

Gov. JOHN LIND DEFINES THE ISSUES

Brands Eberhart a Standpat-ter and Declares Him a Foe to Sen. Clapp.

Says Danger to Junior Senator is from Stand-pat Republicans and Not From Progressive Democrats of Legislature.

Former Governor John Lind delivered a notable speech at Albert Lea Tuesday evening, October 11. He reviewed the issues in the campaign, and his speech has easily been the sensation of the campaign. The idol of the Minnesota Democracy branded Governor A. O. Eberhart, the Republican nominee, as a standpat. He showed the connection between the Republican nominee and his chairman, and pointed out that Progressive Democrats and Progressive Republicans are united in this election. The climax came in the declaration that progressives of both parties favored the re-election of Senator Moses E. Clapp, who has been a consistent Progressive in Congress. The charge was made that the Junior Senator's danger is not from Democrats but from the stand-pat element in his own party. Incidentally, Gov. Lind took occasion to declare in language unmistakable that he was in no sense a candidate for the place held by Senator Clapp and that he favored personally the return of Senator Clapp to the United States senate there to finish the work that he had begun so well in the reform of the administration's unspeakable railroad rate bill and in other progressive legislation.

Coming as it did at a time when Senator Clapp's political manager was charging the Republican state administration with an apparently deliberate and studied program of ignoring the senator's candidacy the Lind declaration for Clapp has brought the entire state of Minnesota, politically speaking, to its feet. Senator Clapp's friends are jubilant, as they have a right to be. The scheme, hatched in corporation headquarters at St. Paul, to encompass his defeat through the aid of Gov. Eberhart, his campaign manager, Senator E. E. Smith, and their satellites, will certainly be defeated by Governor Lind's exposure. Already several Democratic candidates for the senate and house of representatives, following Governor Lind's declaration, have announced their intention of voting for the return of Senator Clapp if they are honored by election.

That Governor Lind was to take a strong and vigorous position on county option was to be expected. In this respect his speech was a verification of the hopes of his friends. He complimented James Gray for his courage and fearlessness and impaled Governor Eberhart for his failure to inform the people where he stands on this important question.

The Broadway Theatre, Albert Lea, was crowded to the doors when Governor Lind opened his address, which was designed to make so profound an impression on the Minnesota political situation.

Gov. Lind opened his remarks by a reference to the retirement of James

district were actuated by the same conviction that impelled the insurgent movement in congress and that underlies the progressive movement in both parties throughout the Union.

The speaker showed by citing instances in other states that the insurgent movement is by no means confined to the Republican party. Southern Democratic constituencies had vied with northern districts and states in rebuking those whom they had determined had been unfaithful to the interests of the people.

The underlying cause is a feeling of injustice. The people feel that they have been wronged—buncoed—by their political servants, and they hold Mr. Tawney and the other standpat leaders, little and big, in both parties, responsible for the wrongs that have been inflicted. The people are determined to oust them, whether it hurts or helps any particular party. That such a feeling exists and is general is evident. The pertinent question in this campaign is whether or not there is any real foundation in fact for its existence.

Governor Lind then reviewed at length the history of governmental affairs in the country, showing conclusively that with minor issues to distract the attention of the country the monopolists had continued to lay the burden on the producers in the shape of tariff legislation. He explained that the Dingley bill was the reward of the great interests for their successful efforts to elect Mr. McKinley under Mark Hanna's leadership. There was great prosperity but it did not get down to the men and women who toiled with their hands or brains for their daily bread. The prices of clothing, shelter and all the necessities of life rose higher and higher. The load of the average man grew harder to bear and the discontent of the people became more pronounced. The mass of the people began to feel instinctively that it was the tariff that cut into their wages, their income and their comforts. When the Republican convention met in Chicago two years ago there was an universal demand among Republicans that the convention should unequivocally pledge the party to a revision of the tariff.

Continuing Governor Lind said:

The pledge was given in the platform. It was understood to mean that the tariff would be reformed and reduced. On the strength of that pledge and understanding, and the assurances of the candidate that he favored revision, as understood by the people, Taft was elected. The Roosevelt administration had shown a progressive policy. Taft repeatedly through the campaign, pledged himself to its continuance. The people took him at his word, and, irrespective of party, were hopeful and confident of his good intentions.

A Discouraging Cabinet.

His choice of officials seemed discouraging. A Pennsylvania standpat was named secretary of state; the counsel of the sugar trust his attorney general; the general counsel of the Illinois Central railway his secretary of war; the general counsel of the Chicago North-Western Railway Co. his solicitor general, and Mr. Balinger whose sole claim to fame at that time was his phenomenal success as a collector of campaign funds on the Pacific coast, was made his secretary of the interior. As I say, the people were a little discouraged by this array of standpat talent, but still hopeful.

