

stitution of the United States?" To which the President answered, "I do not think that has anything to do with my convictions as to the best way it can be done." Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley of the District of Columbia Federation referred to the fact that the pending amendment would have to be referred to the states. To which the President answered by pointing out that three-fourths of the states could then force the measure on an objecting one-fourth. On this point Mrs. Dorr wished to know if the agreement when the Constitution was made did not imply submission on the part of the one-fourth? Answering that he could not say what was agreed upon and declaring the cross-examination improper, the President closed the meeting. [See current volume, page 586.]

On July 3 Dr. Anna H. Shaw, president of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association, wrote to President Wilson disavowing in behalf of the association all responsibility for this attempt to enlist his aid, and saying further that her association had accepted as final his statement made at the previous meeting with him. [See current volume, page 464.]

Washington Doings.

To definitely ascertain the condition of business throughout the country Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo on June 29 sent the following list of questions to all national banks:

1. Does your bank expect to have any unusual demand for money or credit within the next six months? If so, for what purpose or purposes?
2. To what extent, in your judgment, will funds be needed in your immediate section in addition to what local banks may be able to supply conveniently and normally, from their own sources or through the usual accommodations from correspondents?
3. During what months between now and January 1, 1915, will additional funds, if any, be most needed?
4. If, in your opinion, it is desirable to deposit public funds, as was done last year, in the national banks in certain principal cities of the different states, please indicate when and to what extent you think it may be desirable to place such funds in the national banks in the principal cities in your state, upon the assumption that the banks in such principal cities will use such funds, as far as practicable, for the accommodation of their country bank correspondents.
5. If such deposits should be made this season please state when you think the deposits placed in your community could be returned conveniently to the treasury, indicating the proportion of the deposits to be returned each month, so that the last repayments may be made not later than March 1, 1915.
6. What security—commercial paper, United

States or other bonds—can, with the greatest advantage to general business, and with safety to the government, be given by the banks in your section to secure such government deposits?

While it is expected that the federal reserve banks will begin business in time to assist in moving the crops this fall, the treasury department nevertheless will be prepared to help business to the full extent of its powers through the proper use of government funds if it becomes apparent at any time that such help is needed in any section of the country.

The Democratic Senate caucus on July 1 decided against adjournment until the pending anti-trust measures have been disposed of.

The Senate on July 6 confirmed the nomination of Charles S. Hamlin of Massachusetts, W. P. G. Harding of Alabama and A. C. Miller of San Francisco to the federal reserve board. The nominations of Thos. D. Jones of Illinois and of Paul Warburg of New York are still held up. Mr. Jones was subjected to a long cross-examination by the Committee on Banking and Currency regarding his relations with the International Harvester Co., and the New Jersey Zinc Co. He declared that he fully approved of all acts of the Harvester Co., since he became a director. Mr. Warburg was reported on July 6 to have requested the President to withdraw his name. [See current volume, page 586.]

Senators Overman and Chilton testified on July 2, before the committee investigating the use of Senate stationery for promotion of a gold mining company. Senator Overman declared that unknown to him his stenographer had written letters commending the project on the stationery. The stenographer corroborated him, and a messenger told of giving some of the stationery to a promoter who had employed the Senator's son-in-law as attorney. Senator Chilton denied all knowledge concerning the matter. Both Senators said that they own stock in the company. [See current volume, page 609.]

Roosevelt Discusses Public Questions.

Speaking at Pittsburgh on June 30 at a meeting of the Washington party—as the Progressive party is called in Pennsylvania—ex-President Roosevelt condemned the policies of the Wilson administration, and severely denounced Senator Penrose. He spoke in part as follows:

The present national administration is pursuing a course that prevents the existence of prosperity and that does not offer a single serious or intelligible plan for passing prosperity round, should prosperity in spite of the administration's efforts at some future

time return to our people. This is true both as regards the trust question and the tariff question. As regards both the only wise course to follow is that set forth in the National Progressive platform. The nation should deal with both by continuing executive action through administrative commissions of ample power. One commission should shape our tariff policies so as, with thorough knowledge disinterestedly acquired, to give proper encouragement to our merchants, while also giving proper protection to our wageworkers, our farmers and our business men. The other commission should exercise strict supervision and control over big business. We should treat it with entire justice, drawing the line not on size, but on misconduct. As regards the tariff, I wish especially to call your attention to the promises made by President Wilson, and his supporters two years ago. They asserted that their method of tariff reduction would reduce the cost of living and would thus solve the trust question, because, as they said, the trusts were the creatures of the tariff. We then answered that their promises were empty words.

