

**"STAY AT HOME TRUSTEES"**

When it was suggested that Governor De-  
neen of Illinois, or Robert T. Lincoln become  
associated with the Equitable Assurance Society,  
the Chicago Tribune said that neither of these  
gentlemen could afford to permit the use of his  
name in connection with that institution. But  
several other distinguished gentlemen have given  
the use of their names; they have accepted posi-  
tions offered them on the claim that they will  
be able to faithfully serve thousands of men  
who are interested in a substantial way in Equi-  
table affairs and who have been imposed upon  
by the managers of that insurance society.

It is to be hoped that these gentlemen will  
have what they call "a free hand" in the dis-  
charge of their duties. But there is evidently  
abroad in the land, a well defined suspicion that  
the men who engineered the recent change in  
Equitable affairs are not controlled entirely by  
unselfish motives. Indeed, we are told by several  
of the leading newspapers of the country, that  
the change in Equitable management, which was  
represented to be principally along the line of  
reform, is nothing more nor less than the lay-  
ing of the foundation for the greatest financial  
syndicate in the history of this country and that  
that will be the result if "Thomas F. Ryan and  
associates" are able to carry out their original  
plan.

The three gentlemen who have permitted the  
use of their names as trustees under the new  
regime in the Equitable, have assumed a large  
responsibility. Unless all indications are decep-  
tive, they will find it necessary to devote a large  
share of their time to the protection not only of  
the interests of Equitable policy holders, but of  
their own good names.

The man whose standing before the public  
is such as to make the use of his name valuable  
to a great financial concern has made an enor-  
mous investment in that concern when he asso-  
ciates himself with it. Banks print the names of  
their directors and they make it a point to se-  
cure in that capacity the services of men hav-  
ing the confidence of the community. In all too  
many instances these directors do not give that  
strict attention to the bank's affairs which they  
owe to themselves. In all too many instances  
the management of the financial institution is  
left to the care of men who have little or no  
concern for the good reputations of their asso-  
ciates.

The Saturday Evening Post recently printed  
an interesting and instructive editorial referring  
to the popular protest against the "stay-at-home-  
voter" saying that an equally strong protest  
should be made against the "stay-at-home direc-  
tor." The Post pointed out that the affairs of  
the masses having interests at stake in finan-  
cial institutions were sacrificed because of the  
inattention of a number of good men in finan-  
cial directories and because these men neglect-  
ed the important duties they had assumed and  
permitted a few men to manage affairs for which  
the entire directory is in fact responsible.

It is to be hoped that the trustees chosen  
by the syndicate known as "Thomas F. Ryan  
and Associates," will not permit themselves to  
come under the head of the "stay-at-home  
trustees."

The Commoner certainly wishes these trust-  
ees well in every effort they may make to pro-  
tect the interests of the helpless people who  
have been subjected to the merciless management  
of the Hydes and the Alexanders. It may not  
be out of place, however, to remind these trust-  
ees that they will do well to carefully scrutinize  
every detail of the association's affairs during  
the day and sleep with one eye open during the  
night. When men lend the use of their names  
to an institution plainly in the control of finan-  
ciers who, in popular parlance, "won't stand with-  
out hitching," they will do well to remember that  
eternal vigilance is the price of their good repu-  
tations.

**TAXATION AND THREATS**

The representatives of a fraternal organiza-  
tion with headquarters in a western city, threaten  
to remove their headquarters to another state  
if the state authorities insist on the enforcement  
of an order recently made providing for the tax-  
ation of securities held in the reserve fund of  
fraternal and beneficiary orders.

If it is not right that such securities be taxed,  
then protest should be made in proper form. But  
it is not at all creditable to a fraternal order  
that its representatives engage in a threat, so  
common with corporations, to remove their head-  
quarters from the state whose officials have under-

taken the enforcement of the taxation law as  
they understand it.

Doubtless the representatives of this order  
would be very indignant if, after they had re-  
moved their headquarters from the state in which  
it is now located, those of the citizens of that  
state holding policies in that order, should with-  
draw from membership. But when the officers  
of that order seek to influence the taxing power  
of the state by the threat to remove their head-  
quarters in the event certain portions of the  
order's property is taxed, they invite retaliation  
on the part of citizens, who, as would unques-  
tionably be made to appear, have a far deeper in-  
terest in their home state than they have in any  
particular insurance society.

The representatives of that order would do  
well to make their protest in a dignified way to  
the taxing power, and if they feel their cause is  
righteous they could appeal to the legislature,  
which would unquestionably amend the law where-  
ever it was found to do an injustice to the fra-  
ternal order.

Fraternal insurance has a strong hold upon  
the people and that well defined sentiment is  
certain to reflect itself in the legislature in such  
a way as to destroy all inequities.

**NOT WISE TO USE NAME**

Mr. Bryan has received a number of requests  
for permission to use his name in the formation  
of democratic clubs. To all who submit such re-  
quests he would say: It is better to use either  
the word democratic, or the name of Jefferson or  
Jackson. So long as a man is alive the use of  
his name by a political club is likely to be mis-  
understood. Then, too, the use of the name may  
prove an embarrassment to him and to the club.  
Mr. Bryan would prefer that his name be not  
so used. He expects to take an active part in  
politics for many years to come, and he wants  
to be free to say what he thinks ought to be  
said, and to do what he thinks ought to be done.  
In following his conscience and his judgment he  
may possibly go contrary to the opinions of those  
who are members of the various clubs and he  
would regret to hamper the club in its freedom  
of action. Whether Mr. Bryan is ever a candidate  
for any office again will depend upon circum-  
stances; the question can not be decided now.  
"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." He  
does not want to stand in the attitude of a can-  
didate; and the naming of clubs after him might  
be represented by unfriendly critics as an at-  
tempt on the part of his friends to place him in  
this attitude before the country.

