

and a large part, of the campaign to waken our people as a whole to a lively and effective condemnation of the low standard of morality implied in such conduct on the part of great business concerns. The first duty of every man is to provide a livelihood for himself and for those dependent upon him; it is from every standpoint desirable that each of our citizens should endeavor by hard work and honorable methods to secure for him and his such a competence as will carry with it the opportunity to enjoy in reasonable fashion the comforts and refinements of life; and, furthermore, the man of great business ability who obtains a fortune in upright fashion inevitably in so doing confers a benefit upon the community as a whole and is entitled to reward, to respect, and to admiration. But among the many kinds of evil, social, industrial and political, which it is our duty as a nation sternly to combat, there is none at the same time more base and more dangerous than the greed which treats the plain and simple rules of honesty with cynical contempt if they interfere with making a profit; and as a nation we can not be held guiltless if we condone such action. The man who preaches hatred of wealth honestly acquired, who inculcates envy and jealousy and slanderous ill will toward those of his fellows who by thrift, energy and industry have become men of means, is a menace to the community."

This is a splendid illustration of the manner in which the public is robbed by private monopoly. It is time that the private monopoly was exterminated, for its extermination, instead of destroying business, will revive business and at the same time relieve the public from one of its greatest menaces.

#### PLEADING WITH THE SPEAKER

Newspaper dispatches say that President Roosevelt invited Speaker Cannon to the White House, May 5, and bluntly told him that unless he allowed the house to do something for the public interests he would be responsible for republican defeat. The president particularly wanted the wood pulp bill passed.

Referring to the conference between the president and the speaker, Walter Wellman in a dispatch printed in the Chicago Record-Herald says:

"Why pass a bill simply because the newspaper publishers want it? The country will declare we have discriminated in favor of the newspapers and we will receive the righteous swatting of the voters because we have done something for them and not for the rest of the people."

This, in substance, is understood to be the Cannon argument, or excuse, for not yielding to widespread pressure against free-listing pulp and paper. It is an excuse, however, that has been readily met by the new plan of action at the White House.

"If you want to do something for the rest of the people as well, you have the chance." That was in substance the answer given to Speaker Cannon today. "Here's the postal savings bank proposition. It has been urged by the administration, is in the interest of the whole people, and the people, having studied the matter, want the system established. They want that just as much as the publishers want wood pulp and print paper on the free list. You alone stand in the way of both propositions. Act in both matters, or get off the lid and let the house act and then it can not be said that congress was discriminating in favor of any single interest."

This must be interesting reading for republicans who yet believe that the republican party intends to represent the people.

Here the president of the United States invites the speaker to the White House and pleads with him to give republican publishers—and, of course, publishers generally—relief from tariff imposition. And when the speaker says that a wood pulp bill would be a dangerous object lesson for voters who yet imagine that the foreigner pays the tax and that "the rest of the people" will then demand some relief, the president says he might give "the rest of the people" the postal savings bank. "Uncle Joe" is right so far as the object lesson is concerned. A great many republicans who have for years patiently submitted to tariff exactions are very likely—in the face of tariff revision for the benefit of the newspaper publishers—to ask "why not tariff revision for consumers generally?"

And why not tariff revision? If it is good for the newspaper publisher why not give it

to the consumers generally? And how does it happen that this great political organization, whose leaders insist that it is the party of the people, the "party of God and morality," can not be persuaded to legislate in public interests.

It can hardly be coaxed to give enough in the way of remedial legislation to which the republican political managers may point as an excuse for the re-election of their party to the control of the national government?

#### PULP, SOPHISTRY AND PLAIN FACT

Our Washington correspondent states on high Canadian authority that the Dominion parliament is not expected by any well-informed person to impose an export duty on wood pulp. Such a measure, it is true, has been advocated by certain interests, but it is vigorously opposed by other important and politically influential interests, and no action is at all probable for the present and immediate future.

This disposes of the last refuge of the sophists and artful dodgers who, having determined to do nothing that might in any manner or degree affect the tariff, have been hard put to it to find plausible reasons for their unpopular and indefensible position on the wood pulp and print paper question.

The whole affair would be farcical if it did not involve a grave and far-reaching assault on representative government. It is not the interests of the publishers alone that are at stake. Were that the case it would be injudicious for the press to agitate the matter regardless of other injustices in the antiquated tariff act. The Stevens bill in relation to wood pulp and paper is earnestly favored by all who realize the need of forest preservation and prudent utilization of our natural resources generally. It embodies an explicit recommendation of the president based solely on that need, and it could and ought to be passed on its own merits strictly, and without reference to the demand for tariff revision. A majority of the republican members of the house would gladly vote for it on those national and general grounds. The minority is anxious to vote for it and would pledge itself to abstain from confusing amendments "reopening the tariff question."

