

road and that Senator Martin was one of the railroad agents for the disbursement of that fund.

"Mr. Thompson will not deny, I think, that a large sum was contributed by various railroads which, in the aggregate, amounted to many thousands of dollars. Should he do so, I shall be prepared to prove that such was the case. The letters I have already read show that the Richmond and Danville, Chesapeake and Ohio and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac railroads contributed to this fund. I shall now read a letter written by Mr. Thompson on November 23, 1891, showing that he had received from the treasurer of the B. & O. R. R. a check for two thousand dollars, which on that day he asked to be placed in bank to his credit. Will he say that this money was contributed by the B. & O. R. R. for the purpose of preserving Anglo-Saxon civilization in Virginia? If this money was not to constitute a part of a yellow dog legislative fund, for what purpose was it to be used?"

"When Mr. Thompson explains the use to which this money was placed, I may call upon him to make a like explanation as to other and larger contributions.

"But Mr. Thompson says in this remarkable statement of his that none of the money contributed by the railroads, so far as he knows and believes was given on condition that the recipient or the beneficiary should act in his official capacity in any particular way. This statement raises a question vital to the issue between Senator Martin and myself.

"If the evidence I have produced has not already established that there was a 'yellow dog' fund—a fund to be used prior to the election of 1891 in the election of members of the legislature who would recognize their obligations to the railroads when elected and later for the purpose of influencing legislation. I will now introduce a document which I think will convince every doubting Thomas, and put to rest forever every denial that railroad money was used, and used directly by the agents of the railroads. The letter which I will now read to you was written by the same Mr. Barbour Thompson. It was written on October 10, 1891, which was prior to the election, and it establishes beyond all question or cavil or doubt that Mr. Thompson and his agents did not aid democratic candidates notwithstanding their professed interest in our Anglo-Saxon civilization, unless they felt thoroughly satisfied as to their position."

READS HOLLAND LETTER

Mr. Jones then read the letter to Mr. Holland. The speaker then said:

"Again I ask what explanation will Mr. Thompson offer as to the direction given by him to Mr. Holland, who, by the way, was also a railroad man, that he should not render assistance to the two democratic candidates for the legislature, whose names are mentioned in this damning letter, unless he was thoroughly satisfied as to their position. Note how cunningly this letter is phrased. Although the writer states that a letter which he had received from one of the candidates showed very clearly that he was looking to 'us' for assistance, it also states that he had written that candidate 'advising him that I have asked you to see what could be done.' Mr. Thompson evidently did not think it wise to send funds to a democratic candidate about whose 'position' he was in doubt, nor did he think it prudent to send the money coupled with a condition. I do not believe that this letter requires further comment at my hands.

"I think it will be conceded by every honest and fair-minded man who reads Mr. Thompson's statement and compares it with the letter I have just read that it not only does not improve Mr. Martin's plight, but that it puts both Mr. Martin and Mr. Thompson in most unenviable positions. It not only has a direct bearing upon the issue raised between Mr. Martin and myself, which has now become one of veracity and integrity, but it relates to the Lee-Martin investigation.

"If I mistake not both Senator Martin and Mr. Thompson testified in that investigation, and both of them vehemently denounced as false any and every intimation that railroad funds, used to assist democratic legislative candidates in 1895 were distributed with a view to selecting candidates favorable to the former. They stated that these funds were used impartially and with absolute indifference as to the senatorial preferences or leanings of the candidates. According to their testimony they were used only for the purpose of electing a democratic legislature.

"If Mr. Thompson is mistaken in now saying that the money which he and Senator Martin

handled in 1891 was used solely for the purpose of electing democratic representatives in order to preserve our Anglo-Saxon civilization, as his letter to Mr. Holland clearly demonstrates, may he not also have been mistaken when he testified to the same effect in the Lee-Martin investigation? And had his memory been then refreshed, as I have now been able to refresh it, might not the verdict in that investigation have been different? Truly Mr. Thompson's statement opens a wide field for speculation.

"It will hardly be necessary for me to produce further documentary evidence to establish my case."

WATCH IT GROW

Mr. Bryan has given instructions that every new subscriber shall receive The Commoner for a period of two years (which will carry it beyond the presidential election of 1912) for the sum of one dollar. Every Commoner reader is asked to secure at least one new subscriber. Many will be able to secure more than one. Everyone, however, may render some aid in this work.