Congress was called in extra session to revise the Dingley law, which had become thoroughly obnoxious. The house organized by electing Mr. Cannon speaker. He appointed a committee on ways and means—every member a seasoned standpat. The trust agent, who wrote the Dingley bill, was called in again. Sen. Dolliver said of him in a speech delivered in the senate of the United States on June 15 last: "This veteran expert helped the Republican side of the committee in 1897 in the daytime and helped the Democratic side of the committee at night. (Laughter.) He was a messenger between hostile camps. He certified to the committee that the sugar schedule did one thing and certified to the Democratic members that it did another. Instead of being an expert, he was an employe and he has come down now for nearly a generation dominating the proceedings of congress, telling everybody what ought to be done, relieving even the great committee of their duty of investigation, writing these laws and representing to the American people a scandalous performance, such as I have exposed on this floor here this afternoon."

Recognizes Insurgents. The bill prepared by this man was in due time reported to the house. Instead of being read by that body and

considered section by section, in the committee of the whole, as is usual, and as the rules require in case of legislation of that character, a gag rule was adopted cutting off all right of amendment. Permission was given by private arrangement between the speaker and Mr. Payne that Mr. Tawney and two or three other of the speaker's henchmen might propose amendments so as to square themselves with their constituents. Mr. Tawney offered an amendment to the lumber schedule. But the standpat element was in complete control and, of course, it was voted down. The Democrats and a few independent Republicans, Lindbergh, Volstead and Davis of this state, and a few others, protested against the methods adopted to railroad the bill through the house without even having it read in full, but to no purpose. Notice was served on them from the White House to "return to the reservation" and be good Indians or they would have to go without the usual patronage incident to the congressional position.

In the senate, Sen. Aldrich of the rubber trust took charge of the measure as an engineer. The method pur-

president at Winona were probably prepared by the same party who prepared the tariff bill. After analyzing and exposing the misleading character of the figures submitted by the president, Sen. Dolliver said, "Such an analysis of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, schedule by schedule, and item by item, together with a careful dissection of the Winona table prepared for the purpose of proving that "real and substantial downward revision" had been accomplished, would convince anyone that so far as the public is concerned, the tariff revision in fact carries rates as high or higher than the Dingley tariff law on most articles of general use in their finished condition. Most of the reductions were so trivial as to be ridiculous and were either upon articles which we do not import to any extent, but, on the contrary, export in enormous quantities, or were for the purpose of further protecting the manufacturers, especially by reducing the duties on the raw materials, while most of the rates on the finished products were either kept at the Dingley tariff standard or were increased. In fact, a careful scrutiny of the particular items that were changed, and the exact trifling

JAMES GRAY



DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR GOVERNOR.

sued in that body was essentially the same as in the house, except that debate could not be prevented and the Democrats and several Republicans who have since become known as insurgents, fully explained the iniquities of the measure.

The president again came to the rescue of the standpatters and silenced the opposition to the bill as

 * LIND BRINGS HIGH
 * AUTHORITY TO SHELL
 * ENEMY'S STRONGHOLD.

* Sen. J. P. Dolliver (Rep.) Iowa
 *—"I share the universal disgust
 * which has arisen on seeing the
 * greatest executive department,
 * those departments which touch
 * the business of the nation most
 * intimately, made a headquarters
 * for the awkward squad of politics,
 * bucket shops for dealing in political futures upon margins calculated daily from the record of the years and nays."

* Sen. Robert M. La Follette
 * (Rep.), Wisconsin—"It is no longer
 * or the president's bill, or the
 * Wickersham bill, or the Elkins
 * bill. Against all the influence of
 * the railroads, combined with all
 * the powers of the administration,
 * many bad provisions have been
 * stricken out, and many good provisions have been adopted. In other words—excepting as to the court of commerce—the administration bill, framed in the interest of the railroads, has been torn to pieces and rewritten in the interest of the people here on the floor of the senate."

* Finley Peter Dunne (Mr. Dooley) Democrat—"We must not forget that the tariff on bird seed has been reduced by the Payne-Aldrich bill!"

 * as much as possible. Patronage was his argument. The bill was passed and received the president's approval.

That Winona Speech. In his speech at Winona, the president pronounced it "the best tariff bill the Republican party ever passed" and submitted a large array of figures and schedules in support of that statement. Sen. Dolliver, reviewing the president's claim, in a speech in the senate (June 13) showed that the schedules and figures submitted by the

change of rate in each case, shows how cunningly the revision was arranged in order to deceive the public and look like real revision downward.

