

False Claims as to Political Strength

The following editorial was printed in the Cincinnati Enquirer: The enemies of progressive democracy, like the enemies of progression in every form, are at their best in silence, in darkness and in ambush.

Intrigue is their weapon, cabal and combine is their method, and they dread the light, as is natural with all evil things to fear the primal creation of God.

Publicity, enlightenment of the people upon their dark ways and sinister representatives, is certain to defeat their aims and overwhelm their cause with disaster.

The more information the voters have upon any political subject the better position they are in to judge correctly upon that subject, and, believing in this, the Enquirer proposes, without fear or favor, to turn a searchlight upon the election statistics of the past few years and show how absurd it is for what are termed the reactionary forces of the country to either profess to believe or to imagine for a moment that they have any chance to nominate or elect an attorney of their choice, a representative of their interests or an advocate of their views.

We are constantly told of the strength that will be added to the democratic vote through the nomination of a man that will be satisfactory to interests that are by the very nature of things antagonistic to the democratic party.

We are implored to nominate a man that will carry New York, New Jersey and Connecticut by appeals to the conservative sentiment of those states, and one that will be recognized as a friend and an ally of these interests that are so necessary for the party to secure a political victory.

Very good. Let us see what is the voting strength of this "safe, sound and conservative" element that promises to crown the democratic standard with the laurels of victory, provided the party nominates an attorney that has served them well—one who did not rudely enforce the statutes of the United States as written in the anti-trust law.

In 1904 we were promised by this same element a national political triumph of the most sweeping character.

They were to mass their millions of conservative voters at the polls and sweep the country for a man representative of their views and their section of the union.

The democrats placed at their head that

worthy son of New York, Hon. Alton B. Parker, an upright judge, a straight democrat, a man of high character and of good reputation.

And this is what New York, Connecticut and New Jersey did to their own favorite and their own selected candidate:

Connecticut, Roosevelt's plurality..... 38,180
New Jersey, Roosevelt's plurality..... 80,598
New York, Roosevelt's plurality..... 175,552

This was, indeed, a full measure of that conservative democratic strength which was to roll up for New York's candidate and New York's choice a rousing majority.

Now, lest our democratic friends in the east and the south and the west should forget, let us compare these pluralities with those of 1900, when the candidate was opposed by those who delight to class themselves as "safe, sound and conservative."

We can thus truly and accurately arrive at the strength of the reactionaries of these three states:

1900—
Connecticut, McKinley's plurality..... 28,570
New Jersey, McKinley plurality..... 56,899
New York, McKinley's plurality..... 143,606

Democrats of Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and West Virginia, democrats of the whole union, can you not see the weakness of a reactionary candidate, or of any ally or representative of the interests, as our candidate right in the very states they deem their strongholds?

If these men who would select one of their instruments as the democratic candidate for president have any influence over the voters in their own states it was not exercised for the candidate they demanded and that the party nominate in 1904.

If they are without influence upon their home voters, as this comparison of 1900 and 1904 indicates, they surely have none outside of the states named, and a candidate of their choosing would have no chance in any direction.

Let the south and the west see to it that New York, New Jersey and Connecticut are given a strong candidate, one that is known as a progressive and who can carry the three states and enough others to place the party in possession of the federal power.

Let us select a man who can poll the progressive votes of those states and the entire progressive vote of the country.

Such a man can carry New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana and be elected.

Harmon's Record

HOW HE DODGED ON AN IMPORTANT NEWSPAPER BILL, PASSED BY THE OHIO LEGISLATURE

An inspection of the numerous bills passed by the Ohio legislature which Governor Harmon allowed to become laws without his approval does not add to his fame as a progressive executive. One of the admitted bulwarks of a democracy is a free press. This does not mean that because a man owns a newspaper he is licensed to utilize its vast power to tear down the character or to destroy the business of men whom he does not like. It does mean the freedom to write and print with due regard to the truth and the rights and reputations of others, with full responsibility for whatever is printed. If such a publication be true and it be published with good motives and for justifiable ends this is a sufficient defense in an action. Generally speaking, the courts hold a newspaper accountable for the truth of what it prints except in certain cases, where the publication is declared to be privileged.

