed of a lot of exploiters we have plunged this nation into a serious predicament, and it is time that we begin the work of extrication instead of allowing it to be plunged in deeper and deeper.

## ANOTHER SUGGESTION

C. E. Mead of Greenville, Texas, sends to The Commoner a clipping from the Dallas News of December 22, which clipping gives an account of the suicide of a man seventy years of age who gave as a reason for self-destruction that he was a convert to Dr. Osler's theory that a man past sixty years of age had outlived his usefulness.

Referring to this suicide Mr. Mead says:

"I have seen it given more than once before as the reason for suicide, and thought you might like to have this item to use as a scourge for the heartless, criminal folly of this would-be philosopher. If what he has taught were so, which it is not, it were better left unsaid, as it could do no good. And from this dispatch, and others giving accounts similar, it shows that it has been the means of adding the last straw, which has carried down many a despondent soul, where a word of cheer and hope might have encouraged them to fight the battle of life. The 'theory' is a lie and a curse, and its evil influences ought to be counteracted. Your valuable paper is a good channel to start it."

The Commoner directed attention to the Osler suggestion in an article printed in the issue of August 11, 1905, which article was entitled "Mending God's Law." If Mr. Mead will read that article he will find that long ago The Commoner denounced the Osler theory and sought to impress upon its readers the importance of counteracting the evil influences of that theory.