

## A SHAMEFUL FACT

In the beef trust cases on trial before Federal Judge Humphrey in Chicago the attorneys for the packers contend that because Commissioner Garfield had the authority to require the packers to furnish him information concerning their business, and the packers yielded to that authority, they are immune from prosecution.

Several witnesses have testified that before submitting his report to the public Commissioner Garfield presented proof sheets of the same to the packers and their representatives. So clearly has this been established as a fact that even United States District Attorney Morrison is using that fact in the hope of saving his case. Addressing the court Mr. Morrison said:

"The theory of the government is that there was an understanding that the matter (Garfield's report) should not be published unless the packers were satisfied with the report. We will show that Mr. Garfield came back with a typewritten copy of his report which had not yet been printed and that the packers were ready and anxious to have this report go to the publisher."

Of course it was humiliating for a representative of the government to be required to employ this shameful fact in order to avoid the technicality through which the packers expect a dismissal of the proceedings.

Whatever the secrets revealed by the packers to Commissioner Garfield were, his conclusions amounted to the claim that the packers were making a very small amount of money and in some instances had actually lost money, and that there was, in fact, no such thing as a beef trust. The American people did not know then that before that report had been submitted to the public it had passed under the critical eye of the very men with whose investigation the commissioner of corporations was charged. It was generally believed at the time that Mr. Garfield had not made a serious investigation of the beef trust. But until the revelations before the federal court at Chicago it was not known that the recently created department of commerce and labor was, in the language of the street, "playing horse" with the helpless victims of greedy monopolists. Yet this same man who agreed that before his report was submitted it would be acceptable to the men under investigation, was assigned to investigate the Standard Oil trust!

It will occur to a great many people that whatever the outcome of the beef trust case in Chicago may be, Mr. Roosevelt should dismiss Commissioner Garfield from the government service.

## THE SHIP SUBSIDY

Although the corporation lobby at Washington is exerting its efforts to foist the ship subsidy upon the people, it is noticeable that republican newspapers are not generally protesting against that proposed steal—and we have eminent republican authority for thus designating it.

A few years ago when it was seriously proposed to adopt the ship subsidy many republican newspapers denounced the scheme and what they said then represented the general sentiment throughout the country on this question.

In December, 1900, the Indianapolis Journal said: "Congressmen must have mistaken the atmosphere of Washington for that of the country at large or the clamor of a few ship-builders and owners and their lobbyists for the voice of the people. Let republican members go back to the platform of 1896, which demanded the upbuilding of our merchant marine and carrying trade by other methods than a ship subsidy."

In December, 1900, the Dubuque, Iowa, Times said: "No inconsiderable part of President McKinley's support in the recent election came from those to whom the subsidy idea is extremely distasteful."

About the same time the Portland Oregonian protested against the subsidy, and said: "The fact that building and sailing American ships in competition with the fleets of the world has enabled a few Americans to pile up colossal fortunes shows that we can operate the ships as cheaply as the foreigners can operate their craft."

In its issue of December 15, 1900, the New York Press said that senators and representatives had been carried to Europe and back every summer for the past ten years in anticipation of a roll call on the ship subsidy scheme. The Press added: "It may be true of our government, as Hamilton said of the English, that it can not be worked without bribery, but there is no reason why the measures and men which require bribery should be mixed up with those which do not."

The Chicago Record-Herald, while declaring

that the west was "not affrightened by the word 'subsidy,'" said "it balks over a proposition to take money from the national treasury to render the conditions of a self-supporting merchant marine more unprofitable than ever." The Record-Herald denounced the ship subsidy as a "preposterous proposition."

In December, 1900, the Chicago Tribune, discussing James J. Hill's prophecies of what the merchant marine of the United States is approaching in development, said: "It was not understood when the spellbinders were urging the people of the northwest to vote in favor of the re-election of President McKinley that one of the first items on the senatorial program when congress met would be the passage of a 'shipping subsidy' bill which contemplates annually expenditure for thirty years for the special benefit of a number of rich men residing in eastern cities. There is nothing whatever in this adroit resolution (the shipping plank of the republican national platform of 1900) about 'subsidies.' The word 'subsidies' was carefully omitted from the platform. Nor was anything said during the campaign in regard to the extension of our merchant marine by a scheme of public expenditure continuing for a generation. Nobody can recall an instance of a public meeting at which the shipping subsidy bill was made the subject of fair, candid argument or any argument at all; nor were the claims to public aid of the persons interested in such legislation ever explicitly set forth. \* \* \* \* The republican party should not be in favor of one set of measures prior to November 6 and in favor of an entirely different kind of measures subsequent to November 6."

## MAYBE HE KNEW THE SOURCE OF FUNDS

Many of the administration's warmest supporters as well as the people generally are greatly disgusted by the revelations concerning Commissioner Garfield. The Kansas City Journal, a republican paper, says:

"If the testimony of the witnesses in the packers' case is to be believed, Commissioner Garfield is easily the prince of chumps in President Roosevelt's official family—and that is saying a good deal. Facile princeps is no name for it; he is the royal flush of four-flushers, and that is the limit."

