

# CRITICISING A PATRIOT

It is now in order for Senator Chauncey M. Depew to call Senator Thomas M. Patterson to account for a breach of senatorial courtesy, an attack upon the defenders of "national honor," and conduct generally unbecoming one who, pretending to be patriotic, dares to criticise the methods and question the motives of those holding high position in the exclusively patriotic class.

The Denver News, edited by Senator Patterson, prints an interesting editorial entitled "Which of These Two?" Senator Patterson compares the offenses charged against Mitchell with the offenses charged against Depew. While not in the least excusing Mitchell, Senator Patterson says that he has been "an exponent of his own views, sycophant to no power, rugged in the advocacy of right as he has been given to see the right," although "at the age of three score and ten he feels the heavy hand of the law for violating a statute prohibiting his action as an attorney in the departments." Senator Patterson says that Senator Mitchell has been "proof against all temptations to betray or desert his convictions (and they were many), with a constituency largely hostile to his own opinions, he abated neither jot nor tittle of his views nor of their full and constant expression, but, true to himself, stood by his colors and risked retirement for what he believed to be the interests and welfare of the nation. Surrounded by opponents of his own political faith in Washington and at home, he always fought the good fight, and, though he failed in his purposes, he maintained the confidence and, therefore, the support of his constituency. In the recent crusade against some of the despoilers of the public domain the senator was accused of receiving a fee of \$2,000 in consideration of services to be rendered by him in the departments for securing and expediting the acquisition of title to certain timber lands. On this charge, and in the face of a long and honorable public record, he has recently

been convicted; whether justly or unjustly remains to be determined on appeal."

Then Senator Patterson compares Mitchell's record with that of Depew, of whom he says:

"During his long career he never had a thought beyond or above the interest of his adopted family. He never expressed a sentiment, however lofty, unless it would serve the house of his allegiance. A congressional investigation held years ago exposed some of his methods, and but for the immense influence of the Vanderbilts would have beached and stranded him. In the strenuous times between 1893 and 1900 he declaimed eloquently against the socialism of the income tax, the immoral tendency of bimetalism, denouncing free coinage as a crime against honor and patriotism and its advocates as degenerate Americans. His classic disapproval of western heresies and communistic tendencies has long gladdened the hearts of the elect and given reassurance to the magnates of eastern finance and monopoly now so seemingly secure in the possession and control of every department of public affairs in state and nation. Even his opponents have at times been deluded by his ostentatious phariseism into the notion that as senator he had severed the Vanderbilt cable and in his old age was guiding his craft on his own account away from the tides and shoals of other days. But the ways of youth and life's noontide are nearly always those of life's declines. The Equitable earthquake has opened many sepulchers and exposed many careers. The 'national honor' so dear to many of the notables of New York's elect seems to be the only sort of honor some of them ever loved or ever knew. Personal and business integrity, the sole and enduring basis of public morality, seems to have fled, if not 'to brutish beasts,' at least to a lower stratum of New York citizenship."

Senator Patterson concludes his terrific arraignment in this way: "Senator Depew, a man of the classes, devoted for more than half a cen-

tury to the welfare of huge private interests, aristocrat of aristocrats, unlawfully identified himself with the directorate of a great insurance company that the weight of his name might recommend it to the multitude, accepted royal retainers from its treasury without return, is guilty of a diversion of its funds to his own account thinly disguised under a corporate name. The lifelong recipient of favors bestowed by the royal hand of privilege, accustomed not only to see but to advise the disregard of legal and constitutional restraints by powerful combinations, may wince under the public gaze, but these same influences will shield him from the public prosecutor. No indictment for him, but the forum of the senate withal, for is he not needed to help stem the tide of communistic rate regulative legislation that an impulsive president has rashly recommended? What are the interests of policyholders or the demands of justice in the face of such a peril? 'The nation' needs Chauncey, and the man who would interfere with him now would lift his hand against 'his country and his country's honor.' So next winter the New York senator will give his great talents to 'his country's' cause, while Senator Mitchell, in the solitude of his committee rooms, will await the action of the supreme court upon his appeal.

"Guilt should not be condoned. It is repulsive in all its variant forms, and he who tries to distinguish, that he may condemn or palliate, renders a service of questionable benefit. Yet I can not but conclude that if the average citizen of the day, cognizant of the careers and the conduct of both, were compelled to choose between the senator from New York and the senator from Oregon, as an object either of sympathy or of approval, hard though the task might be, he would not stand with Depew upon the senate floor, but place his arm around the drooping shoulders of Mitchell and walk beside him with slow and silent stride out into the marble vestibule beyond."

## ARE OUR DOLLARS "DOLLARS EVERYWHERE"?

Mr. Orwell C. Riddle, of Columbus, Ohio, has made an interesting compilation of Associated Press dispatches relating to money. These dispatches and Mr. Riddle's letter accompanying them, should be carefully read by every Commoner reader. Mr. Riddle says:

"During the campaign of 1896 there was much gusto in the papers that wanted bimetalism by international agreement about 'a dollar that is a dollar the world over,'—meaning that our gold dollar was worth a dollar the world over and that our silver dollar was not. Of course, we answered them by showing that our metallic money at home is the creature of our laws, but away from home it is merely bullion, and that in the Bank of England, the fountain of financial wisdom to the plutocrat, even our gold coins were weighed instead of counted. That was true ten years ago.

