

in the hands of those who desire or possess special privileges under the law. I am glad you men and women realize the dangers to which you expose your sons when you send them to legislatures to tinker with tariffs and to grant franchises and subsidies.

"Surely there must be a better way to handle public property and escape these dangers. Perhaps those who oppose government control of railroads, and municipal ownership of municipal property, are not as wise as we think they are. We ought also to remember that lying is as easy as bribery. Government by the people is a dream and the 'Revolution was indeed fought in vain,' unless we can remove this source of corruption which is destroying the Republic. The wish was expressed here today that the heads of corporations might see the dangers that threaten our nation, and resolve to quit buying legislation. That is a splendid suggestion, and I would like to offer another: That we, the people, help them to keep their good resolution by giving up our foolish and vicious custom of selling the sovereign powers of government for small cash payments, given by Big Business to those who misrepresent us, and by equitable taxation, the taxation of privilege—not industry and thrift—undo as far as lies in our power the mistakes of the past.

"As to remedies, give the people control of legislation, let them take again the power which should be theirs only, to initiate legislation, to O. K. or reject laws that have been passed, to call back their servants from Washington or Springfield when they doubt their honesty and efficiency; then our graft problem could be easily solved. How much money do you think corporations would pay for legislation that had to be O. K.'d by the people? Do you think certain mid-night transactions relative to school land leases and street car franchises in Chicago would have been consummated if the O. K. of the citizens had been necessary to validate these deals? When we have the initiative and the referendum we will have government by the people, and not till then. And if we study carefully the causes which have destroyed republics in the past, and profit by their mistakes, we may yet have a republic here greater than any the world has yet seen—a country like that described by Isalah, 'where those who build houses shall inhabit them, and those who plant vineyards shall eat the fruit of them'—a nation in which the possession of wealth shall be an evidence of good work, well done, by those who possess it."

+

I am glad to note this discussion because, after all, it's a splendid sign when the church clubs take up for discussion and consideration such vital questions. The majority of their members will, I am sure, do the right thing when they know what to do and how to do it; and for that reason I wish that every reader of *The Public* who is also a member of a church would aid in organizing such clubs for the discussion of such questions.

GEO. A. SCHILLING.

+ + +

The question is not how much prosperity the tariff will produce, but how much tariff the prosperity will stand.—Kansas City Post.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, June 28, 1910.

---

### Congressional Corruption.

An exposure of gigantic corruption in Congress in connection with sales of Indian lands was made on the 24th in a speech in the Senate by Senator Gore of Oklahoma. Under existing law, tribal contracts must be approved by the President and the Secretary of the Interior; but these officials have no authority over individual contracts with Indians. To protect the Indians in both respects Senator Gore had secured an amendment in the Senate to the deficiency appropriation bill when it came from the House, whereby contracts with the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations and by individual Choctaws and Chickasaws, were required to be approved by Congress as a condition of their validity. But when the deficiency bill came out of conference committee of the two houses, Senator Gore's protective clause had been altered.

+

Senator Gore did not learn of this until the Senate had adopted the conference committee's report. He was then assured by Senator Hale on the floor of the Senate that the matter had been properly safeguarded. This explanation he accepted, though with a monitory statement that John F. McMurray (the representative of the two Indian nations for several years) would receive graft to the extent of \$3,000,000 from individual contracts and that improper influence had been used by a representative of McMurray's to defeat the protective amendment.

+

Upon examining the substitute provision later, Senator Gore found it unsatisfactory and moved to recall the conference report. Senator Gallinger moved to lay this motion on the table, which was done. Senator Gore thereupon stated, as matter of personal privilege, that on May 4th last he had offered a resolution similar in terms to the protective amendment he had afterward had placed in the deficiency bill in the Senate, and that his resolution, which had now been struck out, had been referred to the committee on Indian affairs; that on the following day Senator Hughes had been di-

rected to make a favorable report on the resolution; and that—

"on May 6 a man came to me with an improper suggestion. He was a representative of Mr. McMurray, a resident of my home town, and had been my friend in a time of need. He assured me it would be to my financial interest if I would call on the Senator from Colorado and advise him not to report the resolution. There was a suggestion that \$50,000 would be available if the contracts were not prohibited. And I am informed that a similar proposition was made yesterday to a member of the House of Representatives."

