

The Commoner.  
ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor.  
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor.  
CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher.  
Editorial Rooms and Business Office 124-126 South 12th Street

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Neb., as second-class matter

One Year - - - \$1.00  
Six Months - - - .50  
Three Months - - - .25c  
Single Copy - - - .5c  
Sample Copies Free.  
Foreign Postage 62 Cents 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 sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

**DISCONTINUANCES**—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year. Presentation Copies: Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

**RENEWALS**—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 31, 08, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1908. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

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

**ADVERTISING**—Rates furnished upon application.

Address all communications to  
**THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.**

The Payne bill is already giving the republican reformers "that tired feeling."

There are those who wish Mr. Roosevelt a long—a very long—and happy visit in Africa.

The republican party is driven to extremities when it raises the tax on both gloves and stockings.

Congress will now begin the work of revising the tariff—maybe up, maybe down—with the accent on the up.

The country is unanimous in returning the verdict that Theodore Roosevelt is our greatest living ex-president.

"The railroads deserve six per cent," declares Judge McPherson. What on—actual investment or on the water?

If gloves are made too expensive to wear it will be easier for the voters to handle the republican party "without gloves" next election.

The wave of Taft prosperity seems to be floating up an unusually large lot of notices of wage reductions in various manufacturing industries.

A pressing question: Will the golf cabinet make as many fozzles on the trust question as the tennis cabinet made "faults" on the same subject?

John Mitchell urges the actors to organize a union. We recommend the idea, if it will result in restricting the output of a certain class of plays now offered to the public.

If the money spent on the Panama canal could be liquified and forced through a hose under proper pressure it would excavate the dirt more rapidly than the steam shovels are doing it.

According to the press dispatches the women are rising in protest against the Payne bill. "The hand that rocks the cradle boxed my ears," has been suggested as a republican campaign song.

Federal Judge McPherson has decided that the two-cent fare law in Missouri is unjust to the railroads. The railroads must be guaranteed a fair return on the investment, even if the wage earners are not to be guaranteed a chance to earn a living wage.

EDUCATIONAL SERIES

Government Money Deposited with the States in 1836

The Commoner received several inquiries asking what had become of the proposition made by Representative Victor Murdock of Kansas in regard to the government money deposited with several states in 1836. Mr. Murdock introduced a bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to demand the repayment of these funds. At The Commoner's request Mr. Murdock has written a statement in reference to this proposition. The statement is hereinafter printed:

THE STORY OF THE FUNDS

Washington, D. C., March 26, 1909.—Editor Commoner: In answer to your recent communication asking what had become of my proposition in regard to the government money deposited with the states in 1836, permit me to say that I have introduced a bill authorizing the secretary of the treasury to demand the repayment of these funds. The story of the funds is this:

Deposits of public money in the banks amounted in 1836 to thirty-nine million dollars, an immense sum of money in those days. The states themselves were tempted and asked for the deposits. Congress, by act of June 23, 1836, voted to make distribution in four installments of all moneys in the treasury except \$5,000,000 to the states on the formal pledge of their faith for repayment. Three installments were paid to the states when the government found its necessities forbade further distribution and the policy was stopped by act of October 2, 1837, which also provided that the funds already deposited should "remain with the states until otherwise directed by congress." So they have remained there to the amount of \$28,101,644.91, and are carried on the books of the department as unavailable funds. The amounts due are as follows:

Maine	955,838.25
Maryland	955,838.25
New Hampshire	669,086.79
Virginia	2,198,127.89
Vermont	669,086.79
North Carolina	1,443,757.39
Massachusetts	1,338,173.58
South Carolina	1,051,422.09
Connecticut	764,670.60
Georgia	1,051,422.09
Rhode Island	382,335.30
Alabama	669,086.79
New York	4,014,520.71
Louisiana	477,919.14
Pennsylvania	2,867,514.78
Mississippi	382,335.30
New Jersey	764,670.60
Tennessee	1,433,757.39
Ohio	2,007,260.34
Kentucky	1,443,757.39
Indiana	860,254.44
Missouri	382,335.30
Illinois	477,919.14
Arkansas	286,751.49
Michigan	286,751.49
Delaware	286,751.49
Total	\$28,101,644.91

It is problematical to what extent the various states have kept segregated these funds. It is known that New York state has done so with her \$4,000,000 and it is said that the money is loaned out and the interest still goes into the revenues of the state.

