

name a man who will bring reinforcements to all of our candidates, not a person who by driving support from the ticket will drag all down to defeat.

**MR. CARNEGIE'S TESTIMONY**

Andrew Carnegie had a hard time of it before the Stanley investigating committee. He admitted that no protective tariff is necessary on steel rails or steel products. He said this country had nothing to fear from foreign importation of steel.

Mr. Carnegie also claims that during all the time he was in active business with the steel trust that he never heard from any of his attorneys that the Sherman anti-trust law had anything to do with the steel trust. He said he thought that that law applied only to railroads.

Mr. Carnegie said that Philander C. Knox was one of his attorneys from 1890 to 1900. On this point Mr. Carnegie was questioned particularly by Representative McGillicuddy of Maine. The following are the questions and answers on this point:

"Then you were left in absolute ignorance as to the effect of the Sherman law?"

"Yes, sir."

"Mr. Carnegie," Mr. McGillicuddy continued, "did you recommend to President McKinley, after his election in 1900, that this same attorney, Philander C. Knox, who left you in blissful ignorance all these years about the effect of the Sherman law, be appointed attorney general of the United States?"

Mr. Carnegie looked at his questioner for a moment in amazement. He started to speak. Turning to Attorney Reed, he exclaimed. "Did I, judge?"

Mr. Reed, almost in a whisper and with a smile on his face, replied:

"Yes, you wrote a letter to the president about Knox's appointment."

"Now, Mr. Carnegie," Mr. McGillicuddy went on, "after ten years' experience with that attorney, who did not let you know about the laws you ought to have known, you recommended him as a proper and fit man for attorney general of the United States?"

"Yes, I did," he replied, "but I object to the form of your question. You ask: 'After I had experience.' I had no experience with Mr. Knox, so far as the corporation was concerned. Mr. Knox had no official relations with me."

"About the same time that Mr. Knox went into the president's cabinet, did his partner, Mr. Reed, go into the directorate of the United States Steel corporation?" Mr. McGillicuddy asked.

Mr. Reed, appealed to by his client, replied that he did.

Before the ironmaster was quizzed as to his views on the tariff, several members of the committee heckled him about the ignorance of his partners and himself about the laws.

"Don't you think it rather unusual," Representative Beal asked, "that so many of these great business men were ignorant of the laws?"

"No."

"Now, don't you believe that some men in the Carnegie company knew they were violating the law?"

"Now, Mr. Beal, when you say that I can see in your face an irresistible smile," Mr. Carnegie replied.

"I see you are smiling, too," the legislator answered.

"Yes, let's smile together, you with me."

"But not be a villain still," Mr. Beal retorted.

When asked if he did not think the government regulation which he recommended was bordering dangerously on socialism, Mr. Carnegie declared that socialism had no terrors for him.

"My motto is," he said, "that all is well since all goes better. The world is growing better every day. I have faith in human nature. That's what makes me optimistic."

Mr. Carnegie also insisted that the distribution from wealth from the hands of a few to the hands of many was increasing yearly.

"Men," he said, "have been able to sit down and agree to fix prices and maintain them."

"Do you believe that situation today destroys competition?" he was asked.

"Certainly."

"That men in these corporations meet somewhere today to fix and maintain prices?"

"I think that is obvious."

Mr. Carnegie was asked if he agreed today with views he expressed two years ago, urging

government control of corporations and regulation of prices.

"I still adhere to them," he answered. "I believe the government should regulate maximum prices."

"Don't you think it is an unfortunate condition?"

"I think the time has arrived when it is necessary, and I point to the interstate commerce commission which has brought order, peace and justice out of chaos in the railroad business."

Representative Beall of Texas, began questioning Mr. Carnegie.

"You were connected with the iron and steel business altogether for about forty years, were you not?" he asked.

"Yes, sir."

"You found it at the beginning a small business?"

"Yes, very small."

"And you left it a business dominating the business of the world?"

"Yes, in steel."

"In the early years you found the business disintegrated?"

"Yes."

"And you left a business greatly improved, greatly extended, with all its attributes, the ore, the transportation, the coal and other facilities assembled and practically dominated by one great corporation?"

"Admirably stated," said Mr. Carnegie.

"George Perkins came to me one day and said: 'Mr. Carnegie, you once told me about your partnership organization and I thought it was foolish. Now I know you were right.'"

Mr. Carnegie gave the committee several illustrations of his power to get business when he was in the steel market.

"Why, take rails, for instance," he continued.

"I had many close friends in the railroad business. I remember only the Union Pacific had asked for bids for 70,000 tons of rails and the bids were to be opened at Omaha. All my competitors were out there. I walked over to Sidney Dillon of the Union Pacific in New York. I had done the Union Pacific a favor once; I got them a loan of something over \$600,000 in Philadelphia and they elected me and George M. Pullman directors.

"I told Dillon about the bids and asked him if the Carnegie rails were sufficient. He said they were. I said, 'I want the Union Pacific to do business with me, and I'll give you the lowest price.' I got the 70,000 tons contract. Now, what's the use of a corporation fighting against such an influence as that?"

