

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

Vol. 6. No. 47.

Lincoln, Nebraska, December 7, 1906.

Whole Number 307.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL ON THE MESSAGE

WHAT A RASCAL

UNTIMELY

PRACTICAL VS. IDEAL

THAT BROWN BABY

A NEBRASKA BANKER ON ASSET CURRENCY

KEEP COOL

SYNOPSIS OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS

HOME DEPARTMENT

WHETHER COMMON OR NOT

NEWS OF THE WEEK

WHAT A RASCAL!

The New York authorities recently discovered that an eighteen-year-old boy had cleared \$10,000 by the organization of a corporation based on wind. The Napoleons of finance in Wall Street stood aghast at the lad's wickedness while the "captains of industry" demanded that the youth be prosecuted. In this connection a story printed by the Kansas City Journal will prove of interest.

"Well, sir?" said the great lawyer.

The visitor spoke tremulously.

"I am a defaulter," he said, "and I want you to defend me."

The other shook him by the hand. "Certainly I will defend you, my friend," he murmured, kindly. "And how many hundred thousand did you say—"

"Hundred thousand?" the client interrupted. "Oh, sir, don't think me worse than I am. It is only \$490 in all, and I expect to pay back every cent before I die."

"George," he said to the office boy, "show this dishonest rascal out."

UNTIMELY

The New York World seems broken-hearted because New York's representation in the United States senate compares so poorly with that of other states. Concerning Platt and Depew, the New York World says that neither is capable of performing the duties of a senator; that neither is fit to sit in the congress of the United States. It is very like the World to make such a protest at this time. If the World had but served its country as faithfully when campaigns are on as it does after election day, there would be no Platts or Depews posing as representatives of the Empire state in the United States senate.

NO FEDERAL INCORPORATION

Judge Grosscup thinks that our corporations ought to be reorganized. That is all right. Some of them need reorganization and a squeezing out of the water but the public must beware of a reorganization that permits the incorporation of industrial enterprises by the federal government. It is one thing for the federal government to protect interstate commerce from the trusts; it is quite a different thing to organize interstate corporations that will be superior to state laws and state courts.

KEEP COOL

Another New York woman claims that she, rather than the author of a much discussed and recently published book, was the first to advocate the "trial marriage" system.

Well, there's no need to make a fuss about it. It is not of any particular credit to any one.

"BITE BIGGER"



ADAPTED FROM A FAMILIAR PICTURE

Comment on the Message

The president's message, just sent to congress, may well be regarded as his most important state paper. It contains much that is democratic and for which the general public may well thank him. It contains some things that ought to arouse severe criticism. The president boldly appropriates some of the doctrines which the democrats have been advocating, and on the other hand he announces some doctrines which are so absurd as to excite amusement if the suggestions came from a less prominent source. In some cases he takes advanced ground; in some cases he retreats from ground already taken.

Take, for instance, his recommendation in regard to campaign funds. He urges the passage of a law which will make it a criminal offense for any corporation to contribute to any campaign fund. In this suggestion he is entirely right. The directors of corporations handle money of stockholders, and as the corporation is not organized for a political purpose, the directors have no legal right to divert funds which they hold in trust to the advancement of their own political views. But the president does not stop there.

As to individual contributions, he virtually recedes from the position taken in a former message. He says: "Let individuals contribute as they desire; but let us prohibit in effective fashion all corporations, etc." He is on record as insisting upon publicity as to individual contributions; why surrender that contention? While it is eminently proper that corporations should be forbidden to contribute, it is also important that the contributions made by individuals should be known. After the recent election in New York the published reports of the committees showed that Morgan, Rockefeller, Carnegie and others contributed large amounts to the republican campaign fund. It is important that these contributions should be known, and it is still more important that they should be known before the

election. The democrats in congress, while supporting the president's recommendation in favor of the prohibition of corporate contributions, should insist that the committee reports should disclose the contributors of all considerable amounts and that the disclosures should be made at least ten days before the close of the campaign in order that the public may see on which side large contributions are being made, for the public will then know from which side the trust magnates and high financiers expect to receive favors. It is not necessary that the names of small contributors shall be given, for when a man gives a few dollars to a campaign fund, it may be assumed that he gives it because he shares in a general interest, but when men give large sums, it is quite certain that they expect some definite return in the way of privilege or favoritism.

The president asks for a law conferring upon the government the right of appeal in criminal cases where disputed questions of law are involved. In this the president is right. While such appeal can not affect that particular case, it can secure a decision which will be a guide in future cases.

The president says: "The government has now definitely begun a policy of resorting to the criminal law in those trust and interstate commerce cases where such a course offers a reasonable chance of success." This is a confession that for many years the government did not resort to the criminal law in trust cases. It is encouraging to know that a reform has been instituted, and the public will watch the effect of the experiment which the president now commends in deterring the trust magnates. This is a democratic position, and the president in taking the step is following democratic advice. If the doctrine of equality before the law is to be the doctrine of the land, there must be no hesitancy