The following named readers have sent in five or more subscribers:

J. P. Hedge, Mo.; J. L. Bates, N. Y.; J. L. Walker, W. Va.; Jas. Daniels, Ia.; J. J. Guffey, Pa.; R. B. Brehant, O.; C. S. Gaunt, Mo.; R. L. Neil, W. Va.; J. Norman, Minn.; Albert White, Me.; H. A. Hostor, Ind.; Geo. C. Giles, Mo.; Wm. M. Righter, Pa.; W. W. White, O.; Dr. Jos. Tucker, Va.; J. V. Slinkard, Mo.; D. B. Pigg, Mo.; T. H. Miller, N. Y.; McEldin Dunn, O.; W. A. Beckett, Cal.; E. J. Kearn, Neb.; B. M. Lowrey, Mo.; W. H. Stutzman, Ill.; Geo. T. Murra, N. D.; A. W. Mannon, Ill.; Geo. W. Hensel, Ill.; L. L. Fisher, Minn.; J. W. Conn, Ore.; J. C. Stapleton, Ore.; H. M. Shilling, Ill.; J. W. Wood, Mo.; R. F. Garner, Cal.; W. W. Glidewell, Tex.; J. W. Hughes, N. Y.; W. A. Silcott, O.; W. B. Morse, Wash.; F. P. Magee, O.; O. M. Spaulding, Okla.; W. H. Kanppenberger, Pa.; A. F. Loehr, Ill.; W. H. Hartman, O.; J. M. Phillips, Pa.; G. A. Pardell, Pa.; Jno. E. Doning, O.; R. W. Good, Me.; H. R. Morris, W. Va.; V. H. Thomas, Okla.; W. H. Moore, Colo.; J. P. Turner, N. Y.; P. J. Marsh, Minn.; Jeff Kennedy, Kan.; W. R. McKimmons, Tex.; G. E. Cook, Mont.; J. Harps, Cal.; F. H. Allen, Dela.; G. W. Thompson, Mont.; J. M. Pettit, Tenn.; W. H. Howard, Fla.; R. B. Brehant, O.; A. J. Gwinn, W. Va.; Joel Stull, Ill.; B. W. Marshall, Ky.; R. B. Knox, Tex.; L. B. Barnes, Ark.; E. G. Edwards, Kan.; S. R. Chappell, Ind.; Amil Markee, Wis.; Gordon Kelsey, N. Y.; F. H. Stiles, N. J.; T. J. Hall, Mo.; L. E. Bopp, S. D.; Jos. M. Harper, La.; F. G. McGutcheon, Me.; Col. Brackett, O.; W. M. Smith, Ia.; Ellis Davidson, Kan.; R. D. Cotter, Mont.; Richard Power, Ore.; Silvanus Hills, Ore.; E. L. Ormsby, Cal.; W. R. Stockwell, N. H.; Jacob Stroup, Ida.; Jno. G. Hess, Md.; F. Brimacombe, N. Y.; E. W. Morris, W. Va.; S. J. Hockman, Ind.; S. M. Wilder, Minn.; Ben Willard, W. Va.; Jno. J. Putman, Neb.; J. H. Thorp, Mo.; P. H. Dunn, Mo.; J. A. Felkor, Ind.; J. D. Anderson, W. Va.; Jas. A. Graham, N. Y.; R. T. Southard, Mo.; Jno. W. Chambers, Ala.; P. C. Nelson, Wash.; W. N. Stratton, Neb.; G. A. Pardell, Pa.; R. S. Lowe, Kan.; Henry Heidacker, Ill.; Huffman Bros., Mo.; A. J. Barrett, Wash.; A. V. Mounce, Ida.; J. E. Lamb, Neb.; W. H. Pickerson, Ia.; W. R. Smith, Pa.; C. M. Brown, Mich.; M. V. Collins, N. Y.; G. J. Pillow, D. C.; C. W. Rosel, O.; Jos. Gass, Jr., Pa.; J. K. Simmons, Ill.; B. W. Terlinde, N. J.; O. D. Rittenhouse, N. D.; R. M. Laling, Neb.; W. B. Scott, O.; B. Coffin, Colo.; Z. T. Littlefield, Tex.; B. Atkinson, Ark.; R. L. Jacobson, Cal.; Jno. W. Chamblee, Ala.; H. D. Fortune, Ill.; G. W. McWherter, Tex.; J. Smith, Wash.; S. F. Hammer, Ia.; Mrs. E. M. Coffindaffer, Mo.; W. F. Eddy, Wash.; O. B. Kortright, N. Y.; H. M. Purdy, Neb.; H. W. Stocks, O.; S. Y. Miller, O.; M. A. Rhodes, Colo.; D. Roach, Ill.; J. Kinney, Mich.; D. W. McGeorge, Pa.; Jas. Tate, W. Va.; F. Krish, Ky.; W. H. Smith, N. C.; W. G. Eckert, Pa.; W. I. Boreman, W. Va.; L. F. Luthy, Mo.; S. A. Beals, Ind.; A. J. Myers, Ind.; Phil. W. Huff, Va.; W. P. Hudson, Cal.; E. J. Yorus, Minn.; S. A. Clark, O.; C. C. Coffey, Minn.; Willis Walters, O.; Francis Kelly, Cal.; J. A. Jenkins, Colo.; S. E. Hughes, O.; D. Brown, O.; J. W. Colley, Mo.; J. C. Smith, Ia.; M. M. Lawrence, Ark.; Wm. Shelby, Ind.; Wm. J. A. Raum, Neb.; F. K. Bridell, Ind.; Joe J. Russell, D. C.; Horace Sague, N. Y.; Jno. M. Fulton, Ia.; B. E. Calkin, N. Y.; Brooke H. Weeks, D. C.; Pete Campbell, N. J.; Bery King, Miss.; D. S. Wean, O.; Kerome Lewright, N. M.; Jas. Sraley, Ala.; I. T. Calhoun, Wash.; G. W. Pulliam, Ky.; F. C. Willey, Wash.; J. Knoblock, Va.; W. K. Sinton,