The Progressive party stands for protection as regards business man, farmer and wageworker alike. It is against all favoritism to special interests. It believes that the tariff is a matter not of politics, but of sound public policy, and that it should be handled in a business way. The schedules should be determined by a knowledge of facts, not by trading votes and log-rolling. It should be the result of the careful deliberation of a body of trained men, chosen not for their political beliefs, but for their expert knowledge of business conditions.

We Progressives advocate the immediate creation of a nonpartisan commission, with power to propose revision of the tariff rates, schedule by schedule, treating each case on an intelligent consideration of its merits, divorced from favoritism and the fostering of special interests.

The Progressive tariff program would not be attained by the reckless haste, the improper influences, the sectional party policies which characterize our present methods of tariff legislation by the general law; and remember, that exactly the same methods were pursued in making the present tariff law as in making the Payne-Aldrich law, which it superseded. . . . Let us turn now to the Progressive anti-trust program. . . . Our program is based on the fundamental proposition that the state should regard private monopolistic power as contrary to public welfare, but that it should never attack a particular business organization merely because of its size. In many lines of industry the unit of social and economic efficiency in our time is a large unit. . . . We wish to put a stop to the misdeeds of business men who do wrong. We wish also to put a stop to the harrasing and persecution of honest business men who do right.

In the main monopoly springs from two causes—either the ability and the will to engage in unfair or oppressive trade practices or the control of some factor necessary to the successful conduct of the industry involved. . . . The evil to which public attention should be directed is not efficiency, but the control of the market gained by unfair trade practices or by taking undue advantage of the exclusive control of a factor essential to successful produc-

tion. . . . We cannot control our great national businesses without power, national power. But the Democrats dare not use power themselves nor let any one else have it. Their trust program, as it stands today, is made futile by this fear. Their official administration bills propose a weak federal trade commission, with no power except to investigate and report. . . . They hold that two farmers selling milk across a state line cannot co-operate, and that two men doing any business across a state line cannot form a partnership or a corporation. They insist that there must be no big business power, concentrated power, or large enterprises anywhere, and that our business must go back to the period of not merely 1850, but 1650; to the cobbler's bench, the grist mill and the blacksmith's forge. This is economic absurdity. We live in the twentieth century, not the seventeenth. . . . Unlimited competition has proved one of the greatest curses of modern civilization. It was unlimited competition which created the great trusts, exactly as it created the sweatshop and is chiefly responsible for child labor. The New Freedom is merely the exceedingly old freedom which permits each man to cut his neighbor's throat.

The Progressives are of the Twentieth century. They face the facts of today. They are not afraid of power, either in business or in government. . . . By long and disappointing experience we have had several cardinal facts hammered into us.

1. We cannot and do not want to destroy all corporations; we must have large units to do our work.

2. We cannot make every man compete with every other man; we cannot go back to 1850, still less to 1650.

3. We cannot destroy monopoly by attacking all forms of concentration, whether monopolistic or not.

4. We cannot destroy real monopoly by attacking its legal form. We must find out and take away the real economic basis of monopoly, which is a very different thing.

5. We can get no effective results through the courts, with their slow and restricted procedure.

6. We must encourage honest business and allow that business concentration which will give the power necessary to serve us. This policy of the encouragement of decent business is as important to the welfare of our people as is our other policy of effective warfare against corrupt and unfair business.

7. There must be co-operation among business men, among wageworkers and among farmers.

The Progressive party is the only party which recognizes these facts. . . . Any attempt such as the Clayton bill makes to destroy all combinations will also destroy this business machinery, which is not monopolistic, which is necessary to modern life, and which only needs to be regulated for the public good.

