MARCH 29, 1912

enumerated information as to the property possessed by him.

After the facts were all secured Holmes, who had charge of the compilation of this information divided the people of this country into three classes; class one, two and three, which is very appropriate. He might have said caste one, two and three, and then his language would have agreed with the division of the population of India. In India the population is divided into three classes; eighty per cent of them never have enough to eat; sixteen per cent of them have barely enough, and four per cent live in unlimited wealth and luxury.

Holmes, from the census of 1890 shows that 4,000 families in the United States, less than three one-hundredths of one per cent of our population have an aggregate wealth of onefifth of all the wealth of the people of the United States; that 1,139,000 families; or less than nine per cent of our population have an aggregate wealth of \$30,000,000,000, making a total for these two which he places under the head of class or caste one, of \$42,000,000,000, or seventy-one per cent of the wealth of the people of the United States, leaving twenty-nine per cent of the wealth for ninety-one per cent of our population.

In class two there are 3,600,000 families who own \$12,000,000,000 of the wealth or more than one-fourth of our population own the same amount as is owned by 4,000 families of the extremely rich. Six million six hundred thousand families or fifty-two per cent of our population had only \$3,000,000,000 cf the wealth or onefourth of the wealth of the 4,000 families who own this country. Therefore, the total of ninetyone per cent of our population owns \$17,000,-000,000 of the wealth of this country, and the rich or nine per cent of the population own \$43,-000,000,000 of the wealth of this country.

Mr. Sparr, a writer on the Outlook, and a lecturer of the New York Law Academy, a man of decided ability and statistician well known throughout the world and a lawyer by profession, made an investigation of the probate records of the middle and New England states, and his observation produced the same results as to the distribution of wealth as that obtained by Mr. Holmes.

These investigations to which I refer as to the distribution of wealth in this country were made in 1890 or twenty-two years ago. Since that time the concentration of wealth has gone on more rapidly than ever before. Fostered by privileges granted by congress, assisted by a president totally in sympathy with the exploiters of this country, the statistics would now show a far greater concentration of wealth than the figures of twenty-two years ago. Then fifty-two per cent of our people owned less than \$90 worth of property per capita; did not own their homes, were possessed of second-hand clothing and second-hand furniture and but little of that. Today an investigation would undoubtedly show a more startling state of affairs. In these twenty-two years the great billionaires of this country have appeared. Since 1890 the government has refused to continue this investigation. When the bill for taking the census of 1890 was before the senate I was a member of the committee on census, and I offered an amendment to the bill to continue the investigation of the distribution of wealth in this country, and the committee composed of a majority of republicans voted down the amendment. I then offered the amendment in the senate of the United States and it was again voted down. In support of the amendment I presented to the senate the facts with reference to the distribution of the wealth of this country and the representatives of the corporations of this country who composed a majority of the senate of the United States by roll call refused to adopt my amendment.

The Commoner.

require too long a discussion of this question, but undoubtedly the means of-transportation and distribution must be taken over and operated by the government in the interests of service rather than of dividends before any effective work can be accomplished to give equal opportunity to all.

It is said that in the past, in the days of the Roman empire, when a wealthy Roman wished to build a villa, he purchased the right to tax and govern a conquered province in Asia, and returned to Rome to enjoy his fortune. But when an American millionaire wishes to build a villa or buy a title in Europe, he purchases a tariff privilege from the congress of the United States, or corrupts a legislature or a city council and secures a franchise, and proceeds to rob his neighbors.

I am of the opinion that the Roman way was the best.

Our banking and currency system organized by these same exploiters of the people of this country, has contributed largely to this work of concentration, and the present Aldrich bill proposed by the bankers' taking into consideration only one class, is but a legalization of the existing pernicious money trust in this country.

Under its provisions they have sole control of the issue of money. These bankers can corner gold, contract or expand the volume of money at will, raise and lower prices as best suits their convenience and profit.

It is the duty of democracy to study this question and enact such laws as will take intoconsideration the whole body of the people and build up its industries, rather than allow one class to fix up their own scheme and confer upon themselves such vast privileges.

The trouble with our present banking system is, that one bank is allowed to deposit with another bank and count the deposit as a part of its reserves. So that a bank in western Nebraska deposits in Omaha, the Omaha bank deposits in Chicago, and the Chicago bank deposits in New York, and thus the money is counted three times over as a part of the reserve in various banks.

