

FAR WESTERN SENATORS AND SENTIMENT.

Tacoma, Wash., July 22, 1909.

It seems to be assumed that the Senators responsible for the tariff bill as it came from their House misrepresented their constituents. So far, however, as the Senators from the Rocky Mountain and Pacific slope regions are concerned, this criticism is unjust. The Senators from those sections—more's the pity—have represented and do represent the sentiments of their constituents. The fact constitutes not only a regrettable but a positively alarming feature of the tariff question.

If the people of the sections of the country mentioned were not protection-mad, their Senators would not have voted for the Aldrich bill. If their Senators had not voted for the Aldrich bill, Aldrich wouldn't have had votes enough to pass his bill. It is a fair conclusion, therefore, that the people of the far West, by reason of their abject ignorance on economic questions, and their devotion to a worn-out system of tariff robbery, are directly responsible for the fact that the whole country may be afflicted with that system indefinitely.

+

Take, for example, the State of Washington.

There is a belief in this State, amounting almost to a superstition, that a tariff on lumber is necessary to the well-being of the State. Everybody out here believes it. Nobody questions it. The thought that such a belief may be erroneous never enters the head of the average man. There is not, so far as I know, a newspaper in the State which has ever dared to suggest that the lumber tariff was not a direct benefit to every man, woman and child in the State.

When a Senator is sent from here to the national capital, he understands that his first duty is to "protect" the lumber interest. He knows that if he fails in this, he will not be re-elected at the end of his term. Not only do the people themselves demand it, but the large lumber interests are openly and avowedly in politics, and ready to punish a recalcitrant or indifferent Senator.

Of course the only way a Washington Senator can secure a tariff on lumber, is to cast his lot and his vote with the protection (Aldrich) combine in the Senate. He must vote for every species of tariff injustice, in order to protect the graft in which his constituents imagine they are interested. And, while there is some kicking in this State over the enormities of the Aldrich bill, not one in a thousand, apparently, is acute enough to trace effect back to cause, and realize the responsibility of his State and of himself for the existence of those enormities.

+

The same is true of Idaho.

In north Idaho are the large lead mines of the Coeur d'Alene mining district. It is a cardinal article of faith with Idahoans that the prosperity of the State hinges upon the maintenance of a tariff on lead ore. Senator William E. Borah of Idaho, a man almost as progressive in his political ideas as Cummins or La Follette or Bristow, has been forced

into a quasi-alliance with Aldrich, against his will, in order to "protect" the lead industry.

+

Utah is interested in lead and wool, and her people are blinded by the same superstition that afflicts Washington and Idaho.

Senator Chamberlain of Oregon, elected as a Democrat on a reform wave, was forced to vote for the wool and lumber schedules to retain his standing at home.

Wyoming people are infatuated with the idea that their State will go to the devil if the tariff on coal or hides or wool is reduced or abolished.

+

This tariff devotion of the people of those States works in two ways:

First, it prevents really progressive Senators like Borah and Chamberlain from lining up with the forces of progress in the Senate.

Second, it furnishes the excuse which men like Warren of Wyoming, Smoot of Utah and Heyburn of Idaho wish for aligning themselves with the forces of reaction, and prevents their being disciplined by constituencies which they daily outrage by their conduct in the Senate.

+

One example of the utter ignorance of the people of the far West on the tariff question may be cited.

During the campaign last fall, Senator Heyburn of Idaho, who is more reactionary, if possible, than Aldrich himself, repeatedly stated from the stump in Idaho that the panic of 1893, and the hard times which followed it, were caused by "the influx of foreign goods" under the Wilson bill (which was not passed until 1894). He did not occupy the usual protectionist ground, and assert that the hard times were caused by the threat of tariff reduction and "free trade," but openly and brazenly asserted from every stump that it was caused by the actual importation of foreign goods in competition with American goods.

I am aware that it is almost unbelievable that a Senator of the United States would resort to such falsehood and misrepresentation—such total political dishonesty; but anyone who doubts it may refer to the abstracts of Senator Heyburn's speeches published in the columns of the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review.

Now the remarkable thing is that, so far as I know, Heyburn's assertion was never questioned. No newspaper denied it; no opposition orator pointed out its falsity. It was permitted to go unchallenged. And, when the legislature met at Boise, in the January following the campaign, Heyburn was re-elected by the unanimous vote of every Republican member of that body.

