

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

Vol. 5. No. 51

Lincoln, Nebraska, January 5, 1906

Whole Number 259

CONTENTS

MUNGER VINDICATED?
CORTELYOU'S DEFENSE
HUMILIATING
DETAILS WANTED
AN IMPORTANT REFORM
"UNCLE JOE'S" STRAW MAN
AT THE BIDE-A-WEE HOME
THE MELDERSKIN'S CARGO
CHRISTMAS BURDENS
SENATOR TILLMAN
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS
THE PRIMARY PLEDGE
NEWS OF THE WEEK

THE NEW YORK FIGHT

A New York newspaper referring to the republican fight in the Empire state warns Mr. Roosevelt that "if the party is to be regenerated from a corrupt and debasing bossism it will not be done by driving one gang into exile and exalting another gang to the seats of the mighty."

The "gang" which Mr. Roosevelt is fighting moves under the leadership of E. H. Harriman and Former Governor Odell. The other "gang" is represented by Platt, Governor Higgins and the insurance magnates. While Odell and Harriman should be shelved, Mr. Roosevelt would win no victory for good government if he simply substituted the Platt-Higgins gang for the Harriman-Odell gang.

In this connection a New York dispatch printed November 23 in the Kansas City Journal, a republican paper, is interesting. The Commoner reproduced that dispatch in last week's issue. It was said in that dispatch that Senator Platt was determined to unhorse Odell and that in this effort he would have the co-operation of Mr. Roosevelt and New York's insurance bosses. It was claimed that part of the program was to put a stop to insurance exposures. It would be well for public interests if Mr. Roosevelt could crush the Odell machine, but it will be a sad day for the people of New York and a most inglorious day for Theodore Roosevelt if he unwittingly lends the prestige of his name toward carrying out the designs of the insurance magnates and giving new power to such men as Platt and Higgins.

NOT PHILANTHROPY

Those who had expected great things from the change in the management of some of the insurance companies are doomed to disappointment. The reliability of Thomas F. Ryan's philanthropic professions concerning his acquisition of life insurance companies is described by the Journal of Commerce when it says: "The testimony of the president of the Washington Life Insurance company in regard to its management since it passed under the virtual control of Mr. Thomas F. Ryan and the Morton Trust company at the beginning of the present year is not particularly reassuring. It contained no evidence of excessive salaries or extravagant or illegitimate expenditures, but the method of investing or rather of employing the funds of the company can not fairly be called conservative, or even prudent, and it casts a shadow of suspicion upon Mr. Ryan's professions in regard to making the control of life insurance serve his own financial interests."



"I ASK FOR BREAD AND THEY GIVE ME PAP"

Has Munger Been Vindicated?

United States District Judge Munger at Omaha imposed upon Richards and Comstock, two land monopolists, a fine of \$300 each, and sentenced them to "six hours in the custody of the marshal."

These men were charged with the illegal fencing of government land.

Secretary of the Interior Hitchcock publicly expressed great indignation because of the light penalty imposed upon these violators of law, and Judge Munger publicly retorted:

"You may quote me as saying, however, that I think the result which the government hoped to attain has been effected. The indictments and the prosecution was primarily for the purpose of obliging ranchmen to abandon their unlawful fences. Now the enclosing of the public domain is not a crime per se. It is nothing more than a statutory offense.

"In view of this fact and of the additional fact that the defendants declared that they had removed their unlawful fences in part and avowed their intent of taking down any fence which might still remain on government land, I believe the sentence passed upon them was sufficient to meet the situation."

Evidently Mr. Roosevelt was not satisfied with Judge Munger's explanation. He was not able to draw the fine distinctions observed by the federal judge at Omaha; and so indignant was Mr. Roosevelt that he summarily removed the United States marshal and the district attorney.

The marshal was removed on the ground that instead of keeping the defendants in his own custody he had turned them over to the custody of their attorney. It was contended in the

marshal's behalf that the sentence was a farce and that the marshal was justified in so regarding it. The district attorney was removed in spite of the fact that he pointed out that the defendants had pleaded guilty and that he had had nothing to do with the imposition of the sentence. Spokesmen for the administration have said that it was not within the power of the president to remove the judge, so he dismissed these two officials by way of giving expression to his indignation.

Judge Munger's statement that Richards and Comstock were not charged with a real crime but rather with a mere statutory offense was laughed at by representatives of the administration and by republican editors.

Now comes Mr. Roosevelt's secretary of the treasury, Leslie M. Shaw, and with respect to his failure to prosecute John R. Walsh of Chicago makes a plea almost identical with that offered by Judge Munger.

Will Mr. Roosevelt dismiss from his cabinet Secretary Shaw, and will he appoint, as he did in the Omaha cases, special counsel to prosecute Walsh?

If Mr. Roosevelt does not call Secretary Shaw to account for his failure to prosecute Walsh then he tacitly endorses the defense offered by Judge Munger.

If the position of Secretary Shaw is correct, then the position of Judge Munger is correct; and there being no fault to find with either position, then Messrs. Matthews and Baxter, the men who were summarily dismissed from office, should be reinstated.

Note the similarity between the defense set up by Judge Munger, and the defense set up by