

## Insulting the Flag

We have been trying to point out to republicans the fact that President Roosevelt is changing the ideals of the nation and substituting the "big stick" for the light of liberty, but many have refused to believe. Now, an appointee of this administration has come to our aid and declared this change in language so plain and forcible that no republican can longer doubt it. Reference is made to the article written by John Barrett, United States minister to Panama, and published in the Chicago Tribune. It is a campaign document contributed by the president's appointee and spread broadcast as an argument in favor of Roosevelt's election. Attention is called particularly to a paragraph which reads as follows:

"If they who today are stumping the land against President Roosevelt could have gone to foreign ports in the old days when the flag stood for nothing, when American merchants and travelers were everywhere snubbed, when our army and navy were the laughing stock of the world, when we had no influence in the councils of the nations; and if, then again, they could have journeyed around the world now, when the flag means more than the standard of any other nation, when our merchants have access to all markets; when our navy is respected in every port, and when our advice is sought in every conclave of the powers they would in sheer sense of stricken conscience renounce their present attitude and pray for the success of the party which has accomplished this mighty change and of a leader whose name is honored in the most remote portions of the earth."

Republicans, what do you think of this? Did the flag "stand for nothing" in "the old days?" Washington held that flag in his hand; did it stand for nothing then? Did it stand for nothing when our revolutionary fathers followed from Bunker Hill to Yorktown? Did it stand for nothing when it was in the hands of Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence? Did it stand for nothing when it was held aloft by the older and younger Adams? Did it stand for nothing when Madison held it or when it was held by Monroe, who has given his name to the Monroe doctrine? Did it stand for nothing in the hands of Jackson at New Orleans and in Washington? Did it stand for nothing in the hands of Hayes and Garfield and Harrison? What say you, republicans? And you, veterans of the civil war? Did it stand for nothing when you followed it through four years of war and upon bloody battlefields?

Did it stand for nothing until it became the emblem of an empire and the companion of the president's "big stick?" Did it begin to stand for something only when it waved over Filipino subjects bought in a job-lot at \$2.50 apiece? Did it begin to mean something only when it was carried against men who were fighting for the doctrines for which our revolutionary sires were willing to fight and die? Republicans, what do you think of this new doctrine of your party, proclaimed by the president's appointee? Do you endorse this doctrine or will you put it aside and say it is merely the flattery of an officeholder who kneels before this new built throne and eulogizes the man from whose hand he receives his daily bread? Barrett is a true and faithful exponent of the policy of our present president. He speaks with brutal frankness of the new policy that the nation is to pursue if imperialism is endorsed. You must forget all that you have ever known of the patriotism and principles of government before you can throw your hats in the air and cheer for Roosevelt and his colonial policy. Surely there must be a multitude of republicans who will refuse to apologize for a century of glorious history as they must do if they endorse the doctrine of Barrett and the doctrine of Roosevelt. The names of our illustrious Americans who have stood for the flag in the "old days" are too dear to the hearts of our people to be forgotten now merely that the name of Roosevelt may be exalted.

## A Needed Electoral Reform

The influence of money and railroad passes in our national and state elections is a growing evil that is engaging the attention of thoughtful citizens who seek to purify politics. One phase of this question was discussed by Mr. Bryan in a speech at Arlington, Nebraska, during the present campaign. He said:

"I have for years noticed that the republicans by their ability to secure passes have had a great advantage over the fusionists. They can take students from their college home to their voting places when these students are republicans. They

can bring the traveling men home to vote and thus give the republican traveling men an advantage over those who vote the fusion ticket. And wherever they find a man temporarily absent from home, they furnish him transportation to his place of residence. This gives them an advantage which amounts in the aggregate to many hundreds of votes, and the advantage is often sufficient to decide a county election or the election in a legislative district. I have recently been reading a history of the reforms which have been accomplished in New Zealand, and among them I notice one that will meet the condition I have just described.

"They have a postal vote there which I believe we should have. It allows a person who is necessarily absent from home to mail his vote under regulations and restrictions which prevent fraud. There is no reason why we should not secure this reform. It will save a large amount of money, not to speak of time wasted, to those who now travel long distances in order to discharge their duty as citizens, and it will neutralize the advantage that the corporations give to the party they favor. If we have a fusion legislature at Lincoln next winter, I am going to bring this matter before the members, and urge the passage of a law which will give the traveling man, the student and the man temporarily absent from home an equal chance with the man who works near his voting place. This is one of the reforms that we need and one that I believe we can secure if we carry the legislature this fall."

## Publicity in Practical Operation

For several years, Mr. Roosevelt has had much to say in favor of "publicity" as a remedy for the trust evil. It is interesting to remember that fact in the light of the statement by the Washington correspondent for the New York World, that "not one fact about trusts, secured by the department of commerce—the sole object of which was to be publicity—has been made public in twenty months."

