

As a Progressive Republican Sees It

The fight for and against the investigation of the money trust is described by Angus McSween, Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia North American in the following dispatch to his newspaper:

If the public interest can be safeguarded against treachery by the democratic leaders of the house of representatives and against a program of attempted deception, the purpose of which will be to persuade the public that something has been done in its behalf, when the service has been rendered only to special privilege, there may be an investigation of the centralized control of money and credit now known as the money trust, and which constitutes the greatest menace to the welfare of the country as a whole.

With a view to doing all he can to erect the safeguards recognized as necessary, Chairman Henry, of the rules committee of the house, who, is fighting for the investigation, presented a new resolution. It provides for the election of a special committee of seven to investigate the money trust as proposed by the Lindbergh resolution, and to take charge of all other proposed investigations now under consideration.

It was announced that Floor Leader Underwood and the other reactionaries are obvious that the fight must still come over the selection of the investigating committee, and that its character will indicate whether anything of importance or value to the public may be expected.

Henry's resolution, while it seems to open the way to some jugglery in the selection of an investigating committee, is intended to head off a plan for the complete stifling of the investigation by Underwood and his followers. This plan was to intrust any investigation which might be ordered by the house to the committee on banking and currency, of which Pujo, of Louisiana, is the chairman. There is not in the entire list of house committees one so absolutely reactionary and special-privilege-controlled as this.

Most of the older members of the committee were appointed by Cannon and were named by him to pack the committee against former Chairman Fowler and to place it in line with all the schemes of public exploitation which former Senator Aldrich and the Morgan-Rockefeller combination, which he represents, wished to force through the congress.

Vreeland, appointed chairman of the Cannon packed committee, and now vice chairman of the Aldrich packed monetary commission, is the leading republican member. Pujo and the two other leading democrats are also members of the Aldrich commission and signed the Aldrich consolidated banking scheme.

To refer a resolution affecting the direct interests of great and powerful financial combinations to the present banking and currency committee of the house would be like referring them to former Senator Aldrich, or Cannon, or to any one of the half dozen democratic house members like Underwood, or Littleton of New York, who are so obviously seeking to serve those interests for purposes of their own.

This is another part of the fight that is still to come, for it will be urged seriously by Underwood, or some of those who express his view, that any investigation of the money trust must be referred to the banking and currency committee.

It was for this reason that Henry proposed in a special resolution the election of a special committee, and included in the scope of the inquiry, which he suggests should be concluded by that committee, other subjects than control of money and credit, in order that it can not be urged that the banking and currency committee should have jurisdiction over the whole matter.

As the situation stands now there is every reason to believe that some sort of an investigation of the money trust will be ordered.

This much even the reactionary leaders will probably concede is necessary to silence public clamor and to prevent suspicion from becoming conviction that the house majority is subservient to the Morgan-Rockefeller interests. But there is very little encouragement for the belief that a serious public-spirited, independent and thorough inquiry will be conducted.

Underwood and others have not been able, despite all their efforts, to suppress the demand for the investigation. They will, however, be strong enough in all probability to name a sufficient number of the democrats on the in-

vestigating committee to make it virtually a packed committee.

For if the committee is to consist of seven men, three of these will be republicans named by Cannon and Mann to serve the trust and not the public, so that if Underwood and Co. can name but one democrat, who will be equally subservient, they will have turned the trick in favor of Wall street, and Underwood will have earned all the support of his presidential ambitions which Wall street has promised him.

It was Underwood who wanted an understanding established with the republicans which would make it necessary that the democrats should accept republican caucus elections to all committees, and it was Underwood who led the democrats in their support of Campbell, of Kansas, for the expressed purpose of making this agreement effective. It is this agreement which makes it possible to pack every committee in the house of representatives.

Representative Martin W. Littleton, a tory member of the committee, declared such an investigation would have the effect of further identifying the democratic party with a "blind and destructive policy."

THE CAMPAIGN IN OHIO IN 1912

The following editorial appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer: There should exist no desire upon the part of any democrat in Ohio to underestimate the results of the election of 1910 throughout the union, and especially not that held in his own state.

Yet it would be a gross folly and self-deception to attach undue importance to the victory obtained by the party that year in this state.

We had in that contest ample evidence of the demoralized and disorganized condition of the republican party, but our own vote, 75,000 short of the vote polled for the same candidate for the same office two years before, was no evidence of his power as a vote-getter, notwithstanding that much misunderstood 100,000 plurality.

The democrats of Ohio in every ward, township, city, county and congressional district in this state are aware of the state and local influences that entered into that campaign and that produced the results.

They know they were not national in their character and that in the next election the democratic party will be contesting upon issues far removed from those that divided the opposition in the 1910 campaign.

Every democrat knows also that the settling or unsettling, as the case may be, of the state issues involved in the campaign of 1910 has drastically weakened in this state the leading candidate of that campaign.