The bill introduced by me gives authority to the secretary of the treasury to demand the repayment of this money and directs that he shall proceed to collect it, repealing that portion of the act of October 2, 1837, which provides that the funds should "remain with the states until otherwise directed by congress."

Mine is an effort to make congress otherwise direct. The money was not given to the states. It was deposited with the states under a formal pledge, solemnly given, that the money would be paid back. Witness the provisions of section 13 of the act, that of June 23, 1836, under which they received this money:

"Section 13. And be it further enacted that the money which shall be in the treasury of the United States on the first day of January, 1837, reserving the sum of five million dollars shall be deposited with each of the several states in proportion to their respective representation in the senate and the house of representatives of

the United States as shall by law authorize their treasurers, or other competent authorities, to receive the same on the terms hereinafter specified; and the secretary of the treasury shall deliver the same to such treasurers, or other competent authorities, on receiving certificate of deposit therefore, signed by such competent authorities in such form as may be prescribed by the secretary aforesaid; which certificates shall express the usual and legal obligations and pledge the faith of the state for the safe-keeping and repayment thereof and shall pledge the faith of the states receiving the same to pay the said moneys and every part thereof, from time to time, whenever the same shall be required, by the secretary of the treasury for the purpose of defraying any wants of the public treasury, beyond the amount of five millions aforesaid."

The states frequently draw upon the federal government for moneys under the form of various claims. Why should not the federal government receive the money justly due it from the states to which it frequently pays so bountifully?

In connection with this proposition I wish to call the attention to the fact that legislation of great magnitude often turns on a word or an obscure phrase. This fund of \$28,000,000 has been held back from the United States by the insertion of a proviso. Following is the act of October 2, 1837, in full:

"Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that the transfer of the fourth installment of deposits directed to be made with the states, under the thirteenth section of the act of June 23, 1836, be and the same is hereby postponed till the first day of January, 1839; Provided, that the first three instalments under the said act shall remain on deposit with the states until otherwise directed by congress."

But for the proviso, the secretary of the treasury would have called for the money. But congress in an act that was apparently saving the government a small sum, added a qualification which really gave a large sum away.

A large part of the money deposited with the states came from the sale of lands in the central west. It belonged to the nation, not to the states, and should be returned.

VICTOR MURDOCK.

WILLIAM SULZER

Democrats are well acquainted with Representative Sulzer of New York, and it was no surprise to them that Mr. Sulzer stood true when some other New York congressmen deserted. The Public, Louis F. Post's paper, pays to William Sulzer, this deserved tribute:

"Suspicious regarding the Fitzgerald contingent on the democratic side in congress are fully verified. The insurgent republicans and the democratic democrats were defeated on the rules question by a counter combination of Cannon republicans and corporation democrats. The corporation democrats were drafted from the south and from New York City, where the corporations work through the democratic party and republicans have to play that they are democrats in order to get elected. There are many notable exceptions from the south; but every member from New York followed Fitzgerald's treacherous lead except two—an independent Brooklyn congressman and William Sulzer. Sulzer's case is especially noteworthy. Although he comes from the heart of the Tammany sphere of influence, he defied the commands of Tammany, and stood with his party and his principles instead of yielding to the corporations. It is only due him to add that his democracy has always been of the democratic variety."

CONSOLING

Dana Estes, the Boston traveler, offers consolation to those who have worried lest Mr. Roosevelt run into danger on his African trip. Mr. Estes says: "In my opinion President Roosevelt will find hunting in East Africa much like shooting cows in a back yard."

In other words, Mr. Roosevelt will be in no more danger than he was when he became the "hero of San Juan hill" through the timely arrival of the negro troops.