Although the law creating the department of commerce and labor gave to that department the power to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance and testimony, this correspondent says that no witnesses have been subpoenaed nor has any testimony been given. According to this correspondent the only information obtained has been classified and given to the president. Only three men know exactly what this information is. They are the president, George B. Cortelyou, chairman of the republican national committee, and James R. Garfield, chief of the bureau of corporations.

The situation is reviewed in an interesting way by the World correspondent who says:

Secretary Metcalf, the present head of the department of commerce, has not been in his office long enough to find out anything.

The department, while Cortelyou was head, conducted three major and eight minor investigations. The first were into the Shipbuilding trust, the great life insurance companies and the Beef trust. Nothing came of them. The shipbuilding and insurance investigations were not completed when the Beef trust was taken up. This is still going on.

The eight minor investigations reviewed the corporation laws in the states of New York, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Indiana, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Ten lawyers made these investigations. They were instructed not only to examine the laws, but to make a general report on the corporations in these states. These results were also tabulated by Commissioner Garfield, given to Secretary Cortelyou and by Secretary Cortelyou taken to the president.

The investigations into the Shipbuilding trust and the insurance companies were begun in the summer of 1903. Ten special investigators were put on the Shipbuilding trust. The orders were to find out exactly who was behind the crookedness of that great financial bubble. A number of men were put at work on the books of the great life insurance companies also.

On Feb. 4, 1904, Representative Martin of South Dakota, introduced a resolution in the house calling on the secretary of commerce to investigate the low price of beef cattle in the country and high prices of beef in the cities and to discover whether this discrepancy in price was due to any trust or conspiracy in restraint of trade. The original resolution required the secretary of commerce to "furnish to this house, at his earliest convenience, the results of the investigation requested." The house amended the request to this indefinite instruction "to make an early report of his

findings according to law." The resolution was adopted in this form on March 7, 1904.

Secretary Cortelyou and Commissioner Garfield then called in all the men from the Shipbuilding trust and the insurance companies and hired some new investigators. These men were all put on the Beef trust. They were told to pay particular attention to the railroad end, to see what part they played in the business of the trust. Twenty men were put to work. Some of them were lawyers, some expert accountants, some beef men, some trained investigators, some cowboys and employes of stockyards. They scattered through the country, from Boston to San Francisco.

This investigation is still on. These men make daily reports to Commissioner Garfield. They have sent in thousands of pages since April 1, concerning not only the operations of the Beef trust, which is composed of seven corporations and controls 60 per cent of the meat business of the United States, but also of the railroads, the system of rebates that prevails, the freight discriminations, and the beef boycotts. Still no publicity. Nothing is given out to the public. No person in the department knows what the gist of these reports is except Commissioner Garfield. He makes an abstract for the president. His file clerk, his secretary and the lawyers and investigators under him dare not say a word about them. One investigator knows not what another does. Commissioner Garfield refuses absolutely to tell a single fact.

He points to the law which says the results of investigations shall be communicated to the president and that the president shall be the judge of what portion of the information secured shall be made public.

Secretary Cortelyou was in close touch with Commissioner Garfield in these investigations and got all the secret information about these trusts, so-called, before he became chairman of the republican national committee, and began to receive political contributions from some of the alleged trusts.

The department of justice is also concerned in Beef trust affairs. It has also had agents in the field. These men have been seeing whether the Beef trust is violating a certain injunction granted by Judge Grosscup of Chicago on May 26, 1903, which restrains the Beef trust from carrying on its business as formerly. The appeal of the Beef trust from this injunction to the October term of the United States supreme court will probably be reached in December or January next. Meantime the agents of the department of commerce are discovering undoubted combinations in restraint of trade and illegal railroad rebates and discriminations and are reporting them to the department. But so far as the public knows after twenty months the department of commerce has accomplished absolutely nothing. The most persistent inquiries in Washington elicit no information. Instead of being a mighty engine of publicity as President Roosevelt intended when he advocated it, the department is more secretive and mysterious in its operations than any other in Washington.

## When Will They Have Enough?

A reader of The Commoner sends a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune, a republican paper, February 15, 1900, and suggests that that editorial will be interesting during the present campaign.

The Tribune editorial is certainly interesting. It was entitled "When Will They Get Enough?" The Tribune pointed out that in the preceding year the Carnegie company made \$20,000,000 and said: "and yet, Mr. Carnegie is not satisfied." The Tribune directed attention to the fact that the Standard Oil company had at the time this editorial was written just declared a quarterly dividend of \$20,000,000, "and yet," said the Tribune, "its directors are not satisfied. They wish congress to pay subsidies to the ocean-going vessels in whose earnings they have a share." The Tribune added:

If there are any other American corporations whose profits were \$20,000,000 last year or promise to be \$80,000,000 this year, it may be taken for granted that the men at the head of them are no more satisfied than the Carnegies and the Rockefellers and are no more scrupulous as to the methods of adding to their possessions.

There seem to be no limit to the rapacity of corporations which have been built up at the expense of the public by excessive tariff