Colo.; W. S. James, Mo.; W. T. Boyd, Ill.; J. M. Dorchester, Okla.; L. E. Brickell, S. D.; H. Willis, Ky.; O. S. Norsman, Wis.; J. F. Kull, Ill.; W. A. Smith, Tex.; Jas. Burnett, Mo.; H. M. Satcher, Miss.; Geo. Sindlinger, Neb.; E. D. Hoover, Ia.; D. E. Joiner, Tex.; J. A. Jayne, N. Y.; F. A. Howe, Neb.; W. A. Buchanan, Tex.; A. E. Price, N. M.; J. T. Nichols, Kan.; Albert Rodgers, Ill.; H. L. Myers, D. C.; S. J. Fitzpatrick, O.; Geo. Sheplar, Mont.; Wm. Fisher, Ill.; J. T. Nicholls, Mo.; D. B. Fink, Kan.; E. M. Hovey, Mich.; J. A. Sellwood, Ore.; Ben W. Smith, Ky.; J. M. Crist, Wash.; T. J. Hicks, Cal.; Nick Guintana, Colo.; W. L. G. Haskins, Cal.; A. J. Johnson, Ind.; Wm. H. Hilliker, Mich.; Jno. Fromm, Sr., Ore.; Chas. Tripp, N. Y.; T. P. Burns, Kan.; Z. S. Hamilton, N. J.

EDITORIAL ACROBATICS

Under the headline, "Editorial Acrobatics" the Newark (N. J.) Evening News prints the following editorial:

June 17 the New York World devoted its leading editorial to "The Money Monopoly." Recently its leading editorial was entitled, "Is Wilson Bryanizing?" The former was a stout, well-reasoned defense of a statement made shortly before by Governor Wilson at Harrisburg, Pa., in which the governor had guardedly and judiciously indicated the anger that lies in the irresponsible power of concentrated industrial credit. The latter is one of the most extraordinary "flops" in the history of journalism, not excepting the performance of the New York Sun, when, in 1904, it leaped in the interval between editions, from the band-wagon of Alton B. Parker, "the white-plumed knight," to the opposite track of the political roadbed.

Such deliberate self-stultification on the part of a powerful and useful journal can not credibly be ascribed to a mere mischance, still less to a miracle. Like any other natural event, it must have a sufficient cause.

What, then, is the cause whose effect is so complete a reversal of editorial opinion?

Two answers, and only two, suggest themselves. Either both editorials were written with equal conviction and in lofty disregard of consistency, or else the Man Higher Up issued the command in obedience to which this high and lofty tumbling is performed for the public admiration. But how shall the public follow so inconsequential a wisdom in the first case, or retain respect for newspaper morals in the second?

The World first insisted that the "money monopoly" was a very real and present menace, adducing facts and figures in support of its contention. It now dismisses the whole thing as the phantasy of "a master phrase-maker" "without regard for the facts." But, after all, is not the World more convincing in its second manner? If its readers still cherished any doubts as to the power of the money monopoly June 17, when the World relied on mere logical reasoning to establish its existence, will not the last of these doubts be relinquished now that palpable proof is put into their hands?

We are driven, therefore, to the explanation which the World aptly applied to another case in its editorial of June 17. This explanation reads:

"Unless common report is mistaken, the governor is already on the monopoly's blacklist and it has decided that he would not be a proper candidate for president of the United States."

CONCENTRATED CONTROL OF WEALTH

Speaking at Harrisburg, Pa., in a gathering of democrats, Governor Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, said:

"The plain fact is that the control of credit is dangerously concentrated in this country. The money resources of the country are not at the command of those who do not submit to the direction and domination of small groups of capitalists who wish to keep the economic development of the country under their own eye and guidance. The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities, are in the hands of a few men, even if their actions be honest and intended for the public interest, are necessarily concentrated on the great undertakings in which their money is involved and who necessarily, by every reason of their own limitations, chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom. This is the greatest question of all and to this statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men."