

Insurgency was also rampant throughout the country districts of the State. In Newcastle, Lawrence County, the Socialists elected a Mayor. The Democrats gained six judges and in sixteen counties breaks were made in the Penrose machine. Some of these counties went Democratic for the first time in 25 years. The Republican majorities in practically every county were reduced or converted into victories for the Democrats, the Keystoners and the Socialists. Surely the people are beginning to view politics in a new light in Pennsylvania, the old bulwark of Republicanism.

The great Quay machine, handed down to Penrose in perfect working order, is crumbling. In 1912 it will have no easy task to hold itself together, for in the opinion of many, Pennsylvania will then be "fighting ground" for Progressives.

BERNARD B. M'GINNIS.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

"CURRENCY REFORM" A LA ALDRICH

Denver, Colo.

We are living in troublous times; but of all the things that threaten our peace and liberty, nothing seems to me quite so dangerous as the scheme for handing the country over to the bankers, wholly and irrevocably, as is proposed by the "Aldrich Currency Plan."

That the people will allow such a measure seems incredible, but unless the promoters of the scheme felt tolerably sure of success they would hardly advertise it so boldly; for, hitherto, their work has been done largely under cover, and its ultimate object disguised.

I have read that "at a convention of the National Board of Trade, held in Washington, a series of resolutions was offered by the New York Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association of New York and the New York Produce Exchange and was adopted unanimously." (Please notice, that, although the convention was held in Washington, our national capital, New York did the business.) The series begins as follows: "Resolved, that this convention unequivocally declares in favor of the creation for the United States of a central banking organization, based upon the following general principles." The series of resolutions ends with this: "(10) That the Central organization is ultimately to become the sole note-issuing power."

The "general principles" embodied in the intervening resolutions I have left out as being irrelevant to my purpose. If the end of a road is highly undesirable we are not interested in its direction nor in its various crooks and turns. The end of this road—"to become the sole note-issuing power"—is the goal towards which the longing eyes of American bankers have been turned ever since the first national bank was chartered—when, in its sore need, the nation sold its birthright for a mess of pottage.

A Money Trust is essential to the life of the other trusts. It has been with us, imperfectly developed, as the National Banking System, over 50 years; is it now to be perfected as a "Central Banking Organization" and "become the sole note-issuing

power"? Then we may expect a tyranny compared to which that of George III. over the American Colonies would look like benevolent protection. Any business man could be ruined at the behest of this money combine; no business could start without its consent. There would be no way out except through a revolution in which "confiscation" and "repudiation" would sound like mild terms.

If the Aldrich' currency plan, when full-blown, shows the people the real facts in the case, perhaps the experience will not be too dearly bought though the price be tremendous.

CELIA BALDWIN WHITEHEAD.

+ + +

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE?

Fairmont, Minn.

In the issue of The Outlook for Dec. 2nd there appears an editorial anent The Regulation of Bank Organization. The article states that "the Kansas Supreme Court has for the first time in this country established the power of a Commonwealth to deny charters to bank organizations." The article cites the specific instance on which the Court rendered its decision upholding the action of the Charter Board in denying an application.

May I ask as to the similarity of the principle involved in the regulation of the establishment of banks and the principle involved in the regulation of wages by a labor union? If the free-lance laborer must have his inviolable right to engage himself to whomsoever he chooses and for what price or wage he chooses guaranteed to him, why must not the ambitious banker by the same token be guaranteed the same freedom of independent action? Why must capital be protected against free lance capital and labor go unprotected against free-lance laborers?

Of course the motive of the regulation of bank organization is the protection of the depositor. But is the welfare of the depositor any more sacred than the welfare of the child of the laborer? Is there any more reason that capital shall be made secure against injudicious free-lance bankers than that the welfare of the home of the laborer shall be made secure against injudicious free-lance laborers? Why should the bank already established in a community have any vested interest against a new banking establishment and be protected in that interest by the State, and the already employed laborer be denied any vested interest in his job and remain unprotected against any new comer?

Is not the labor union censured and stigmatized for attempting to secure for itself the same protection which the State of Kansas has guaranteed to the banks already established in that State?

ALBERT E. FILLMORE.

+ + +

PULLING THE SUPREME COURT'S TEETH.

New York, Nov. 27.

Mr. Leubuscher, in The Public of November 24, says that I, in The Public of October 20, "unwittingly" suggested a peaceable method of depriving the Supreme Court of the United States of all power to declare unconstitutional most classes of