If the members of a club desire a name that  
will emphasize their determination to give effect  
to the will of the voters they might call the club  
the Primary Pledge club. Mr. Bryan appreciates  
the hearty response that has been made to the  
primary pledge appeal, and personally and through  
The Commoner will give every possible assist-  
ance to those who are thus organizing for an  
aggressive fight in 1908.

**BUT SOME ONE MUST YIELD**

The Washington Post says: "We have read  
many times about threatened splits in the repub-  
lican party, but somehow they don't materialize  
very frequently."

But it is evident at this time that some-  
thing will happen to the republican party unless  
some republicans abandon their position.

A very large number of republicans insist  
that the shelter which the trusts find in the tariff  
must be destroyed. The tariff barons say that  
the maintenance of that shelter is a patriotic duty.  
If this difference is not settled to the satisfaction  
of the tariff baron the world knows that he will  
not tamely submit.

Mr. Roosevelt says that the interstate com-  
merce commission must be given authority to fix  
railroad rates. The railroad managers and their  
representatives in the United States senate say  
"No." Somebody must yield on this point.

Mr. Roosevelt says, in effect, that the time  
has come when we must shackle cunning as in  
the past we have shackled force. But the repre-  
sentatives of cunning protest vigorously against  
the shackles. It is plain that some one must  
yield on the shackling question.

Mr. Roosevelt has, in effect, said that in  
spite of the republican claim that it is the duty  
of Americans to buy at home, even though they  
are required to pay more than they would if the  
purchase was made in a foreign market, the  
supplies for the Panama canal will be purchased  
abroad in order to avoid the impositions which  
the trust magnates seek to put upon the govern-  
ment. Republican leaders like Cannon and

Grosvenor, backed by the agents of the trusts,  
say that the public money shall not be spent in  
foreign markets, but must be spent in this coun-  
try. Someone must yield on this point or else  
the split will be forthcoming.

Mr. Roosevelt has said that the criminal  
clause of the Sherman anti-trust law must be en-  
forced. The champions of the trust system say  
that the enforcement of that clause is too radi-  
cal. Some one must yield on this point.

Certain reforms demanded by the republican  
administration and by the rank and file of the  
party are so essentially at war with the doctrine  
and the practice of the republican party, and yet  
so thoroughly in keeping with what public inter-  
ests seem to require at this time, that there will  
be a split unless one party or the other to this  
contention surrenders.

Do we not well know that there is no prob-  
ability that the representatives of special inter-  
ests will yield? The question is, will those re-  
publicans who have insisted upon reform yield?  
If they remain true to their convictions and strive  
to put these reforms into actual operation or  
seek to give to them the formal endorsement of  
their party, they will be entitled to credit, even  
though they fail. But it would be impossible to  
conceive of a more humiliating spectacle than  
that wherein a man who, like Theodore Roose-  
velt, has won the applause and commendation  
of men of all political parties because of his ad-  
vocacy of certain reforms, abandons his efforts;  
abandons his efforts because the special inter-  
ests he assails have secured control of republican  
representatives in congress; because his patriotic  
course is not in line with the record of a party  
that has habitually surrendered itself into the  
merciless keeping of trust magnates and corpora-  
tion chiefs.

Perhaps there will be no split in the repub-  
lican party, but in that event one side or the  
other of the present day conflict must yield. The  
attention of the American people is now riveted  
upon the situation. They will be interested in  
learning which of the contestants yields—and they  
will, undoubtedly, know when the yielding has  
taken place.

**WHY NOT PAUL MORTON?**

Judson Harmon of Cincinnati, who with F. N.  
Judson of St. Louis, was retained to investigate  
the charge that the Santa Fe railroad had vio-  
lated the anti-rebate law, announces that Mr.  
Judson and himself have retired from all con-  
nection with that investigation.

According to Mr. Harmon's statement,  
Messrs. Harmon and Judson recommended "that  
certain proceedings be taken." It has been wide-  
ly published, and is not denied, that these "cer-  
tain proceedings" were the prosecution of Paul  
Morton for his part in the violation of the anti-  
rebate law. Mr. Harmon says that the attorney  
general disapproved the recommendations, add-  
ing "as he had a perfect right to do." It seems  
however, that Messrs. Judson and Harmon were  
so convinced of the correctness of their recom-  
mendations that they thought their duty required  
them to adhere to their views and they so noti-  
fied the attorney general, and, as Mr. Harmon  
says, "retired from further connection with the  
matter."

Of course the attorney general had a perfect  
right to disapprove the recommendations, but a  
great many people will be curious to know what  
rule exempts a conspicuous personage like Paul  
Morton from prosecution for the plainly admitted  
violation of law.

When a man of influence violates a law, there  
is no place for a "weaking" in the office charged  
with the duty of enforcing the law. The people  
are not given "a square deal" when a man is per-  
mitted to escape punishment for his misdeeds  
simply because he happens to occupy a conspicu-  
ous position in the councils of the political or-  
ganization immediately in control of public af-  
fairs.

If there is any good reason why the law  
should not take its course in the case of Paul  
Morton, Mr. Roosevelt should make that reason  
known to the public. As Mr. Harmon says, "there  
should be no mystery about what has become  
of the matter." The people want to know the  
truth and the whole truth. They have a right  
to know whether the refusal to prosecute Paul  
Morton for his confessed violation of law squares  
with Mr. Roosevelt's proclamations from the  
stump.

Mr. Shaw has no objection to Mr. Taft sit-  
ting on the tariff lid as long as he pleases. It is  
when Mr. Taft sits on the Shaw presidential boom  
that Mr. Shaw enters strenuous objection.