

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

Entered at the postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class mail matter.

One Year	\$1.00	Three Months	25c
Six Months	50c	Single Copy	5c
In Clubs of 5 or more, per year	75c	Sample Copies Free.	
		Foreign Postage 50c Extra.	

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to *The Commoner*. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where such agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps, or money.

RENEWALS.—The date on your wrapper shows when your subscription will expire. Thus, Jan., '04, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January 1904. Two weeks are required after money is received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give the OLD as well as the NEW address.

ADVERTISING rates furnished upon application. Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

The Commoner wishes to each one of its half million readers a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

It will be noted that Baking Powder Magnate Zeigler tries to make light of the boodling charges against him.

It must be confessed that ten millions of Uncle Sam's dollars will make a very ornamental hatband for Panama.

Mr. Hanna keeps on declining, but he talks with the emphasis of a man who is depending a great deal upon his friends.

President Roosevelt must have had on his "far-sighted" glasses to be enabled to see the independence of Panama before it happened.

Another girl has been born into the Vanderbilt family and already a number of infantile earls and dukes are being taught to take notice.

George Washington wrote something about "entangling alliances," but it must be remembered that George's reputation for strenuousness was not press agented.

Perry Heath refuses to resign, and President Roosevelt should resign himself to the situation. Uncle Mark is not allowing his friends to be shoved these days.

With a distinct recollection of the Transvaal the British newspapers experience no difficulty in finding commendations for the president's course in the Panama matter.

"No man is above the law, and no man is below it," says President Roosevelt. Well, what's the matter with the criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law, then?

Senator Hoar wants the president to have an opportunity to tell the whole truth about that Panama deal, and that is why Senator Hoar is not in good standing at the White house just now.

Since the republicans "redeemed" Nebraska from fusion rule the state has been plunging in debt at the rate of \$1.05 a minute. This is a very expensive kind of redemption for the taxpayers.

Would it not be a good idea to put an emancipation proclamation into the Sulu stocking? Or will the administration refuse to issue the proclamation on the technicality that Sulus wear no stockings?

Captain J. F. Kiehl, of McKeesport, Pa., is desirous of obtaining information of the whereabouts of John P. Kiehl, a plasterer by trade, about 54 years old and a member of the Masonic fraternity.

By the way, speaking of senatorial trafficking in postoffices, is it not true that while men may not as a rule do that to secure election, is it not generally conceded that senators do it to secure re-election?

A British scientist predicts that in about five billion years the days will be fifty-five hours long. When that time comes doubtless the trusts will pay by the day and dock their employes for the time lost in sleep.

The more Mr. Hanna looks into existing conditions and future probabilities the more apt he is to let President Roosevelt have the nomination by default. Uncle Marcus may be too wise to go up against foreordained defeat.

Secretary Root says he is willing to stand for everything General Wood did in Cuba. This is quite brave of Mr. Root, but, perhaps, if he will take another look he will discover that he already has about all one man can stand.

The annual Nobel prize of \$39,150 has been awarded to William R. Cremer, M. P. for his work in behalf of international arbitration. This is encouraging. That amount of money is almost one-half of the winner's net profits in the last heavy-weight prize fight.

Perry Heath declares that he will not resign. Having profited by the statute of limitations he is now ready to take advantage of the statute of intimidation. He will dare them to discharge him. Perry has his eyes on a few pillars of the republican temple that show signs of being easily pulled down.

The steel trust will reduce the wages of 150,000 employes on January 1, the reduction being from 15 to 25 per cent. This will save the steel trust \$15,000,000 a year. Accompanying the reduction will, we presume, be a neat little circular setting forth the wondrous beauties of "letting well enough alone" and "the full dinner pail."

The Baltimore American says that "Colombia should reflect upon the profound truth contained in the fable of the dog who dropped the bone from his mouth to secure the one he saw in the water reflecting his own image." And while Colombia is about it she might ponder long and well over the fact that under present conditions this once honest republic is now engaged in diplomatic work for profit, regardless of common honesty.

Mr. Roosevelt said: "The people of Panama rose literally as one man," and the New York Evening Post is unkind enough to intimate that the president meant that Mr. Bunau-Varilla really did it all. The Post points out, however, that in any case, Mr. Roosevelt's phrase is hard upon the junta, because there are at least three men in the body that assumes to stand for the government which has been recently recognized on the isthmus.