But a small group of eminent standpatters defy the majority, flout the president, treat his messages with contempt, refuse to consider or hold hearings on the bill, resort to subterfuge after subterfuge—all in order to avoid straightforward action. That eminent "trust buster," Uncle Joe, introduces a resolution for an independent inquiry by a committee that has nothing to do with the wood pulp question and whose findings would bind no one and hold out no promise of legislation; and that other eminent trust buster, Congressman Man, is made the inquisitor in chief to put the publishers on the defensive and obscure the real, the paramount arguments for the wood pulp and paper proposition.

But whom will all these tricks deceive? Do the individual representatives imagine that their constituents will be terrified by the names of Cannon, Payne and Dalzell and accept as sufficient the pitiable plea that the house could do nothing against the veto of the triumvirate? The individual representative will have to face the music in his own district, and buncombe will not "go."

(The above is not a Commoner editorial. It was not taken from any democratic paper. It appeared as an editorial in that devoted old republican newspaper, the Chicago Record-Herald—issue of April 28.)

#### "A STRONG TAFT MOVEMENT"

Writing from New York to his paper, the Chicago Record-Herald, William E. Curtis says: "There is a strong Taft movement in Wall Street. You would be surprised to hear the enthusiastic indorsements that are given to the secretary of war by the men who are supposed to be violently opposed to the policies of the president."

That sounds familiar. Commoner readers will remember that during the month of March the Taft press bureau, located at Columbus, O., sent out, according to the Washington Herald, printed slips bearing these headlines: "Business Hope Lies on Taft," "Assert Taft is Best Candidate," "Big Wall Street House Calls on Financial Interests to Assist in Nomination." Following are extracts from the Taft circular: "Mr. Taft's long record is distinctly against any conclusion that he would continue Mr. Roosevelt's methods. He has displayed brains, abil-

ity, good judgment, and, above all, sanity, in the great and successful accomplishments of his career. We must not lose sight of the fact that there is a temperamental difference in the two men, Roosevelt and Taft. By nature and by training, as a lawyer and as a judge, Mr. Taft has always manifested a thoughtful attitude in his judgment, and a great deliberation and conservatism in his actions. Neither is it conceivable that a man of his force of character would be controlled, when in the full power of the presidency, by any outside personality."

In its issue of March 9, the Washington Herald printed an interview with General Kiefer, a member of congress, in which he said that he was for Taft and did not believe that if elected he would "too closely follow Roosevelt's ideas." It will be remembered that these reports greatly disturbed Mr. Taft and his managers and they took pains to say that the circular from the Taft headquarters had been issued by a subordinate at the Columbus office.

Later the Omaha Bee, a leading Taft organ, quoted from the New York Commercial-Advertiser this paragraph:

"As to the 'me too,' charge it became dead and showed not even mechanical life when it appeared that with respect to the Roosevelt policies Governor Hughes, Senator Knox, Speaker Cannon, Vice President Fairbanks and the others were quite as much for them as Secretary Taft."

#### "NOW LETTEST THOU THY SERVANT"

At a dinner given to Senator Knox by the Americus Republican club at Pittsburg, Mr. Nicholas Longworth, a member of congress from Ohio, referred to Mr. Bryan as "a statesman who never wrote a statute, a soldier who never fought a battle, a lawyer who never had a case, a farmer who never turned a furrow."

Then Mr. Longworth said: "I want to say there is one thing in which I agree with him. Mr. Bryan has repeatedly and ably advocated that this government should own and maintain legations and embassies in the various capitals of the world and should own and maintain consular establishments in some of the principal ports. In that proposition I am in absolute accord with Mr. Bryan: in fact, it is a hobby of mine which I am apt to ride upon all occasions, and perhaps I may be pardoned for mounting it for a moment here."

It is, indeed, gratifying to learn that even upon one proposition Mr. Bryan has been able to win the approval of Mr. Nicholas Longworth. Such a result might well be the height of any man's ambition.

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The house committee has at last reported the McCall bill providing for publicity as to campaign contributions. The McCall bill is the bill which has been urged by the publicity organization, of which Mr. Perry Belmont is president. This is one of the measures which Mr. Williams, as leader of the minority, has urged upon congress and it is to be hoped that he will succeed in forcing action. Refusal of the republican majority to allow the bill to come to a vote can be construed only as an effort to continue the corrupt use of money in politics. The McCall bill is intended to compel publicity as to campaign contributions and publicity is death to the corrupt methods which have been employed during recent years. If we can compel the publication of contributions before the election, contributions given for a corrupt purpose will be very much lessened, for the predatory corporations cannot make public contributions to a campaign fund without hurting the party which they attempt to help. The democrats by favoring this law show that they are trying to purify politics; the republicans by opposing it prove their intimate association with the corrupting influences which have to so large an extent made our government the private asset of favor-seeking combinations.

A Maine manufacturer offers Congressman Littlefield \$5,000 if he will prove to the satisfaction of twelve disinterested men or women that the protective tariff is a good thing for American workingmen. As Congressman Littlefield resigned in order to make more money than a congressman's pay, here is a chance to make a good start.