"Enclosed you will find market quotations of various dates which I cut from the regular daily Associated Press reports showing how our gold eagles are on the market in London with a fluctuating value.

"At a dinner a year ago attended by Dr. Reemelin, of Cincinnati, and several other members of the old Bimetallic club at Cincinnati, which was given by my cousin, Lewis Steutz at his home here and at which Mr. Lentz and myself were guests, I put the poser to Dr. Reemelin as to why our gold dollars that are 'dollars the world over' should be quoted on the market in London at fluctuating values, instead of being just dollars—or eagles. His answer very naturally was that the Americans abroad wanting our gold money for returning home or exchange elsewhere brought this about, but he would not go into the deeper mystery of our money having abroad a market value different from its stamp value, coinage value, legal value, or whatever you chose to call it, at home.

"I do not know how to explain my ideas about this financial phenomenon of 'a dollar worth a dollar the world over' being worth more away from home than at home, or being fluctuating in value abroad and rigid at home, even that 'sacred' gold dollar so dear to the hearts of the republican

campaign howlers in 1896. If it were the silver dollar the mystery would be discernible and easily solved.

"And here's the rub: If our gold dollars are marketable at fluctuating values in London, what is to keep our gold eagles above par, or what is to prevent their going below par at least to the extent of expense for recoinage into foreign coins? And if our silver dollars were to be put on the market in London what would regulate the price, bullion value or coinage value? If our silver dollars were to be put on the market in London at the bullion value what would be the effect on the value of our silver dollars in New York?

"You will see by enclosed quotations of the money market in New York as carried by Associated Press reports, that Mexican dollars are quoted there at bullion values. What is to prevent London doing the same thing to our silver dollars? And once London were to do that would it not knock into a cocked hat the silly contention of goldbugs that our dollars are dollars everywhere because predicated on a gold standard, especially when our gold money itself is subjected to variation? I sincerely believe that the British money changers do not juggle our silver dollars as the Mexicans are at New York simply to save the New York money changers from exposure and ridicule about our 'sacred' gold standard. I have wondered, too, why the goldbugs do not attack the silver dollar in this way—perhaps they may do so in time, say after they get a bill passed for recoinage of silver dollars into subsidiary coins.

"I admit all that may be said about desirability of obtaining our own coins when abroad for exchange, but I believe that the philosophy of finance goes deeper than that. I believe that if any of our coins can be put on the market in foreign countries and sold above par they can be sold below par if any occasion for financial juggling, such as war or panic, should arise to give fictitious qualms. And if our coins can be sold at speculative values in Europe then is our dollar not 'a dollar that is a dollar the world over,' whether it be silver or gold?

"And does not all this go further to prove that we should take the whole question into our own hands and fix our financial system and value

of various coins without the aid or consent of any other nation, especially when we see that under the 'sacred' gold standard even our most 'sacred' gold coins are juggled by the money changers of Lombard and Threadneedle streets? We ought to make it impossible for anybody to speculate in our money by making it unprofitable to do so.

"I fear I have failed to make myself clear but I believe a great principle is involved here, and have tried to unfold it."

### GOLD EAGLES

First among the enclosures are quotations of gold eagles at London and Mexican silver dollars at New York showing fluctuations. These dispatches follow:

London, Jan. 16.—Bar gold, 77s, 9½d; American eagles, 76s, 4¾d.

London, Jan. 19.—Bar gold, 77s, 10d. American eagles, 76s, 5d.

London, Jan. 23.—Bar gold, 77s, 10½d. American eagles, 75s, 5½d.

London, Feb. 6.—Bar gold, 77s, 9¼d; American eagles, 76s, 4¾d.

London, April 17.—Bar gold, 77s, 9¼d. American eagles, 76s, 4¾d.

London, May 1.—Bar gold, 77s, 9½d. American eagles, 76s, 4½d.

London, June 26.—Bar gold 77s, 9¼d. American eagles 76s, 4¾d.

Berlin, June 26.—Exchange on London 20 marks, 47½ pfgs for checks.

London, June 27.—Bar gold 77s, 9½d. American eagles 76s, 4¾d.

London, June 29.—Bar gold, 77s, 9¼d. American eagles 76s, 4¾d.

London, June 30.—Bar gold 77s, 9d. American eagles, 76s 4d.

Berlin, June 30.—Exchange on London, 20 marks 46¾.

London, July 3.—Bar gold, 77s 9¼d. American eagles, 76s, 4¾d.

### MEXICAN DOLLARS.

New York, Feb. 14.—Mexican dollars 47½.

New York, Feb. 21.—Mexican dollars 47¼.

New York, Feb. 25.—Mexican dollars 47.

New York, March 4.—Mexican dollars 46.

New York, July 25.—Mexican dollars 45½.