The only alternative is the Progressive plan, which is sane, effective and fair. We propose to provide a strong commission, getting prompt action by direct administrative process; with power in that commission to attack directly all unfair and oppressive forms of competition; power in that commission to take a case of monopoly, find out what is

the real business cornerstone of its monopoly, and then bring the full strength of the government directly against it. We propose to do away with all unfair practices by big business or little business.

We propose heartily to encourage honest business and to give full scope to efficiency, provided the efficiency is used for the benefit and not to the detriment of the people as a whole.



Concerning Senator Penrose, Colonel Roosevelt held him responsible, together with Barnes, Root and other Republican leaders, for the election of Wilson. "They stole from the rank and file of the Republican party," he said, "the right to govern themselves; to nominate their own candidates and promulgate their own platform. They took this action with the deliberate purpose of electing a Democratic President." In reply to this denunciation, Senator Penrose, in an interview, quoted a letter of congratulation he had received from Roosevelt on the occasion of the great majority rolled up in Pennsylvania in 1904. The Senator stated further that during Roosevelt's whole administration their relations were cordial.



In a statement given to the press on July 2, Colonel Roosevelt denounced the treaty with Colombia. He declared the payment of \$25,000,000 to be "a naked payment of belated blackmail." He characterized the transaction as "discreditable," and further said that "it will forfeit the right to the respect of the people of the United States." "There is small wonder," he said, "that many hundreds of Americans in Mexico have been endeavoring to become British, German or French subjects in order to get some protection from some government." [See current volume, page 609.]



This statement by Colonel Roosevelt followed one made on the preceding day by James T. Du Bois of Hallstead, Pennsylvania, who had been minister to Colombia during Taft's administration. In this statement Mr. Du Bois endorsed the pending treaty. "The public men of Colombia," he said, "compare favorably with those of other countries and are neither blackmailers nor bandits." Concerning the Panama revolution, Mr. Du Bois said:

A handful of men, who were to be the direct beneficiaries of the revolution, conceived it and not the hundredth part of the inhabitants of the isthmus knew of the revolt until an American officer, in the uniform of the United States army, raised the flag of the new republic.

Mr. Du Bois declared that negotiations under the Taft administration failed because of excessive

care to avoid impugning the motives of ex-President Roosevelt. He further said:

While negotiating for a treaty I made the Colombian authorities understand that under no circumstances would the United States apologize to any nation for a political act—that was our unwritten law that never had been and never would be broken. I suggested that a chivalrous expression of regret that our friendship had in any way been marred might later be embodied in the treaty as a balm for the wounded feelings of a once friendly nation which had been humiliated before the world, whose credit had been destroyed in foreign countries, whose borrowing ability had been annihilated, and whose persistent appeals for arbitration had been ignored.



That Colonel Roosevelt will be able to resume public speaking in six weeks was the assurance given on July 1 by his physician, Dr. H. Holbrook Curtis, a throat specialist. [See current volume, page 635.]



Commission on Industrial Relations.

The Federal Industrial Commission heard on June 27 at Philadelphia the testimony of James H. Maurer, president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor and a Socialist member of the legislature. Mr. Maurer declared that union men were justified in arming themselves under such conditions as prevail in Colorado, Michigan and West Virginia. When asked about the McNamaras he disclaimed sympathy with them but said that they "were victims of your own system of individualism. If their pleas were true, and I believe they were, they tried to protect their class by employing the methods of this idiotic age." As an immediate relief measure Mr. Maurer suggested the minimum wage. [See current volume, page 636.]



The action of the Senate Appropriation Committee on July 6, in cutting down the appropriation for the Industrial Relations Commission from \$200,000 to \$50,000 will, if not corrected, cripple the work of the commission. The explanation offered for the action is that the commission offended in letting facts become known regarding the prevalence of unemployment.



Social Questions Before the Rabbis' Conference.

The Central Conference of American Rabbis at Detroit on July 6, tabled a resolution of sympathy for Joseph Fels, also one declaring against prohibition, and others declaring for the minimum wage, industrial insurance, old age pensions, prohibition of child labor, right of labor to organize and similar measures. Rabbis Alfred G. Moses of Mobile and Max Heller of New Orleans advocated the Fels resolution. "Here is a man whose name