

REPUBLICAN OPINIONS ON TARIFF TRUSTS.

Governor Mount, of Indiana, December, 1899, speaking to the Indiana Hotel Keepers:

"I emphatically favor removing all tariff protection from every industry that belongs to a combination formed in restraint of trade."

Chicago Times-Herald, March, 1899:

"Most certainly it should be the duty of congress, in both branches of which the republicans have a majority, to abolish or suspend the protective duty on the products of any industry which has been organized into a trust and which has arbitrarily raised the prices of such products."

Hon. John Sherman, in United States senate:

"Whenever this free competition is evaded or avoided by combination of individuals or corporations, the duty should be reduced and foreign competition promptly invited."

St. Paul Pioneer-Press, April, 1900:

"The whole list of protected monopolies ought to be brought within the purview of a tariff reform which would enable foreign competition to put a limit on their ability to raise prices."

Ex-Senator Washburn, of Minnesota, said in an interview in the New York Tribune of September 11, 1899:

"The republican party, whether justly or unjustly, is associated with trusts in the minds of the masses. As a party we have reached a crisis where we have got to call a halt. The republican party has got to disconnect itself from trusts. It has got to do something more than adopt platform planks against trusts.

\* \* \* \* \*

"It seems to me, after giving the matter a great deal of thought, that the republicans in congress will have to examine the subject thoroughly, and whenever they find a trust is depending for its exorbitant profits largely on protective duties it will be the duty of republican congressmen and senators to remove the duties at once. We cannot stop short of that. The duties must be repealed when it is shown that the trusts are benefiting by them. This should be done with the duty on steel rails and tin plate."

Minneapolis Journal, October 2, 1899:

"The senator is so eminently correct in his position that tariff duties which enable trusts or any other kind of monopolies to raise prices above the point at which they could otherwise be maintained should be lowered in the public interest, that we must range ourselves beside him on that proposition."

New York Commercial Advertiser, in the fall of 1899:

"The time will soon come when public opinion will no more tolerate protective duties on trust products, for protection should logically promote home compe-

tion, while trust organization destroys it."

Portland Oregonian, March, 1900:

"Because the paper trust has put up the price of printing paper to an unconscionable figure, Representative DeVries of California has introduced a bill to repeal the duty on printing paper and the material of which it is made. It is very well; but there are about 40 more big trusts that have help through protective tariff, and should be dealt with in the same way."

Senator Plumb, of Kansas, opposing the McKinley tariff, August 26, 1891:

"There are dozens of lines of manufactures covered by the terms of this bill which are controlled by trusts. \*

\* \* I do not know of any better way to start in at least to reduce the exactions of trusts than to cut down the shelter behind which trusts are created."

Philadelphia Ledger, February, 1899:

"What is imperatively required is a revision of the tariff such as will modify the rates, or, better still, place upon the free list all foreign goods, whether raw material or finished product, that are the subject of domestic monopoly."

OUR BIRTHRIGHT OF LIBERTY.

There is great danger of our crime against the Filipinos being nationally accepted as an unalterable fact. Despite vigorous protests and outcries of horror the war has been ruthlessly prosecuted. A poor, untrained, half-equipped race, struggling for freedom, has been crushed by a rich, all-powerful, grasping republic. The victim, so far as concerns its battle for independence, is probably at its last gasp. We are a busy people. Our tendency is to shrug the shoulder and, in spirit, to say with Pope that "Whatever is right." We are thinking about the Porto Rican mess and the presidential campaign. Even Bishop Potter, in whose patriotic insight so many of us trusted, now says that Philippine self-government is "only an academic question." We have gone out of our way to strangle the spirit of liberty on an island thousands of miles from our shores, and we are beginning to be proud of the achievement.

The purpose of this letter is to bring a reminder that not much over a century ago we were, ourselves, battling for that freedom which is our proudest boast; that at that time the general opinion as to the character of our people was in some respects far lower than we are now forced to entertain concerning the Filipinos; that predictions as to the impossibility of successful American self-government were then pronounced by men far abler than those who now deny such possibility to the Philippine people; and that the words uttered by the patriots of that time on both sides of the ocean cannot be re read, under the present humiliating conditions, without bringing a blush of burning shame to

the cheek of every liberty-loving American.

Burke's Speech.

As applicable to the conditions of our time, how appropriate are the words of Burke, written in 1777:

"There never was a period in which the steadfastness of some men has been put to so sore a trial. Liberty is in danger of being made unpopular to Englishmen (Americans). Contending for an imaginary power we begin to acquire the spirit of domination, and to lose the relish of honest equality. The principles of our forefathers become suspected to us, because we see them animating the present opposition of our children (of the Filipinos). The faults which grow out of the luxuriance of freedom appear much more shocking to us than the base vices which are generated from the rankness of servitude. It is impossible that we should remain long in a situation which breeds such notions and dispositions without some great alteration in the national character. Those ingenuous and feeling minds who are so fortified against all other things, and so unarmed to whatever approaches in the shape of disgrace, finding these principles, which they considered a sure means of honor, to be grown into disrepute, will retire disheartened and disgusted. Those of more robust make, the bold, able, ambitious men, who pay some of their court to power through the people and substitute the voice of transient opinion in the place of true glory, will give into the general mode; and those superior understandings which ought to correct vulgar prejudice will confirm and aggravate its errors. Many things have been long operating toward a gradual change in our principles; but this American (Philippine) war has done more in a very few years than all the other causes could have effected in a century.

A generally high opinion has been expressed as to the character and moral qualities of the Filipinos. No one has imputed to them dishonesty and cowardice. In contrast, what, based on a close political relationship and frequent personal intercourse, was English opinion concerning Americans during the revolutionary time? Franklin writes as follows:

"A little before I left London in 1775, being at the House of Lords, when a debate in which Lord Camden was to speak, and who indeed spoke admirably on American affairs, I was much disgusted from the ministerial side, by many base reflections on American courage, religion, understanding, etc., in which we were treated with the utmost contempt, as the lowest of mankind, and almost of a different species from the English of Britain; but, particularly the American honesty was abused by some of the lords, who asserted that we were all knaves and wanted only by this dispute to avoid paying our debts.

On February 2, 1775, Colonel Grant stated, in the house of commons, that "he had served in America; knew the