Very Little Free.

A great deal of stress has been laid upon the supposed enlargement of the free list, and yet the only new items on the free list of the Payne-Aldrich tariff are hides, a few semi-finished coal-tar products, radium, works of art over 20 years old, miners' appliances and Brazilian nuts. The senator omitted to mention the fact observed by "Mr. Dooley" that the tariff on birdseed had been reduced.

Both of our senators criticized the bill and refused to give it their vote. With such Republican testimony against it, it is hardly necessary to occupy your time discussing schedules. I will only mention a few things in corroboration of Sen. Dolliver's remarkable statement.

Must Eat a Ton of Sugar.

The reduction of the duty on sugar was paraded as a great gain to the consumer. The old rate was \$2 per 100 pounds. The new rate is \$1.95. To benefit by this reduction to the extent of \$1, a family will have to consume a whole ton of sugar.

The president stated in his Winona speech that there were 261 items in the cotton schedule. Of these 28 had been decreased; 47 had been increased and 186 left alone. The fact is that all the decreases in the cotton schedule were upon cotton yarns, except one, and solely for the benefit of the manufacturers. Through the whole range of cotton cloths the most startling and inexcusable increases were made, not increasing the Dingley rates openly, but by changing the classification and the method of assessing the duties.

In the metals' schedule there were a few reductions on iron ore, pig and scrap iron, bar and sheet iron and steel, none of which commodities are ever purchased by the general public. The old rates were retained on most finished articles ready for use, such as cutlery. Upon structural steel ready for builders' use the duty which had been previously \$10 a ton was nearly doubled by being transferred to another class.

A Robber Tariff.

The wool schedule, not even the president attempted to justify. It is little less than robbery. On cloth worth not more than 40 cents a pound, the duty averages over 140 per cent;

Republican Gubernatorial Candidate "Prudently Silent" on Vital Issues.

"Ed. Smith," says Governor Lind, "Has Served With Eberhart, Under Eberhart and Over Eberhart."

on cloth worth more than 70 cents a pound it averages 95 per cent. As a result of the increased duties on cheaper cloths, cotton, wool and silk, the material for women's and children's wear has nearly doubled in price. Almost the same increase is noticeable in ready-made clothing for men. In men's clothing, however, the increase in price is not as noticeable as the deterioration in quality. It is difficult to find an all-wool garment at a price within the reach of the ordinary man.

It has been a mystery to me for years that the American people could be induced to stand such an imposition, but the matter has been very cleverly managed. The two classes who bear the heaviest part of the burden of the tax on clothing, for instance, are the wage earners and the farmers. Each of these classes has been made to believe that it is the special beneficiary of the whole tariff system. Now, however, laboring men have generally come to understand that the manufacturer does not pay higher wages because he is licensed by law to hold up the public. They realize that the level of wages in the protected industries is lower than in the occupations which are not protected, as a rule, and that it would be lower than it is were they not protected by their organization.

As to you farmers, I am a little fearful that some of you are still looking through a fringe of standpat wool. Some of you still believe that a tariff of 20 cents a bushel on wheat is the cause of our good wheat prices. Let us consider that question for a moment. Of the leading farm products on the protected list, grain, corn, cotton and meats, we export immense quantities every year. Let me ask you my farmer friends, do you get more for the bushel of wheat that is consumed in New York than you do for the bushel that goes to England? Does the hog that is eaten in Boston bring you a better price than the one shipped to Germany? If not, how does the tariff on these commodities help you? If we did not produce enough grain to supply our domestic demand, the question would be different. The tariff would then enable you to hold up the consumers for a higher price. Wool, so far as I know, is the only agricultural product which we do not produce in sufficient quantities for our needs. The tariff on wool increases the price to the farmer. But even if you own sheep, that slight increase does not compensate you for the general tariff burden you bear.

Why Prices Rise.

The increase in the price of farm products is not the result of tariffs, but of world-wide economic changes. Let me point out that to you briefly. In the latter half of the last century machinery commenced to be extensively employed in farm production. This, in connection with new lands opened and made available by railroad development in America and in Asia, almost doubled the world's output of food products. With no more mouths to feed and this sudden increase in quantity of food, the European markets as well as our own became glutted. We were selling our surplus in the world's market then as now, and we had to take the world's price, as we do today. Prices that had prevailed for decades were cut in two. From the early '70's to the end of the century there was a severe depression in farming the world over. This accounts largely for the heavy emigration from the farming countries of Northern Europe during that period. Here in America the emigrants got virgin soil to "rob," which enabled them to continue the losing fight of going against a glutted market. The situation of our farmers 15 or 20 years ago was really alarming. The calling which had been the mainstay of society since the dawn of civilization seemed to be doomed.