Fred T. Dubois, who, as a Democrat, formerly represented Idaho in the Senate, and who is unquestionably an honest man, always took particular care to befriend the lead and beet sugar tariffs, because he knew that to oppose either one meant his political extinction.

+

Now, I don't have to tell the readers of The Pub-

lic that a tariff on lumber benefits nobody in Washington, save the owners of standing timber; that a tariff on lead benefits nobody in Idaho but the owners of lead mines; that a tariff on wool benefits nobody but the landowner or the land grabber; that nobody in Wyoming is helped by a tariff on coal except the Union Pacific Railroad Company, which owns every working coal mine in the State, and which will not permit an independent mine to ship at equal terms on its road; nor do I have to point out that there is no possibility by which the average citizen of those states can be benefited by the tariffs which he so enthusiastically supports.

The point I wish to make is that we must go deeper than the mere combination of Senators at Washington to serve selfish interests, in order to place responsibility for the tariff bill. If it were merely a question of our Senators misrepresenting us, we could easily correct that, because out West here we are electing Senators in direct primaries; but the trouble is that our Senators do not misrepresent us,—at least not to the extent that some people seem to think they do. The Senators from the far West have been doing our bidding.

+

It is not my purpose to point out a remedy for this condition.

As a matter of fact, there is only one remedy. It is to be found in the economic education of the masses.

But how are you to educate a people who believe that they are the custodians of an inspired economic principle, and that you are groping in the heathen darkness of "British free trade"?

Theoretically I believe, I suppose, in the Initiative and Referendum; but I can't overlook the fact that high protection, militarism, government-by-injunction, the big army and the big navy and the "big stick" have all in turn been submitted with practical directness to the people at the polls, and their decisions on those questions do not impress me with the efficacy of the referendum as a measure of reform.

PUGET SOUNDER.

[The foregoing editorial letter is published without the name of the writer, because men in business and dependent upon it for a livelihood cannot afford the risks of publicity when they write of the economic, political and social conditions which prevail in any of the embryo dukedoms of America in which their bread-winning work is done. If there is oslerization for the worker above forty in years, there is something analogous to oslerization for business men who write too frankly and publicly. The writer is, however, peculiarly well qualified to testify upon the subject which his letter covers; and from many other sources of information, we are convinced of the accuracy of his statements.—Editors of The Public.]

+ + +

First Young Lady (learning golf): "Dear me, what shall I do now? This ball is in a hole."

Second Young Lady (looking over a book of instructions): "Let—me—see. I presume you will have to take a stick of the right shape to get it out."

First Young Lady: "Oh, yes, of course. See if you can find one like a dustpan and brush."—Tit-Bits.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date. ☉

Week ending Tuesday, August 3, 1909.

Revolution in Spain.

The rioting in Spain over the sending of more troops to Morocco, reported last week (p. 730), has developed into revolution. The poorer classes have complained that the rich can escape conscription by the payment of \$300, and that they themselves are being sent to Morocco to be killed in a rich man's war. The strongest resistance to the Government's program was initiated at Barcelona, as reported. This city lies in northeast Spain, on the Mediterranean, in the old province of Catalonia. It is the second largest city in the country, and is the commercial and manufacturing metropolis. Catalonia has always been the home of republican movements for Spain, and of late years both socialism and anarchism have made wide propaganda there.

+

The rioting became more violent on the 28th, and took on an anti-clerical form. Many churches, colleges and convents were wrecked in Barcelona and the smaller neighboring towns; monks and nuns were murdered; railroads were torn up, and the movement began to assume the proportions of a revolution. King Alfonso, who had been hooted in the streets of Madrid on his arrival from the country, declared all Spain to be under martial law, and announced a temporary suspension of constitutional guarantees. In the meantime news came of more reverses for the Spanish troops in Morocco, with a long list of dead. Strict censorship of news had been established, and on the 29th the Government announced that the chief bands of Barcelona insurgents had been driven by cavalry into St. Martin's square and shot down, until the survivors surrendered. During the three days of fighting in Catalonia, of which this was the third, 1,500 insurgents are believed to have fallen. Following their apparent control of the situation the Government instituted drumhead courts martial, and the condemned were summarily stood up against walls and shot. In the meantime socialists and radicals were being freely arrested in Madrid. On the 1st uncertain news crept through the censorship, of more insurgent fight-