

been in to see me for three or four days. "Well," I said, "I will send up." When he came through the door he did not meet me with his characteristic frankness. But I greeted him exactly as usual and said, "E, I want to have a little talk with you." I moved my chair right up to his, placed my hands on his knees and looked him in the eye a moment before I spoke. Then I asked, "E, what's the matter?" The tears started in his eyes and the response came at once: "Governor, I can't help it. I've got to vote against the railroad taxation bill." After a moment he added, "I haven't slept any for two or three nights. I have walked the floor. I have thought of resigning and going home."

"Tell me all about it, E," I said.

"Well," he replied, "you know that all I have in the world I have put into that factory of mine. I have told you about how proud I was of the thing. Now," he said, "this railroad lobby tells me that if I vote for that railroad taxation bill they will ruin me in business. They can take away everything I've got. They have threatened to give my competitors advantages over me in railroad rates that will offset any advantages I have with my new machinery. Now, I can't beggar my family. I have a wife and babies."

I said, "E, you can't do this wrong. You can't violate your conscience." I talked to him quite a bit. He got up and walked the floor. He said he would always be for our measures, but he could not risk being driven to the wall. And then he left the office.

A few minutes before the roll call on the bill, E, who sat next to Lenroot, turned to him and said, "Lenroot, in five minutes I am going to violate my oath of office."

Lenroot was shocked and said, "What do you mean?"

He replied: "It is a question between my honor and my bread and butter, and I propose to vote for my bread and butter."

And he voted against the bill.



### Stealing Wages in Lawrence.

For seven weeks a strike has been in progress at the textile factories in Lawrence, Massachusetts. These factories are subsidized through the Federal government by means of the protective tariff. The reasons given are the necessity of the subsidy in order to maintain American wages. The wages are nevertheless reduced below the living point, and a long strike results. Thereupon the powers of the State—judicial, police, and military—are brought to the aid of the subsidized employers; and this interference in their interest is extended so far beyond the law as to interfere with the sending by strikers of their children to temporary homes in other cities. By what law have the police done this? If by none, why do the higher authorities allow it? And then that tariff subsidy. This makes the question national. The

people of the United States are empowering those Lawrence manufacturers to charge excessive prices for their products *in order to pay good wages*; but the employers *pay starvation wages* and put the extra prices into their own pockets. Hasn't this a good deal the flavor of stealing by trick and device? and isn't it time for Congress to take up Congressman Berger's investigation resolution and find out why tariff protection for workers does not profit workers?



### For a "Money Trust" Whitewash.

Several members of Congress went on record last week in unblushing defense of secrecy for the "money trust." Ex-Speaker Cannon led them. There is no telling how many more may do the same thing when the attempt to uncover these "money maggots" reaches the danger point. At present, however, it seems as if the caucus vote which suppressed a special committee and referred the matter to the neatly packed committee on banking, may have failed in its anti-publicity purpose. By a vote of 207 to 8 in the House on the 24th the committee on banking were given pretty strict orders. They may not now be able to sidestep the investigation, as was undoubtedly the original expectation. And none the easier will it be since other and unpacked committees are asking authority to investigate the "money trust" with reference to their own respective functions. Thus the judiciary committee proposes to investigate the "money trust's" violations of the Sherman law, and the committee on Presidential elections proposes investigating its connection with campaign contributions.\*



### That Postal "Surplus."

Why should the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General demand of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association that it withdraw its endorsement from its organ? If because the organ had misrepresented the Department, a demand for correction would have been more appropriate. For the Department to demand a boycott by its employees of their organ has a high-handed appearance. As to the misrepresentation, it appears to have been to the effect that the recent Department boast of a "surplus" is not true. The R. F. D. News (the organ in question) had explained that this "surplus" was arrived at by bookkeeping methods, and did not represent the actual financial condition of the postal service. And now this "misrepresenta-

\*See The Public of February 23, page 172.