Briefly stated, a privileged publication means that the newspaper has the right to publish certain matters without being held responsible for the truth of the statements contained therein. In some states the statutes prescribe what sort of matter is privileged, but in most of them the courts, following constitutional guarantees, have protected newspapers in the publication of reports of legislative and judicial proceedings. This privilege is extended to newspapers because the public weal demands it. Otherwise a newspaper would be compelled to prove the

truth of every statement made in council and legislative meetings by members as well as the contents of documents and informations and indictments filed in court.

At the 1911 session of the Ohio legislature Senator Bader introduced and there was passed a law specifically defining just what a newspaper might print under the protection of judicial privilege, a safeguard that is valuable not only to the newspaper, but to the public. On page 95 of the "Laws of Ohio for 1911" will be found this act. The general code is supplemented by the enactment of two new sections conferring this right upon the press of Ohio. One of these sections provides that the publication of a fair and impartial report of the proceedings before state or municipal legislative bodies or before state or municipal executive bodies, boards or officers, or the whole or a fair synopsis of any bill, ordinance, report, resolution, bulletin, notice, petition or other document presented, filed or issued in any proceeding before such legislative or executive body, board or officer, shall be privileged, unless it shall be proved that such publication was made maliciously.

The other section provides that the publication of a fair and impartial report of the return of any indictment, the issuing of a warrant, the arrest of any person accused of crime, or the filing of any affidavit, pleading or other document in any criminal or civil cause in any court of competent jurisdiction, or of a fair and impartial report of the contents thereof, shall be privileged, unless it be proved that the publication was made maliciously, or that the defendant has refused or neglected to publish in the same manner in which the publication complained of appeared, a reasonable written explanation or contradiction thereof by the plaintiff, or that the publisher has refused, upon request of the plaintiff, to publish the subsequent determination of such suit or action; pro-

vided that nothing in this act shall authorize the publication of blasphemous or indecent matter.

This law, in short, gave to the newspapers the right to print an impartial account for the information of the public, its readers, of just what was being done or said or determined by the public bodies and public courts of the state. It is a law equally important to newspaper publishers and the public. It is a necessary law. It is a law distinctly progressive, which a governor jealous of free institutions like the press would hasten to approve. Governor Harmon neither approved nor vetoed it. It was passed April 26th, 1911, and after having laid in the executive office without action upon it for ten days, it became a law without his signature, in accordance with the constitution of the state of Ohio.

C. Q. D.

Henry's Great Fight

Following is an Associated Press dispatch: Washington, Jan. 29.—The proposed congressional investigation of the domination of the financial interests of the United States by a so-called "money trust" has developed a live issue in the house democracy, threatening to mar the harmonious progress of the party since its elevation to control of that branch of congress. Representative Henry of Texas, chairman of the rules committee, today introduced a resolution to direct a most sweeping investigation, particularly aimed at the New York stock exchange and clearing house association groups of financiers in Wall street, who are declared to be dominating corporation and railroad interests; the national banks and their alleged promotion of speculative schemes with deposits and the influence of the "money power" in the nomination and election of public officials.

This attempt of Mr. Henry to broaden the scope of the inquiry originally proposed by Representative Lindbergh of Minnesota, evoked a stirring protest from his democratic colleague, Representative Littleton of New York. Mr. Littleton declared that the proposed inquiry "would further identify the democratic party with a blind and destructive policy."

Democratic Leader Underwood has been counselling with his colleagues several days and though he has not yet made a public statement, he had viewed the proposition with considerable concern as to its effect on the party. The issue will be fought out first in a party caucus.

Mr. Henry proposes a special committee of seven members to conduct the inquiry, which should embrace also pending resolutions relating to changes in the anti-trust law. This committee would have autocratic power. It would be empowered to summon financial magnates and demand production of books and papers. The resolution in its reference to the New York stock exchange and clearing house is designed to ascertain whether they are dominated by any individual or group of individuals in "directing the use or deposit of funds of national banks in the city of New York or of interstate roads or industrial corporations."

William J. Bryan has for some time vigorously urged on congress an investigation of the money trust.

MIGHT HAVE WAITED

The Hartford Courant says: "A cheap sensation was started recently in New York to the effect that Mr. Morgan had outwitted the Stanley committee (investigating Steel trust affairs) by running surreptitiously off to Europe. The fact is that the intention of Mr. Morgan to sail soon has been frequently published of late and his departure was not secret."

But Mr. Morgan might have waited a bit after he had been told that he could serve his country by giving some inside information. He is, however, so deeply interested in art that the country must spare him—particularly when energetic committees like the Stanley committee gets too inquisitive.