In my opinion all money should be issued by the government itself and the volume of money regulated so as to maintain a steady range of prices. No bank should be allowed to loan its deposits or deposit with another bank. This of course would prevent banks from making a profit through loans except as a commission charge either of the borrower of the money or the person who had it in the bank to loan, and would eliminate all panics and remove the explosive feature of our financial system. No bank in France outside of Paris is allowed to loan a dollar of its deposits. There has been no panic in France for the last seventy-five years. Our present banking system and the plan proposed by the Aldrich bill would simply center all the money of the country in the great centers and especially in New York. For during the last ten or twelve years under Roosevelt's and Taft's administration not only the railroads but the industries of the country have been gathered into great combinations having their financial center and their treasurers in New York, so that the growth of the deposits in the New York banks has simply been enormous and astonishing. In fact our great industries and our transportation companies are all now managed from New York. Ten years ago the leading fifteen banks and trust companies ten of them in New York, three in Chicago and two in Boston, held \$967,000,000 or forty-three per cent of the total currency then in circulation. Today fifteen institutions in the same states hold \$1,800,000,000 of deposits or more than half of the total actual amount of money in circulation in this country on February 1, 1912. In 1895, seventeen years ago, New York's share of the deposits of the fifteen institutions was \$260,000,000; ten years ago it was \$722,000,000. Today it is \$1,260,-000,000. The currency law and the banking law should be so framed as to keep the money in the localities where it is deposited. If no bank was allowed to re-deposit with another bank, and no bank was allowed to loan its deposits, and the government issue all the money and keep its volume sufficient to maintain a steady range of prices, it would be legislation in the interests of the whole people. While banking would not be so profitable, the industries of the country would be more stable. The banks should charge a commission for loans secured by them for their people and the transaction would be between the borrower and the lender, and thus the banks would not be borrowing upon call and loaning upon time and thus of necessity exploding with every approaching

panic. The granting of special privileges to the few to exploit the many, the donation of the natural resources of the country to great monopolies that has produced the universal feeling of unrest which has and is disturbing the business interests of this country. We protest against the anarchy of wealth.

A certain professor has said that he did not wish to disturb business, but the people do wish to disturb business.

It is the duty of democracy to overturn the present system of business and reorganize it on the basis of equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

Democracy should favor the recall of judges. So far as the state and local courts are concerned it is a state question, but the recall of the United States judges or rather the judges of the United States circuit and district courts could be best accomplished by abolishing the courts and conferring their jurisdiction upon the courts of the various states, with a provision that the decision of the supreme court of a state should be final upon all subjects.

The constitution of the United States provides: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

These inferior courts were established by congress upon the theory that a citizen of one state could not get justice in the courts of another state. We all know that a citizen of Masschusetts can secure justice in the courts of Illinois. If a citizen of the United States goes to a foreign country he and his property submit to the courts and the laws of the country where he happens temporarily to reside, and therefore there is no reason why these United States courts should exist. The judges are appointed for life, responsible to nobody, out of touch with the people and they use their power to misconstrue the constitution, overturn the acts of congress and have become the tools of the great corrupt interests of this country. In fact as a rule corporation lawyers who have spent their lives conniving with cunning skill to enable the great combinations to evade the law of the land, alone are selected to be the judges of the United States courts.

A concrete illustration of this state of affairs arose in New York in 1895: a general traffic association which was a combination of all railroads between New York and Chicago, was attacked by the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, on the ground that it was a combination in violation of the Sherman anti-trust law. Mr. McFarland, the United States attorney, for the southern district of New York, appeared before the interstate commerce committee of the United States senate, and under oath, made the following statement: "When the case came up Judge Lacombe stated that in his opinion he was disqualified to hear the case or any proceedings in it as at that time he owned bonds or stocks in some of the defendant railroads, and he also stated that he understood that most if not all the judges of that circuit were under the same disqualification." It was finally decided that Judge Wheeler, the district judge of the Vermont district, was apparently the only judge in the circuit who was not under a disqualification similar to that which Judge Lacombe had stated he was under, namely, the holding of some bonds or stock in some of the defendant railroads. The case was finally tried before Judge Wheeler, and as he was a creature of the political system in vogue, that is, had been appointed through the influence of the senators from Vermont. Senator Edmunds then in the United States senate, was employed by the railroads as one of their attorneys and filed a brief in the case. Judge Wheeler decided the case in favor of the railroads. An appeal was taken by the United States to the circuit court and then Judge Lacombe stated from the bench that he was now qualified to try the case because he had disposed of his stocks and bonds in the defendant railroads. He thereupon affirmed the decision rendered by Judge Wheeler and the case went to the supreme court of the United

In 1910 when the census bill was again before the senate I am informed that Senator La Follette of Wisconsin undertook to secure a similar amendment with the same result.

How has this great concentration of wealth been brought about? By the granting of privileges to the rich, by refusing to legislate in the interests of labor, by evading the enforcement on the part of the government of the anti-contract labor law, by the craft and cunning of the men who manage the great corporations of this country.

It is the duty of democracy to take this question vigorously in hand and by proper legislation bring about a redistribution among the people whe earned it of the wealth thus corruptly taken from the toilers of the country, and enact into law such legislation as will prevent such accumulations in the future. I will not undertake to suggest the remedy, that would

(Continued on Page 10.)

•	The speeches of Congressmen Robert
•	L. Henry, of Texas, and Frederick Town-
•	send Martin of New York, will be pub-
•	lished in next week's issue of The