Disappointments as to expected action upon various measures, resentments as to unexpected action as to others, grievances, real or imagined, all the numerous causes that sap political strength and bring political weakness have been in operation for three years in this state. There is no reason to doubt that the 75,000 votes of shortage in 1910 might be five times that shortage under existing conditions in a national contest with a candidate upon whom these local disappointments, resentments and grievances would center, in addition to the opposition upon his record and associations in national issues of supreme importance and interest to the people.

The coming campaign is to be a contest for the advancement of the interests of the great masses of the people, and to select as the leader of that campaign a candidate whose vote had fallen off 75,000 in two years' time in his own state and whose record in national affairs had been in opposition to the party candidates and platforms, would be but a travesty, entirely unwarranted considering the importance of the issues involved.

This campaign will be between the republican and the democratic parties upon national issues and a tremendous vote will be polled in Ohio. Our candidate must be one that will appeal to the voters through his fidelity to his pledges, his loyalty to his supporters, and his long and faithful attachment to the principles advocated by the party.

Ohio's electorate has largely increased in numbers since 1908.

The voters in the state were far more numerous in 1910 than in 1908, yet the vote of the entire state was 200,000 votes less in 1910 than in the earlier year.

The 300,000 voters of this state who failed to vote in 1910 will be at the polls next Novem-

ber, and the democrats will need a candidate to head their ticket that can carry the state upon the greatest total vote ever cast.

UTAH WILL BE DEMOCRATIC

Ogden, Utah, Feb. 7, 1912.—The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb. Gentlemen: In your issue of the 2d Inst., I see a letter from one George O. Brophy, assistant superintendent of the Union Pacific Railroad company, with offices at Ogden, Utah. This man expresses a decided preference for Judson A. Harmon as the democratic nominee for president. Mr. Brophy, so far has not been known in democratic councils in Utah; in fact he acknowledges that he is a stranger, but expresses his intention to use his influence to secure a Harmon delegation from this state.

Mr. Brophy may have reference only to his personal influence, but we assume, inasmuch as his letter to you was written on an official letterhead, that he means the influence of the Harriman interests will be for such a delegation. I desire to assure you and your readers, that Utah's democratic state convention will not be dominated by the Harriman or any other corporate interests. We are progressive, and we will send a progressive delegation to the national convention. I will not attempt to name the man the Utah delegation will support in national convention, but speaking as one who has been honored by my party in the past, and one who has been a worker in the party ranks in this state for the past fifteen years, I say that our candidate will most assuredly be a progressive.

The fact that Mr. Harmon has, or has not been a supporter of Mr. Bryan, is not the question we have to deal with. No apologies are necessary. We want a constructive statesman; a man who is abreast of the times; a man who is in favor of the initiative, referendum and recall; in fact, a man who realizes that the paramount issue is "Shall the People Rule." We have plenty of such, in the democratic party, without taking a man—who is just as good as Taft. We might do worse than to nominate a man for the fourth time. Very respectfully,

SHERMAN S. SMITH.

Delegate to Democratic National Con. in 1908.

A POLL FROM THE BUCKEYE STATE

Rushsylvania, O., Jan. 22, 1912.—Editor The Commoner: Probably you will find below something of interest to Commoner readers as well as something in the way of expression of this vicinity as to the choice of voters for their preference or choice of candidates for president.

Below you will find the result of an election for choice of men so far mentioned as candidates for president. This election was held at the law office of Hon. John P. Bower, Rushsylvania, Logan county, Ohio, on January 18, 1912, at which election more than three-fourths of the qualified voters of the village precinct seemed eager and quite anxious to cast a vote for their first and second choice for their candidate for president in the approaching presidential nomination:

DEMOCRATIC	
First Choice	Second Choice
Harmon 10	Harmon 6
Bryan 31	Bryan 17
Clark 2	Clark 21
Wilson 2	Wilson 9
Folk 1	Folk 3
Underwood 0	Underwood 3
REPUBLICAN	
Taft 23	Taft 5
Roosevelt 42	La Follette 16
Cummins 0	Roosevelt 25
Hughes 0	Cummins 5
Beveridge 1	Hughes 13
Foraker 0	Beveridge 2
Garfield 2	Foraker 2
Cannon 0	Garfield 6
La Follette 24	Cannon 3

This vote is taken in one of the strongest republican precincts in the Eighth congressional district of Ohio. Very respectfully,

M. C. BRADY.

A MICHIGAN POLL

The Bay City (Mich.) Tribune took a presidential poll with the following results:

DEMOCRAT	
Bryan 74	
Champ Clark 15	
Gov. Harmon 10	
Woodrow Wilson 4	
REPUBLICAN	
Roosevelt 554	
Taft 130	
La Follette 9	
Beveridge 2	
A. B. Cummins 1	