Literally as one Man.

Mr. Roosevelt said: "The people of Panama rose literally as one man," and the New York Evening Post is unkind enough to intimate that the president meant that Mr. Bunau-Varilla really did it all. The Post points out, however, that in any case, Mr. Roosevelt's phrase is hard upon the junta, because there are at least three men in the body that assumes to stand for the government which has been recently recognized on the isthmus.

Senator Hoar of Massachusetts says that he has often voted against his party's policies, and that he has nothing to regret for his votes on those occasions. He adds that he has never bolted the party because it always sooner or later came around to his view. Will Senator Hoar undertake to say that there is any reason for the belief that the republican party is getting any nearer to Senator Hoar's views on the question of imperialism than it was at the time Senator Hoar delivered his great speech in the senate?

Mr. Hoar and His Party.

Senator Hoar of Massachusetts says that he has often voted against his party's policies, and that he has nothing to regret for his votes on those occasions. He adds that he has never bolted the party because it always sooner or later came around to his view. Will Senator Hoar undertake to say that there is any reason for the belief that the republican party is getting any nearer to Senator Hoar's views on the question of imperialism than it was at the time Senator Hoar delivered his great speech in the senate?

The Milwaukee News is a bit pessimistic, for it says: "President Roosevelt is desirous that Perry Heath shall be removed from the secretaryship of the republican national committee, fearful that should he be retained it will handicap the republican presidential nominee. Mr. Hanna insists that Heath shall remain, making light of the president's fears. Mark is in a better position to judge than the president. He has just carried Ohio by 125,000 votes and he knows what he has done and he knows that the voters know it. It really doesn't seem to make any difference."

The News is Gloomy.

The Milwaukee News is a bit pessimistic, for it says: "President Roosevelt is desirous that Perry Heath shall be removed from the secretaryship of the republican national committee, fearful that should he be retained it will handicap the republican presidential nominee. Mr. Hanna insists that Heath shall remain, making light of the president's fears. Mark is in a better position to judge than the president. He has just carried Ohio by 125,000 votes and he knows what he has done and he knows that the voters know it. It really doesn't seem to make any difference."

In his message to congress, Mr. Roosevelt did not touch on the tariff question and it is possible that on the one hand he does not want to give offense to those republicans who believe in tariff revision, and that on the other he does not want to do anything to discourage the highly

Ignoring the Tariff Question.

In his message to congress, Mr. Roosevelt did not touch on the tariff question and it is possible that on the one hand he does not want to give offense to those republicans who believe in tariff revision, and that on the other he does not want to do anything to discourage the highly

protected interests who contribute liberally to the republican campaign fund. It will be remembered that no less an authority than Colonel "Lafe" Young, editor of the Des Moines Capital a republican paper, recently said that a vast amount of the campaign funds allotted to Iowa in 1896 was brought through the influence of National Committeeman Cummins, "and it is presumed a good part of that fund came from the protected interests."

Referring to the Grand Rapids, Mich., water scandal, the Chicago Record-Herald voices a very general sentiment when it says: "One is almost tempted to say that a city the size of Grand Rapids which permits private companies to have anything to do with furnishing its water supply deserves no better fate. Whether the testimony of Salsbury is finally corroborated or not, the project to let a contract for supplying the city with water has developed a scandal which should impress the people with the necessity for full and complete municipal ownership and control of the city's water supply."

Public Ownership Solves It.

A republican newspaper charges that the republican congress has "deliberately and systematically" prevented "the abolition of the forty-five customs houses where the receipts are not sufficient to pay the cost of collecting the customs." Is it possible that this republican paper expected republican congressmen to pay any attention to recommendations of this sort? Have not republican congressmen preached to the people the doctrine of "let well enough alone," and would they dare to face their constituents after having abolished forty-five positions in which generous provision may be made for faithful party workers?

Letting "Well Enough Alone."

