

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 12, NO. 5

Lincoln, Nebraska, February 9, 1912

Whole Number 577

Question the Thirteen

The following democratic congressmen voted AGAINST the Cullop amendment:

Brantley, of Georgia,
Dies, of Texas,
Garrett, of Tennessee,
Hammond, of Minnesota,
Holland, of Virginia,
Korbly, of Indiana,
Littleton, of New York,
Morrison, of Indiana,
O'Shaughnessy, of Rhode Island,
Peters, of Massachusetts,
Shirley, of Kentucky,
Post, of Kentucky,
White, of Ohio.

The Sullop amendment reads as follows:

"Hereafter, before the president shall appoint any district, circuit or supreme judge, he shall make public all indorsements made in behalf of any applicant."

Is there anything in that amendment that an honest man can object to? Why should the President DESIRE to conceal the recommendations upon which he appoints public servants? And why should he be PERMITTED to conceal recommendations if he does desire to do so? The amendment does not interfere with his RIGHT TO APPOINT; it simply asks him to step out into the daylight and let the people see to what indorsements he gives weight and what indorsements he ignores. Anything wrong about that?

The opponents of the amendment say that it is unconstitutional. The objection is ridiculous, but suppose it were a doubtful question? Why not let the court decide the question of constitutionality? If the amendment is DESIRABLE let congress pass the bill; the federal courts can be relied upon not to allow the people to have any more light than the constitution permits. The thirteen democrats opposing the law give the benefit of the doubt to the predatory interests. If the thirteen had their way about it the courts would have no chance to decide the question on the side of the people.

The thirteen democrats made a mistake—a grievous mistake. With some of them such mistakes are a matter of habit, but some of the thirteen are new offenders. It remains to be seen whether they have been misled or have deliberately started on a downward course. Their constituents should write them, demanding an explanation. By the time they get through explaining they will know more. Those democrats (in the districts represented by the thirteen democrats) who favor the Cullop amendment should make it an issue. It should be indorsed in the congressional platforms in these districts and the candidates should be com-

CONTENTS

QUESTION THE THIRTEEN
ARTFUL DODGING
THE CHILD'S BUREAU
HOW THE BEEF TRUST OPERATES
TIMELY QUESTIONS BY A "COUNTRY EDITOR"
A CHINESE REPUBLIC
REQUIRING PUBLICITY ANNOYS THEM
THE FIGHT DESCRIBED
OHIO PROGRESSIVES AT WORK
GOVERNOR FOLK OPENS MISSOURI CAMPAIGN
RICHARD L. METCALFE'S PLATFORM
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK
WASHINGTON NEWS

EVERYTHING ANTI-TRUST IS "RIDICULOUS"

In his testimony before the Stanley investigation committee at Washington Andrew Carnegie said that the day of competition in the steel trade had gone by and he admitted that prices are controlled by agreement. Mr. Gardner, the attorney representing the committee then read to Mr. Carnegie the following paragraph:

"Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract, or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court."

Mr. Carnegie was then asked: "Would it be advisable for congress to enact such a law as I have just read to you?"

"Such a law would be ridiculous," promptly responded Mr. Carnegie.

"Well," replied Mr. Gardner, "what I have just read is the first section of the Sherman anti-trust law that has been on the statute books since 1890."

The New York World's correspondent, referring to this incident, says: "Mr. Carnegie looked sheepish, everybody else laughed."

mitted to publicity or left at home. A MAN WHO REALLY BELIEVES THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO MAKE HIS APPOINTMENTS ON SECRET RECOMMENDATIONS CAN NOT BE TRUSTED TO REPRESENT A DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUENCY.

THE MONEY MONOPOLY

Kansas City dispatch to the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal: Arthur E. Stillwell of the Kansas City, Mexico & Orient railway, says the money trust is blocking the development of this country. Unless a project is sanctioned by the trust no big deal can be carried through.

Mr. Stillwell cites as an instance the recent underwriting of a large block of Orient bonds in France, and says:

"Recently, having secured underwriting for a large issue in France, the securities were approved by the French government; yet no bank could be found to act in connection therewith on account of interference by the money trust of this country. There are hundreds of the subscribers to the stocks or bonds of this company who have been urged by some emissary of the money trust to cancel their subscriptions as soon as made and hundreds of others who have been dissuaded after stating that they would subscribe.

"Up to the present time we have remained silent in the hope that as the road progressed these attacks would cease. But now with nearly nine hundred miles in operation we think we are justified in calling attention to the obstacles we are daily encountering in a persistent endeavor to prevent the completion of this great international, transcontinental road."

"PRACTICAL"

If, as Col. Watterson avers, Governor Wilson expressed a fear that money received from Ryan would, if known, do more harm than good, he may have offered it as a "practical" suggestion, calculated to influence Bro. Watterson after the said journalist had refused to consider the governor's objection on its merits.

Artful Dodging

The money trust having failed in its effort to prevent an investigation by the banking committee. The fact that the money trust wants that committee intrusted with the investigation is proof positive that it thinks it can control that committee. It may be mistaken, but a democratic congress can not take chances in such an important matter.

Press dispatches report that members of the banking committee have threatened to resign if the special committee is appointed. Let them resign! Men who would resign on such grounds admit themselves unfit for the committee.

This is no sham battle. It is the real issue between democracy and plutocracy, and a roll call will enable the people to mark for slaughter any democrat who, for any reason or under any pretext, plays into the hands of the financial pirates who, having plundered the weaker business men, are now trying to terrorize the democratic party.

A special committee is needed to make this investigation—a committee made up of men picked for the purpose, and no man can be so ignorant of the forces at work as not to know which side is the people's side in this controversy, and he who takes Wall street's side takes it at his peril. In a crisis like this the congressman who can be fooled is as much a public menace as the open and wilful tool of the interests.

Strength to Mr. Henry! Drive the Wall street crowd into the open!

THOROUGH INVESTIGATION DEMANDED

Editorial in Lincoln (Neb.) Journal: Arthur E. Stillwell, an independent railroad builder of some note, gives a concrete example of the abuse of power charged to the so-called "money trust." He has been raising funds to complete his Kansas City, Mexico and Orient railway. He had arranged for placing a large block of bonds in France, but could find no American bank through which to make the exchange. This, he claims, was due to pressure by the centralized banking interests of New York. These interests are identified with railroads of their own. The inference is that they would neither help Stillwell finance his competing line nor allow others to do so if they could help it. He adds that these same interests have used their influence with American subscribers for the stock or bonds of his road to secure the cancellation of subscriptions.

This charge is of the same nature as was made recently by Baltimore men who had tried to raise funds to build an independent steamship line to ply through the Panama canal. In general terms the condition alleged is about like this: New York has become the nation's money market. The country's surplus grain goes to Chicago to be sold. That brings it in control of New York banks. These banks are controlled by men with great industrial interests—railroad, manufacturing combinations, and so on. For mutual advantage they have come to act as one man. The country's fluid capital is thus in control of men with industrial interests, and they refuse to loan it to any business that competes with their own. It is also charged that this group uses this money supply to manipulate the stock market to their own advantage or the disadvantage of competitors. Through their control of this money, it is charged, they can say whether business is to expand or contract; whether times are to be good or bad.

How far this is true is the question congress is asked to investigate. No less an authority than Secretary MacVeagh and other supporters of the monetary commission plan of banking and currency reform can be found for the belief that the case is at least potentially as these charges make it. An honest and able investigation of the facts would be of unquestionable value. Whether such an investigation by congressional action is possible this political year is another matter.