

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 8, NO. 48

Lincoln, Nebraska, December 11, 1908

Whole Number 412

CONTENTS

CARING FOR EX-PRESIDENTS
GUARANTEED DEPOSITS IN NEBRASKA
INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL
"CLOSE TOGETHER"
STORY OF A WHITE HOUSE DENIAL
MR. ROOSEVELT AND EDITORS CLASH
JOSEPH G. CANNON AS A "DIZZY
RADICAL"
SOLVING THE MYSTERY
THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK

GUARANTEED DEPOSITS IN NEBRASKA

It may be expected that all sorts of ingenious schemes will be put forth by bankers and their representatives to prevent the passage of a guaranteed deposits law by the Nebraska legislature. Realizing that it will be impossible to prevent some action on this line the enemies of guaranteed deposits propose a deferred payment plan. Under this plan the depositors would not receive their money promptly. Indeed, as proposed by some, they would not receive it until the assets of the bank were disposed of. This plan would destroy the very purpose of the guaranteed deposits system. It would not prevent bank runs because the depositor would be almost as much afraid of having his money tied up in a broken bank as he would of losing it entirely. It would not protect the commerce of a community for the reason that deferred payments would withhold, temporarily at least, the deposits from use in the business of the community.

The pledge with respect to guaranteed deposits under which democratic members of the legislature were elected was well understood by the people and the Nebraska legislature may be depended upon to fulfill that pledge. The Nebraska democracy will give to the people of this state a guaranteed deposits law that provides for immediate payment upon the depositors' demand.

The bankers who oppose guaranteed deposits dominated the republican state convention and dictated its platform. The issue before the people was made plain and no one will be successful in an effort to distort the issue before the legislature.

NO RESENTMENT

The Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia North American says that Mr. Cannon has made known to members of the house that any republican congressman who refuses to enter the republican caucus and to abide by its decision will be denied recognition as a republican in house proceedings if Cannon is re-elected to the speakership. This correspondent adds: "There is some possibility that the attitude Cannon has assumed will arouse the resentment of house members."

It is more probable, however, that none of these members will have the courage to show their resentment in an effective way. Mr. Cannon will probably be re-elected speaker and even though the rules undergo a change on the record, it will be merely a pretense and Cannonism will continue business at the old stand.



WANTED: AT LEAST SOME MEASURE OF RELIEF

CARING FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

The New York World is just now interesting itself in President Roosevelt's future. It is urging his election as senator from New York and inviting the opinion of democrats and republicans throughout the nation as to the wisdom of the suggestion. The Commoner will not attempt to select a senator from New York; that duty rests, according to the constitution, upon the people of that state. It is interested, however, in the reasons which the World advances in support of its suggestion. One of these reasons is:

"Any man who has been president of the United States has gained an experience that is invaluable to the nation and should not be lost. He has a knowledge of foreign relations which is of the utmost importance to the senate in the consideration of treaties. His familiarity with all the administrative departments makes him a veritable cyclopaedia of information in regard to many questions of legislation. Whether his own policies be good or bad, whether his judgment be sound or weak, his experience in the White House is a great national asset which the American people should have the benefit of."

This argument is properly submitted to the people of New York and may have weight in their decision. Some of the arguments advanced by the World, however, are not only unsound but betray a leaning toward the European idea of official life. It says: "Moreover the dignity of the office is shockingly lowered when a president of the United States, at the end of his term, is thrust into private life to shift for a living for himself and family as best he can."

This argument smacks of royalty; there is nothing American about it. A president is selected by the people to exercise temporary au-

thority in the name of the people. How can the dignity of the office be "shockingly lowered" when the president drops back into private life? A congressman represents about two hundred thousand people and does an important work, and yet the dignity of the office is not "shockingly lowered" when he drops back to the practice of law, to merchandising or to farming. A United States senator sometimes represents five millions of people; the dignity of his office is not "shockingly lowered" when he drops back into his place as a private citizen. A governor sometimes represents more than five millions and during his term of office is a very important factor in the state machinery, and yet there is no lowering of the dignity of the office when he lays aside the sceptre of state and becomes again a fellow-worker with those in whose name he exercised the authority of a chief magistrate.

It was the hope and expectation of our forefathers that our nation would set an example to the world in democratic simplicity; and that Europeans who have been looking up to their crowned heads as if officials belonged to a superior order of beings would learn from us that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and that public officials are servants, not rulers or masters. But we have been drifting away from this idea, until one of Mr. Roosevelt's hired men, Secretary of War Wright, actually took Mr. Bryan to task for calling the president a hired man. Secretary Wright's speech was not important except as it indicated how far some have drifted toward the aristocratic idea.

No, the dignity of the office is not "shockingly lowered" when "a president of the United States, at the end of his term, is forced into