The Outlook Was Dark.

The outlook was dark for young men on the farm. The farmer's calling seemed neither profitable nor pleasant. The cities with their large opportunities for lucrative employment and for comforts beckoned them to come—and come they did in great numbers. Since 1890, down almost to the present time, there has been a veritable exodus from the country to the cities, not only in America, but in Europe. The great cities and industrial centers of the world have doubled and trebled in population in the last two decades. By this movement of population the number of people engaged in producing food has been relatively decreased and the number engaged in producing other necessities and comforts of life has been very greatly increased. I think that on the whole, the redistribution of population made necessary by the invention of machinery, has probably been accomplished. As a result, work on the farm has become substantially as remunerative as it is in the industries or in commerce. It is these economic changes that have bettered the condition of our farmers in the last few years. The prices of farm products have simply risen under the operation of the general economic law

of supply and demand, and not by reason of any tariff. The only way the tariff affects the price of a commodity is by limiting the supply. The available supply of farm products has been limited, as I have shown by operation of natural causes.

How much longer, my farmer friends, are the trusts going to be able to pull the wool over your eyes and make you believe that you are benefited by the monopoly tariff?

Standpat Treachery.

Another evidence of standpat treachery to the people is furnished by the history of the railroad bill in the last congress. The Republican party has promised to amend the interstate commerce act. Ostensibly to redeem this pledge, the attorney general, under the president's direction, prepared a bill which was sent to the senate for introduction. The bill was introduced by Sen. Elkins. It was most generous in its terms to the railroads, but appeared to overlook that the public had any rights. It created a new court open to railroads to enjoin the orders of the interstate commerce commission, but denied the public admission to that court upon equal terms. It denied shippers, communities, firms and individuals interested in defending the orders of the commission, from appearing by counsel or otherwise to sustain the orders in court. It repealed the Sherman anti-trust act, so far as railroads were concerned, and authorized pooling. If the bill had become a law in the form in which it came from the White House, every shipper and every industry in this country would have been at the absolute mercy of Wall street.

People Owe Much to Clapp.

Sen. Clapp is entitled to the gratitude of the people of this state for the able and fearless manner in which he combatted the vicious provisions of that bill. On April 26 last, he gave voice on the floor of the senate to the indignation he felt over the unscrupulous methods resorted to by the president and his attorney general to force this measure through congress. He said: "When this bill came from the committee, it was with a declaration more or less official—if we are to regard as official the dictates of anyone—that it should be passed without crossing a 't' or dotting an 'i.' More than that, we were told, with an assumption of authority in the widespread publicity given to a declaration which I cannot question, that the test of party loyalty would be to pass this bill without questioning its provisions. More than that, we were told that the protests which minority members of the committee might make to the provisions of this bill, while no power could prevent our making our protests, would be met with that condition which, in military parlance, is clothed in the expression, 'Give them the cold steel,' and in parliamentary parlance with the expression, 'Give them the roll call.' But I am glad to say that we have finally reached a point where those who would seek to defend this bill have been obliged to meet debate with debate."

Sen. Dolliver of Iowa said on the



MOSES E. CLAPP.

United States Senator from Minnesota, same subject. "In common with good citizens everywhere, I share the universal disgust which has arisen on seeing the greatest executive department, those departments which touch the business of the nation most intimately, made a headquarters for the awkward squad of politics, bucket shops for dealing in political futures upon margins calculated daily from the record of the years and nays."

"It does not trouble me very much to be relieved from participating in business like that. But I cannot forbear to express my sorrow, that, with nearly three full years to win the confidence of the American people by an intelligent interpretation of the public will, it should be thought necessary, in order to bolster a falling political enterprise, to review the most odious degradations of parliamentary government in other lands and past generations by doling out the offices, which belong to the people, in exchange for



HON. JOHN LIND. Former Governor of Minnesota.

A. Tawney. He congratulated the progressive people of the First district upon the good beginning they had made. He pointed out the importance of the event not only to the people of the district but of the whole state. He complimented Mr. Tawney on his conceded abilities and the service he had rendered. He said he was in entire harmony with the leaders of the Republican party, and in the light of this fact and the President's public endorsement of Mr. Tawney he regarded his defeat as a "phenomena of the times." His defeat could only be defended because "the conviction had forced itself on the masses of the Republican voters of the district that Mr. Tawney and those with whom he trains and acts politically have ceased to represent the people." That conviction was the cause of his defeat. I believe that the voters of the First