The Journal wants to know whether Mr. Garfield "supposes that the government's attitude toward monopolistic trusts in general and the beef trust in particular was merely a bluff," and it concludes:

"It appears that Mr. Garfield has betrayed his trust as well as the packers. President Roosevelt's warm defense of Loomis and Paul Morton and Press Agent Bishop has given him a well-earned reputation for sticking to his friends, but he will have to look up the famous recipe that used to make such a lasting coat of whitewash for the White House if he expects to stick to Garfield."

Mr. Garfield was born and raised in the republican party and it would not be surprising to learn that he did take it for granted that the trust busting program was "a bluff." Perhaps he has learned that the trusts have during three campaigns provided the republican party with its campaign funds. Would it be strange that in the light of these and other facts Mr. Garfield was not impressed seriously with his mission.

## CHAMP CLARK'S SPEECH

All too brief reference has been made in the newspapers to the speech delivered in the house of representatives January 5 by Representative Champ Clark of Missouri. Mr. Clark was frequently interrupted by republican members, and the dialogue provides one of the most interesting chapters to be found in the Congressional Record. Mr. Clark's speech was admirable, and the good-natured as well as effective way in which he met his adversaries won commendation from all quarters. If any Commoner reader desires to read Mr. Clark's speech in full—and everyone should avail himself of that privilege—we have no doubt a copy of the speech could be obtained by a request to that effect addressed to Mr. Clark at the national capital.

## WHERE IS THE DIFFERENCE?

Several daily newspapers that have been very severe in their denunciations of "Town Topics" and its editorial policy would do well to pay some attention to the beams in their own editorial eyes. It developed in the "Town Topics" case that that publication profited by refraining from telling what it knew to be to the discredit of

people amply able to pay for silence. But is that any worse than to deliberately publish misleading editorials with a view of deceiving the people into the belief that policies calculated to benefit only the owners of the paper are of general public benefit? Several great daily newspapers are known to be owned by railroad corporations, and these papers are constantly trying to make it appear that they are published with a sole view of benefitting the people when they are in fact published for the sole purpose of misleading the people. "Town Topics" seems to have profited by what it did not print. Some other publications are published for the purpose of profiting the eminent corporationists who own them by blinding the eyes of the people to the real purposes of the owners. Is that sort of thing more honorable than the policy pursued by Mann's publication?

## A NEW DIVERSION

It is stated that Mr. Henry C. Frick, the steel and coal baron, has purchased a Pittsburg daily newspaper that has long made him the subject of ridicule. This offers a new field for the diversion of our multi-millionaires, and incidentally points the way to a solution of that vexed question as to how the money being accumulated in a few hands shall be distributed among the people. Managers of big corporations long ago secured great newspapers through which to safeguard and advance their corporation interests, but it seems to be something new for a corporation manager to invest in a newspaper in order to avoid its ridicule. If our multi-millionaires begin that sort of thing and keep it up it will be easy to see a solution of the problem of vast fortunes. Mr. Rogers will have to turn a great many Standard Oil and Amalgamated Copper tricks if he manages to buy up all the newspapers that are ridiculing him, and Senator Depew, instead of resigning \$20,000 sinecures will have to hustle quite lively in search of more.

## WEIGHING THE MAILS

It is announced that some time this spring the government will weigh the mails west of the Missouri river for the purpose of fixing the compensation the railroads shall receive during the next four years for carrying the mails. The weighing will occupy about 100 days. The railroads will be paid for four years on a basis of what is carried during the weighing period. This plan makes it easy to pad the mails during the weighing period. It has been charged time and again that during the mail weighing season the mails have been loaded down with public documents sent out under congressional frank and shipped from point to point, weighed and reweighed time and again during the weighing season. That the payments made to railroads for transporting the mails are responsible for the deficit in the postal department is well known. Forty millions of dollars are paid every year to railroad corporations for mail service. Pound for pound the railroads charge 800 per cent more for mail carrying than they do for express carrying, and instead of furnishing cars as they do to the express companies, they charge Uncle Sam a rental for the mail cars that annually equals the cost of the cars, and in many cases exceeds it.

## CAN IT BE?

Even the St. Louis Globe-Democrat is scared. The Globe-Democrat appeals to the republican leaders to "do something," and concludes in these words:

"On the work which will be done in the next three or four months, therefore, will depend the maintenance of the republican supremacy in the legislative department of the government. The election of a democratic house this year, to serve through the second half of President Roosevelt's term, would be a bad blow to the republican party and a menace to the country. This peril should be kept constantly in mind through the remainder of the session by the republicans in each branch of congress, particularly by those in the senate."

Coming from the Globe-Democrat it is a remarkable admission that "on the work which will be done in the next three or four months will depend the maintenance of the republican supremacy." For years we have been told by the Globe-Democrat that republican supremacy was assured because the republican party is the "God and morality" organization. Can it be possible that the republican party is liable to error?