+

Learning meanwhile that the House had not yet adopted the conference report, Senator Gore secured the attention of Congressman Murphy of Missouri, and through Mr. Murphy's vigorous opposition the House rejected the conference report by an almost unanimous vote. This action being reported to the Senate, Senator Hale moved that the Senate insist upon the Gore amendment and ask for further conference. On that motion Senator Gore spoke more fully. He stated that the man who had approached him on May 6th said that an ex-Senator from Nebraska, an ex-Senator from Kansas, and a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs were interested in the contracts. He added that he had just seen Mr. Tawney, one of the House conferees, and had asked him who had suggested the inefficient provision which was substituted by the conference committee for the Gore amendment, and Mr. Tawney named the very member of the House mentioned by the man who had approached Senator Gore. Gore's account of the attempt to bribe him is thus reported in one of the dispatches:

"A former personal friend, a man who had loaned me money, indorsed my notes, and had otherwise befriended me, came to me at the time I introduced my bill," said Mr. Gore, following his charges on the Senate floor, "and in the course of our conversation he said: 'I am interested in these McMurray contracts. There is a big fee in them.' I replied that I understood so. 'Yes,' he added, 'and there is enough for two.' I resented the intimation, but, nothing deterred, he continued: 'I can get you \$25,000 if you will call off Senator Hughes and not have your bill reported.' Receiving no encouragement from me, he raised the offer, saying: 'I believe if I should go and lay down on McMurray I could get you \$50,000.' I told him I would not do it for all the lands in Oklahoma. No, 'I will not at this time name the man, but I will in case of a Congressional investigation.'"

Although Senator Gore refused to mention any names but McMurray's, he said he hoped there would be an investigation of the whole matter, in the course of which he would make full disclosures. He went so far as to prepare a resolution for an investigation, but withheld it upon assurance from Senator Hale that the interests of the Indians would be properly safeguarded.

When Senator Gore in the Senate and Mr. Murphy in the House had finished speaking, the deficiency bill was returned to conference committee where a protective clause satisfactory to Senator Gore was inserted, and with this clause the bill was enacted by both Houses. Involved in this scandal there are reported to be in Oklahoma 450,000 acres of coal lands worth \$160,000,000. Before adjournment both Houses adopted on the 25th resolutions for a thorough investigation. The resolutions were mutually independent, and each House appointed its own committee, as follows: For the Senate—Wesley L. Jones of Washington, chairman, Theodore E. Burton of Ohio, Coe I. Crawford of South Dakota, Charles J. Hughes Jr. of Colorado, Leroy Percy of Mississippi. For the House—Charles H. Burke of South Dakota, chairman, Philip Campbell of Kansas, Clarence B. Miller of Minnesota, John H. Stephens of Texas, Edward W. Saunders of Virginia. This action was taken reluctantly, according to John Callan O'Laughlin in his Washington correspondence for the Chicago Tribune, who reports:

The sudden change of heart on the part of the leaders in Congress with respect to the Gore charges was not the least of the surprising developments in this astounding matter. Early in the day it had been determined to smother an inquiry if possible into the relation of any Senator or member of Congress to the Indian contracts. The leaders were willing to have the Indian affairs committee inquire into the validity of the contracts which J. F. McMurray had made with the Chickasaws and Choctaws and whether or not the fee of 10 per cent he had exacted was reasonable. They showed little disposition to have investigated the charges that members of Congress and two former Senators were interested in the agreements as alleged by Senator Gore. The matter was so pregnant with serious possibilities for the Republican party, however, that after careful consideration the conclusion was reached that an investigation would have to be made.

+ +

#### Conference on the Breakdown of Representative Government in Illinois.

What may become an historical conference of national interest and influence assembled at Peoria on the 27th in response to an open call (p. 587), and came to order under the temporary chairmanship of Charles L. Capen, of Bloomington, formerly President of the Illinois Bar Association. The object of the conference, as stated in the call, was "to consider the breakdown of the representative government of Illinois" an allusion to recent exposures of bribery in the legislature in connection with the Senatorial election and other legislative affairs,—“and to devise ways and means if possible, of restoring it.”

+

The opening meeting, on Monday afternoon, showed an earnest but not large attendance. The