**TELL THE PEOPLE**

Omaha, Neb., January 4, 1912.—Editor of The Commoner: Your statement in last week's Commoner that the people are more often fooled by men than by issues is not only true, but strikingly applicable to present political conditions so far as the democratic party is concerned. To know where every candidate stands on the issues upon which the coming campaign will be fought is the right of the voters who will participate in the coming presidential primaries. No man ought to be a candidate for the nomination for president who is unwilling to take the people into his confidence upon all issues which will enter into the campaign. Any man who seeks the democratic nomination must know that if the nomination is to come to him as the choice of the masses of our party, they must understand and indorse his position on important issues. No man who is not big enough and brave enough to trust the people by informing them what his attitude is on all measures affecting their welfare, is big enough to lead the democratic party in the fight that must be made this year.

Suppose that a few men claiming to be deeply interested in the welfare of the people and in the success of the democratic party, should announce that they had written the party platform for 1912, but that the contents would not be made public until after the national convention had met and adjourned. And suppose that these men should then ask democrats in the different states to send delegates to the national convention pledged to adopt that platform. How many votes would such a proposition receive? Yet is not this just what democrats are requested to do when they are asked to support as a candidate, one who refuses to state where he stands with reference to the issues before the people.

I. J. DUNN.

**BOOMING ROOSEVELT**

The Chicago Tribune is carrying on a campaign which it hopes will result in the nomina-

tion of Theodore Roosevelt. The Tribune urges that Mr. Roosevelt's name be placed upon the ballot in every state where they have direct primaries.

**HARMON'S RECORD**

**THE DISBARMENT OF THATCHER**

The talented gentlemen who prepared for nation-wide circulation several pamphlets showing the eminent qualifications of Governor Judson Harmon as a candidate for the democratic nomination for the presidency devoted one chapter to the labor bills enacted by the 1911 legislative session in Ohio. Not in direct terms, but inferentially, the credit for these enactments is given to Governor Harmon. Among the many excellent bills which the Ohio democrats passed in the interest of labor was one reinstating in the practice of the law Attorney Charles A. Thatcher, of Toledo.

Mr. Thatcher is a leading lawyer of Lucas county. A great deal of his practice, by choice, has been as a representative of union labor. Thatcher was disbarred from practice in Ohio by the supreme court because he sided with labor and criticised the judges in a controversy which organized labor had with that tribunal. Those who are familiar with legal controversies between labor and capital need not be told that the lawyer who sacrifices himself for the workmen secures for himself an allegiance among the men who toil that is remarkably strong.

The supreme court, because of the stinging criticisms of Thatcher in a pending case, took away from him his means of livelihood. After that tribunal disbarred him he could practice in no court of record within the boundaries of Ohio. Immediately his cause was taken up by the laboring men of the state. There was but one tribunal left with the power to reinstate Thatcher. That was the state legislature.

One of the first bills introduced in the house was that which sought to reinstate Mr. Thatcher. It passed early in the session, two months at least before adjournment. It became a law, and it may be found in "The Laws of Ohio, 1911," on page 84. It recites that, "Whereas, Chas. A. Thatcher of the city of Toledo, Lucas county, Ohio, possesses the qualifications of an attorney and counsellor-at-law and is of good moral character and has practiced law in Ohio for about twenty years, and has a number of clients who require his services as an attorney and counsellor-at-law, he having no other profession or occupation; and, whereas, an emergency has arisen whereby, without legislative relief, he is prohibited from acting as an attorney or counsellor-at-law, and also from the applying for admission to the bar in this state; therefore, be it enacted," etc. The enactment is a formal legal reinstatement and a command to all courts to receive him as an attorney.

Thatcher lost his license or right to practice in a controversy wherein he represented labor against capital. The action of the court was so arbitrary and unjust—at least it so appealed to a majority of both houses of the Ohio legislature—that they took this extraordinary means of reinstating him. The bill was passed April 18, 1911, and after being signed by the presiding officers of the two houses, was sent to the governor. What did he do with it?

Here is the official record: "This bill was presented to the governor April 18, 1911, and was not signed or returned to the house wherein it originated within ten days after being so presented, exclusive of Sundays and the day said bill was presented, and was filed in the office of the secretary of state May 2, 1911," thereby becoming a law. Governor Harmon had an opportunity to show himself the friend of labor by signing the bill reinstating labor's champion in the practice of his profession. Instead he took the middle course, where neither capital nor labor would be either pleased or displeased—he allowed it to become a law without his signature.

The importance of this bill is probably not understood outside of Ohio in other than labor circles. Yet it is considered so important by the compilers of Harmon "boom" literature, that on page 25 of the pamphlet entitled, "A Story of the Progress in Ohio During Governor Judson Harmon's Administration" it is given the place of honor as last but not least of what the Ohio legislature "under Governor Harmon's guidance" did for the trade unionists. C. Q. D.