A republican newspaper charges that the republican congress has "deliberately and systematically" prevented "the abolition of the forty-five customs houses where the receipts are not sufficient to pay the cost of collecting the customs." Is it possible that this republican paper expected republican congressmen to pay any attention to recommendations of this sort? Have not republican congressmen preached to the people the doctrine of "let well enough alone," and would they dare to face their constituents after having abolished forty-five positions in which generous provision may be made for faithful party workers?

While, in his brief accompanying the Bristow report, Mr. Roosevelt talked finely concerning corruption in public office, newspaper dispatches say that the administration "through orders given to the United States courts at San Juan have seemingly put the quietus upon the smuggling scandals that have given San Juan such unpleasant notoriety, caused a lot of trouble and expense for prominent army and navy officers and citizens and repeatedly brought Porto Rico into a state of great excitement." In the first place, some people will wonder where the administration found its authority to give orders to the United States court or to any other court. It would also be interesting to learn whether the Roosevelt administration laid down in the brief accompanying the Bristow report a code of morals which is not to apply to our new possessions.

That Code of Morals.

While, in his brief accompanying the Bristow report, Mr. Roosevelt talked finely concerning corruption in public office, newspaper dispatches say that the administration "through orders given to the United States courts at San Juan have seemingly put the quietus upon the smuggling scandals that have given San Juan such unpleasant notoriety, caused a lot of trouble and expense for prominent army and navy officers and citizens and repeatedly brought Porto Rico into a state of great excitement." In the first place, some people will wonder where the administration found its authority to give orders to the United States court or to any other court. It would also be interesting to learn whether the Roosevelt administration laid down in the brief accompanying the Bristow report a code of morals which is not to apply to our new possessions.

An Associated press dispatch from Chicago, Ill., under date of November 29, says: "Following its announced policy of centralization, the International Harvester company has decided "Policy of Centralization" to lay off 7,500 of its 13,000 employes and effect a saving of \$5,000,000 a year. The first step in the direction of economy was taken last night when 1,500 employes of the Deering division were notified their services were no longer required. These men were employed in the factories at Irondale. It was announced today that the Irondale men were not the only Chicago employes of the company who were to suffer. Of the 7,000 workers in the Deering division 3,000 in all are to be laid off. Of these 1,500 are employed in the Fullerton avenue plant, the others being at Irondale, One Hundred and Eighth street and the Calumet river. The McCormick division will not discharge so many, but 1,500 of its 7,000 employes being slated for dismissal. Another 3,000 workers to lose positions are those employed in the mills at Milwaukee, Springfield, O., and Plano." According to this dispatch, then, "the policy of centralization" adopted by the International Harvester company results in the throwing out of employment of 7,500 men and a saving to the company of \$5,000,000 per year. Is it possible that these results follow only the particular policy of centralization adopted by the International Harvester company, or are they not the logical outcome of the policy of centralization that is going on all over the country today? And yet republican leaders tell us that the trusts have come to stay and that the policy of centralization must not be interfered with, save for a few occasional doses of publicity.

Policy of Centralization.

An Associated press dispatch from Chicago, Ill., under date of November 29, says: "Following its announced policy of centralization, the International Harvester company has decided "Policy of Centralization" to lay off 7,500 of its 13,000 employes and effect a saving of \$5,000,000 a year. The first step in the direction of economy was taken last night when 1,500 employes of the Deering division were notified their services were no longer required. These men were employed in the factories at Irondale. It was announced today that the Irondale men were not the only Chicago employes of the company who were to suffer. Of the 7,000 workers in the Deering division 3,000 in all are to be laid off. Of these 1,500 are employed in the Fullerton avenue plant, the others being at Irondale, One Hundred and Eighth street and the Calumet river. The McCormick division will not discharge so many, but 1,500 of its 7,000 employes being slated for dismissal. Another 3,000 workers to lose positions are those employed in the mills at Milwaukee, Springfield, O., and Plano." According to this dispatch, then, "the policy of centralization" adopted by the International Harvester company results in the throwing out of employment of 7,500 men and a saving to the company of \$5,000,000 per year. Is it possible that these results follow only the particular policy of centralization adopted by the International Harvester company, or are they not the logical outcome of the policy of centralization that is going on all over the country today? And yet republican leaders tell us that the trusts have come to stay and that the policy of centralization must not be interfered with, save for a few occasional doses of publicity.