

## Butting In

Harper's Weekly, edited by Colonel George Harvey, prints under the headline, "Mr. Bryan's Butting In," the following editorial:

"We can not but wonder what Mr. Bryan thinks he gains for his party or for himself by constantly butting his head against a stone wall. It is hardly conceivable that he did not know that the house democrats would turn down Mr. Henry's muckraking enterprise. How could they have done anything else without stultifying their own organization? The regular committees are their committees selected to do the very work outlined by the Henry resolutions. To have deprived them of their rightful jurisdiction would have implied confession of incompetency, if not, indeed, of self distrust. And yet Mr. Bryan telegraphed that there were 'many objections' to the regular procedure, and added: 'But it is enough to know that Wall street prefers regular committee.' Consequently he regarded the caucus as a 'crisis,' whose result would 'largely affect our chances in the coming campaign.'

"What the many objections are is left wholly to conjecture. Our own opinion is that Mr. Bryan did not set them forth, because they do not exist. And what does it matter to a house of congress what Wall street prefers or doesn't prefer? That sort of back action reasoning is as innocuous as it has become tiresome. Equally discreditable to our mind is the avowed purpose of jockeying with our vast and intricate industrial and financial organism for mere partisan advantage. Mr. Bryan was in wrong from the beginning, and came out, of course, at the little end of the horn.

"What we should like to know is, why does he do such things? Can he feed upon nothing but deserved defeats? Such butting-in, as he must know, seems only to stir up internecine strife and to weaken the party to which he owes more than any other living man.

"Doesn't Mr. Bryan want to win? Or is he just pig headed? Or what?"

It is just as natural for Harper's Weekly to condemn Mr. Bryan for giving his support to Mr. Henry's effort to have a real investigation of the money trust as it was for certain members of congress to place obstacles in the way of Mr. Henry's good efforts.

Harper's Weekly, like other defenders of the money trust, wanted the investigation committed to what it calls the regular committee—that being the banking committee. Harper's Weekly says "to have deprived them (the banking committee) of their rightful jurisdiction would have implied confession of incompetency, if not indeed, of self distrust." But what reason is there for saying that the banking committee has "rightful jurisdiction" over this investigation. The Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat, in an editorial printed in a recent issue of The Commoner, answered this point so completely that the pertinent paragraph is reproduced. Pointing out that the banking committee was charged with certain general duties relating to banking and currency conditions, the Democrat said:

"But the probe of the Money trust sought by Chairman Henry and urged by Mr. Bryan was a very different proposition. It was aimed at the development of relations in the financial world which have little if anything to do with the currency or with legitimate banking or with the sort of legislation the banking and currency committee would have occasion or opportunity to recommend. And evidently it was with a distinct understanding of the attitude the banking and currency committee would take in the matter that impelled Wall street to exert all its powerful influences in having the 'investigation' committed to such friendly hands as those fittingly represented by the Louisiana democrat who has most frequently distinguished himself in the house by voting on important questions with the standpat republicans."

Harper's Weekly is greatly disturbed, asking, "Can he (Mr. Bryan) feed upon nothing but deserved defeats?" Well if a defeat be deserved, Mr. Bryan surely can profit by it but majorities—particularly in congress and in legislatures—have not always been right. So far as Mr. Bryan is concerned he conceives it to be his duty to form opinion with respect to a public measure

and champion it or oppose it without consideration as to its probable success in the immediate contest.

No one ever heard Harper's Weekly protesting against the "butting in" in the affairs of congress or of state legislatures by the emissaries of special interests. Not one moment of time but that a host of agents for special interests—and the smoothest of them all are the agents for the money trust—are on guard at the national capital "butting in" the affairs of the people. These use all sorts of argument and all forms of persuasion to have the men elected for a public and a sacred duty employ the power given by the people for the advancement of special interests; and such papers as Harper's Weekly has never had one word of protest for this form of "butting in."

"Doesn't Mr. Bryan want to win," asked Harper's Weekly. Surely Mr. Bryan wants to win. Not, however, merely an office for himself or for his friends, but he wants to win for the party and for every patriotic member of the party the glory of a real victory—a victory for popular government, a victory that will give the people genuine relief from the impositions put upon them by the very power for which such publications as Harper's Weekly speaks.

Is it not about time that there be some "butting in" in behalf of the people all along the line?

### A RAILROAD ATTORNEY AT WORK

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Tuesday, March 19th:)

#### DENIES IT VIOLATED LAW

The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Railway company yesterday, through its attorneys, HARMON, COLSTON, GOLDSMITH & HOADLY, filed answers to two of the government's suits against it for the alleged violation of the safety appliances act. The company admits that it is a corporation doing business under the laws of Ohio, and that the actions against it were brought at the suggestion of the attorney-general of the United States at the request of the interstate commerce commission, but denies all other allegations made in the petitions.

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer, March 19th:)

#### UNITED STATES COURTS

At the beginning of the fourth week of the trial of the suit in equity of the McKell heirs against the C. and O. Railway company, to recover over \$3,000,000 alleged due as damages for the failure of the company to carry out a contract for the transportation of coal from McKell's mines in West Virginia, it appears that the case may get to the jury by Thursday. The defense will probably place its last witness on the stand for direct testimony today, and tomorrow it is expected that all of the rebuttal testimony will be closed. Arguments will probably begin Thursday morning.

