

The Commoner
ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, CHARLES W. BRYAN,
Editor and Proprietor Associate Ed. and Publisher
Edt. Rms and Business Office, Suite 207 Press Bldg.

One Year.....\$1.00 Three Months..... .25
Six Months..... .50 Single Copy..... .10
In Clubs of Five or Sample copies Free.
more per year75 Foreign Post. 25c Extra

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where such agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps, or currency.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus, January 21 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1921.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to—

THE COMMONER, LINCOLN, NEB.

have not sufficient means of bringing their grievances before the public. The avenues of information are all in private hands. The partisan newspapers are partial to their side and do not fairly present the situation. It is impossible for a man with convictions to present the opposite side as strongly as he presents his own. The so called independent papers may be divided into two classes, viz.; those that try to be independent and those that do not try. Those that try do not succeed because the bias of those who own the paper will not permit impartiality in the presentation of the issue and there are many so called independent papers that are now adjuncts of predatory interests and deliberately deceive the public. In the contested states that decide presidential elections, Republican newspapers are almost always with the corporations that enjoy special privileges. The public, therefore, is not clearly informed as to the real issues and as to the arguments pro and con. I see no hope except through the establishment of a national bulletin—not a newspaper but a bulletin—under bi-partisan control, which will furnish the three things needful. First, a clear presentation of the issues as they are stated by the two sides. Second, a comparison of the arguments as they are offered by the two sides in editorial space supplied to representatives of the various parties. Third, space for the presentation of the claims of candidates so that the candidates without wealth can have the same access to the public that the rich candidate has.

These are a few suggestions which I deem worthy of consideration. I appreciate the opportunity of presenting them to so representative a body of Southern Farmers.

Officers of the federal reserve bank are giving out interviews to the newspapers to the effect that there is no reason to believe a permanent depression of business exists and they urge upon business men the possession of an optimistic outlook. If the average business man had been able to make as big a per cent the last year as the federal reserve banks piled up at the expense of farmers, stockmen and small business men, they might feel optimistic, too.

An Omaha grand jury has indicted ninety-eight persons for frauds connected with the financing and operation of corporations that earned money only for the promoters. Ninety-eight seems like a large number of men to gather in a judicial dragnet until one stops to recall how many were actually engaged in bilking the public during the blue sky craze.

The packers having cut the wages of their employes are to have a strike on their hands. Having cleaned up the stockmen the packers evidently feel that they would have little difficulty in restoring old-time peonage conditions in the slaughter-houses.

A lot of complaints are heard about telephone service, the principal one being the failure to work of the lines connecting the wholesalers with the retailers of the country.

Lincoln's Municipal Coal Yard

The following statement by City Commissioner Charles W. Bryan is made in reply to a statement published in The Journal Sept. 29, 1921, and credited to H. T. Folsom, of the Union Coal Company. Mr. Bryan says:

"On Monday, Sept. 26, I presented to the city council an official report as city commissioner and superintendent of the municipal coal yard, giving information relative to the operation of the municipal coal yard, I felt the council and the public were entitled to.

In the State Journal of the morning of Sept. 29 there appeared a statement credited to one H. T. Folsom, of the Union Coal Company, under the following heading: "Brands C. W. Bryan as a Lie Spreader." The Journal's lead story preceding the Folsom statement vouches for the Folsom statement in the following language: "In a statement issued Wednesday H. T. Folsom, of the Union Coal Company, nails as unadulterated lies four statements made by Commissioner Bryan in a communication submitted by the latter to his colleagues of the council last Monday."

The low plane on which the statement was prepared and the manner in which it was written up by the newspaper are entirely out of harmony with present day civilization, education, culture or good taste. The statements made in the municipal coal yard attack are not worthy of a reply, but as the attack was made on a department of the city government and was intended to discredit the municipal coal yard and to intimidate the head of the city department in question from continuing his efforts to protect the public, I will set forth below the proof of the statements made in my official communication to the council and will trust the public to judge for itself as to who lied:

I stated in my official communication to the council that "a good man with a team could earn \$16.00 a day during the coal hauling season, and that a man with a truck from \$25 to \$30 a day." Mr. Folsom brands this official statement of mine as "lie No. 2." I will let Mr. Reed, a coal hauler with a team, answer Mr. Folsom. I have a signed statement from Mr. Reed as follows:

Lincoln, Neb., Sept. 29, 1921.

"I hereby certify that I have hauled and delivered with a team 24 tons of domestic coal in one day, the haul ranging from ten to thirty blocks to the trip.

H. D. Reed, 2269 Y street."

I will also let Mr. Wentink answer Mr. Folsom. Mr. Wentink operates a truck, and in a signed statement he says:

Lincoln, Sept. 29, 1921.

"I hereby certify that I have hauled 27 tons and delivered it in one day. I have made \$111 in six days hauling coal.

John Wentink, 2539 South 9th street."

I stated in my official report to the council that "it was possible for a coal dealer to pay for a motor truck within from sixty to ninety days out of the profits that some coal dealers are making out of the delivery of coal." Mr. Folsom branded this statement as "lie No. 3."

By referring above to Mr. Reed's letter, you will note that at the rate of \$1.25 per ton Mr. Reed would make with a team \$30 per day or in sixty days make \$1,800. In ninety days he could earn \$2,700. You will note that Mr. Wentink with a truck hauling 27 tons in a day at \$1.25 per ton would make \$33.75 per day. In sixty days at that rate he could earn \$2,025 or in ninety days \$3,037.50.

When I stated in my official report to the council about the municipal coal yard that "a man with a team could earn \$16 a day, that a man with a truck could earn from \$25 to \$30 a day and that a coal dealer could pay for a truck out of the profits of his coal delivery in from sixty to ninety days," my statement was very conservative. Two thousand dollars earned in sixty days would pay for about three trucks, and \$3,000 in ninety days would pay for about four and one-half new trucks or pay for about seven good second-hand trucks. In other words, a coal dealer out of his profits on the delivery of coal could pay for a fleet of trucks in sixty days or for a flock of trucks in ninety days capable of delivering 150 tons of coal a day.

I think the public will agree that Mr. Reed and Mr. Wentink have disposed of the so-called lies No. 2 and 3.

In my official report to the council I stated

that "the municipal coal yard had received up to that time orders for 315 tons of coal, which represented a saving of about \$750 to those who had purchased their coal up to that time from the muny coal yard." Mr. Folsom branded that statement as "lie No. 4."

When I was pushing the municipal coal yard project last February and urging the old council to put in a municipal coal yard to protect the public from profiteering in coal, I stated that "it was costing Lincoln people upwards of \$7.00 per ton to get coal delivered to their bins after it had reached the city of Lincoln on the train." I quoted the price of coal at the mine from federal government reports to show that coal could be bought for \$2.75 and that it was being sold in Lincoln from \$14.25 to \$14.50 per ton. I challenged the coal dealers to deny it, and they did not dare do so.

The public joined in the demand for a municipal coal yard, and when it appeared as though the old council might yield to the demand and put in a municipal coal yard, the price of coal was reduced by coal dealers from \$14.50 to something like \$11 per ton. Then when the old council stated that owing to the fact that the price of coal had receded and that the winter was nearly over and they did not deem it necessary to put in a municipal coal yard, the price of coal was advanced to above \$12.00 per ton.

After my election in May and the movement had been gotten under way to put in a municipal coal yard by direct vote of the people under the initiative and referendum and the petitions were in circulation to adopt a coal ordinance and to recall two members of the council in order to reduce the cost of living and the coal ordinance was permitted by the other members of the council to be passed and put into effect, the price of Central Illinois coal or what is known as cheap, sooty Illinois coal, was reduced to \$10.50 per ton, and in some instances to \$9.75 per ton. The high grade coal that the muny yard is selling at \$10.50 is \$4.00 a ton less than the same coal was being sold in Lincoln when I commenced the movement for a municipal coal yard last winter, and as the price of this grade of coal has advanced at the mine 55 cents a ton since last March, the purchase of the 315 tons of coal represented a saving to those who had purchased it of more than \$1,200 in place of the conservative statement I made of \$700 in my official report to the council on Sept. 26.

The figures and statements in proof of this answer to Mr. Folsom's so-called branding of "lie No. 4" can be verified in the columns of the Journal and statements corroborated by the manager of the municipal coal yard in Omaha, Mr. Butler, verified by advertisements and official statements that have appeared in the Journal since last January, and I will let Mr. Butler's official statements and the other statements referred to dispose of Mr. Folsom's charge of "lie No. 4."

In my official statement to the council that Mr. Folsom attacks, I stated that "the price of coal in Lincoln had been reduced about \$2.00 a ton by coal dealers notwithstanding the price at the mines had been advanced to from 50 to and 75 cents a ton since last February," Mr. Folsom branded that statement as "lie No. 1," and in his tirade to the press stated that "on last January the price of Illinois coal was from \$7 to \$9 per ton F. O. B. the mines, and since that time had been reduced as low as \$2.25 for the Central Illinois coal (which is the cheap sooty coal) and \$3.75 for Franklin county coal."

In proof of my statement that the price of Illinois coal had been advanced since February from 50 to 75 cents a ton and that Mr. Folsom's statement that the price of Illinois coal in January was from \$7 to \$9 a ton at the mine, needs some further explanation, I will quote prices of actual purchases in the open market by a large wholesale coal dealer whose books will verify the figures which I quote:

1921	Price at Mine
Jan. Franklin Co...	\$4.15; Central Ill... \$3.75
Feb. Franklin Co...	4.15; Central Ill... 3.75
Mar. Franklin Co...	3.50; Central Ill... 3.00
Apr. Franklin Co...	3.65; Central Ill... 2.75
May Franklin Co...	3.85; Central Ill... 2.50
Aug. Franklin Co...	4.05; Central Ill... 3.25
Sept. Franklin Co...	4.05; Central Ill... 3.50

These figures representing actual purchases by a Nebraska wholesale coal dealer at the prices and during the months named prove my statement that coal has advanced from 50 to 75 cents a ton since last February, and Mr. Folsom's own statement shows that the price of coal has been reduced \$2 a ton or more notwithstanding the fact that the price of coal has gone

Continued on Page 12