THERE IS AN IMPOSING ARRAY OF COUNSEL ON BOTH SIDES IN THIS CASE. GOVERNOR HARMON, TOGETHER WITH HIS LAW PARTNERS, Colston, Goldsmith and Hoadly, W. H. Wadsworth, Maysville, Ky., and Sims & Enslow, of Huntington, W. Va., represent the C. and O., while Brown, Jackson & Knight and John H. Holt, of Charleston, W. Va., and Paxton, Warrington & Seasongood, of Cincinnati, represent the McKell heirs. During the hearing more than 50 witnesses have been examined and depositions of half as many more have been read.

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer, March 24:)

#### HARMON AGAIN AT DESK

Columbus, Ohio, March 23.—For the first time in more than a week GOVERNOR JUDSON HARMON today was at his desk in the state house, having returned to Columbus late yesterday from Cincinnati, WHERE HE HAS BEEN INTERESTED IN A CASE IN THE FEDERAL COURT.

#### MONTICELLO—A NATION'S PRIDE

Hereinafter will be found an editorial which recently appeared in the Times Dispatch, of Richmond, Va. It is right. Monticello should belong to the nation. Senator Martine's bill looking to this end ought to pass. If the nation does not purchase it, Virginia should; if Virginia does not, the state university or the city of Charlottesville should.

Congressman Levy, the present owner, is a man of wealth—he could afford to give Monticello to the nation, state, city or university—reserving, if he desires to do so, a life estate. If he will not do this, the nation should buy it or, if sale is refused should condemn it for public use and pay what it is worth. The money

value is not large and the amount could be raised by public subscription. The Commoner will undertake to raise its share. Let Monticello belong to the people.

That Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, in Albemarle county, be purchased by the United States and established as a memorial open to the people of the country, was the object of a resolution introduced in the senate by Senator James E. Martine, of New Jersey. The resolution merely provides for a joint committee of five members from each branch of congress to "inquire into the wisdom and ascertain the price of acquiring this home as the property of the United States, that it may be preserved for all time in its entirety for the American people."

There can be no doubt of the wisdom of this proposal. There is no spot of ground in the whole nation, outside of Mount Vernon, that is of more vital and permanent interest to the people of the United States. It should be in the true sense a shrine to which pilgrims, not only from this country, but from the world, might come to breathe in the inspiration that will always dwell for men in the very air of the earthly residence of a great soul. Jefferson was a statesman of noble visions, an educator beyond his day, a believer in democracy, in liberty of thought and action, and a constructive social thinker, whose message, after a century, still bears the stamp of living truth. How great a force in our life his beliefs are today has just been attested by the will of a great journalist, who gave \$25,000 for a statue of Jefferson, to be erected in New York, and asked the people to join with him in erecting a fitting memorial to this wise servant of the nation.

The present owner of Monticello has fulfilled what should have been a public trust with patriotism and devotion. He has done well to preserve the beauty of this estate, and doubtless, as far as was possible, he has opened his private residence to the demands of visitors, who have come to pay tribute and to honor the memory of one whose life made their lives richer and freer. But the time has come when he should be relieved of his stewardship and Monticello belong to all the people, to be cared for by them, and to be opened to them at all times. If the national government does not see fit to purchase this heritage, the state of Virginia should assume it as her duty, not so much to honor Jefferson, whose fame is fixed beyond all material recognition, but as an honor to herself. She should offer it to the world as a visible symbol of her constant faith in the principles for which her son labored.

This mountain, from which Jefferson looked down upon that other lasting memorial of his wisdom, the University of Virginia, would be one of the most beautiful parks in any land. The view from its top covers miles of hills to the Blue Ridge, and meadowland almost to Richmond. And it adds to the charm of scenery the molding influence of historical tradition. The national government has already built a road part way to the gates, and the rest should be completed. The house itself is a miniature of the Colonial-Grecian style of architecture, and could be converted into a museum of priceless souvenirs. If the people of the whole nation demand it, let them take what is part of their glorious past; if not, let the state preserve it as the resting-place in time of one she gave to serve the cause of truth forever.

#### A MINIMUM WAGE—WHY NOT?

The British house of lords has passed, and the king has signed, the house of commons' bill providing for a minimum wage. It is a justifiable protection to the wage earning class. But whether the public is ready for such a law, applying to all industries, what objection can there be to applying it to protected industries. The employers have been demanding aid in the form of a tariff duty—and they have been demanding it on the ground that they must pay their employes more here than is paid abroad to those engaged in similar industries, but the employes have no way of securing their share of the benefits voted. Why not fix a minimum wage for those engaged in industries protected by a tariff? Why not provide—if not for a fixed minimum wage—for wages as much above the highest foreign wages as the rate levied on competing imports?

#### THE COAL TRUST

"Price of coal in 1898 and before, f. o. b., Manitowoc, Wis., was \$6.10 per ton to consumer, and the lake carrying charges from Buffalo docks to Wisconsin docks was 75c to \$1.00 a ton. The unloading was then about 25c a ton, and was mostly unloaded by hand at that time.

"In 1911 coal sold to consumer in Manitowoc at \$8.00 a ton. Lake carrying charges are from 30c to 40c a ton. As now the unloading is done by modern machinery it is costing them from 5c to 10c a ton, making a difference of profit to the coal trust of over \$2.00 a ton, and they make a price to the retail dealers all over the country which nets them a profit of only a dollar a ton. The miners, according to reports, are receiving a little advance in wages, which will probably not exceed 5c a ton, but these figures can be secured accurately at the bureau of commerce and labor."

The above information is furnished The Commoner to support the charge that there is a trust in anthracite coal, and it supports it. Why not have an investigation of the coal trust.