

ion were sound. The bank invites deposits, and it can only do so upon one theory, namely that the deposits will be returned on demand. It relies for its credit largely upon the laws made by the state and upon the regulations enforced by law. It is certainly reasonable that the bank, having drawn deposits into its vaults through the presumption raised by the law, ought to willingly submit to a law that compels it to make this presumption good. While comparatively few banks fail, still, as a matter of fact, a bank does not offer any absolute security to the ordinary depositor, and to the mind of the average man it will not appear unreasonable, unlawful or unconstitutional to compel a bank to give security to its depositors. The banks that oppose this law are not proposing any other form of security; they are opposing all propositions for additional security. It will take an adverse decision of the court of last resort to convince the plain, common man that it is unjust or unfair to compel the bank to protect its depositors.

The second reason given by the judge for his decision is as weak as the first. The word "bank" has come to have a technical meaning. It suggests to the depositor that his money is protected by laws requiring inspection, and a certain legal reserve, besides imposing liability upon stockholders. To say that a man can call himself a banker and thus take advantage of the name without submitting to the conditions imposed by the law is to obliterate the line between fraud and fair dealing.

The right to secure deposits without giving security for them is not an inalienable right. It is not even a prescriptive right, and it is hard to believe that the supreme court will endorse such a proposition and give to it the sanction of law. If the arguments advanced in the court above are no more conclusive than the arguments upon which Judge Munger's decision is based, the friends of the guarantee law have reason to hope that the law will yet be sustained.

NEWSPAPER OPINION

As a rule the newspapers of the country agree that it was unfortunate for Mr. Taft that Mr. Pinchot wrote the letter to Senator Dolliver. Many of them say that the letter was a plain bid for a discharge and out of self respect the president had nothing else to do than to remove the chief forester. Some newspapers taking this view, however, say that Mr. Taft should have suspended Ballinger during the investigation. Most of the newspapers, however, distinctly take sides with Pinchot, declaring that his has been a fight against special interests and that the president has injured his administration beyond repair by adhering to Ballinger.

The Denver News, a democratic paper, edited by former Senator Patterson, appears not to have great admiration for Mr. Pinchot. The News not only approves Pinchot's discharge but displays some glee over it and intimates that the chief forester is considerable of a fakir.

The Chicago Inter-Ocean, republican, says the republican party has become bewildered and adds: "We all know what the Roosevelt idea is but what's the Taft idea? Nobody knows."

The Chicago Tribune shows plainly that it is not pleased with Mr. Taft, saying: "The sea of republican politics has become a mad, seething, swirling whirlpool."

The Indianapolis News, republican, says: "The president can not realize too soon that the best friends he has in congress are the insurgents and the progressives—that is, if his policies are what they are supposed to be and ought to be. Of course if he has abandoned reform—which no one believes—he must look for friends among the reactionaries."

The Chicago News, republican, says that it is now incumbent upon the administration to show that Pinchot, Glavis and their associates are not public spirited men.

The Des Moines (Ia.) Register and Leader, republican, practically washes its hands of its late candidate for the presidency. It says: "The president himself has shifted his position on every important question, not only once but several times in the one year of his administration."

The New York World calls upon Mr. Taft to say what he thinks of Governor Hughes' objection to the income tax. The World says: "If Governor Hughes' arguments go unanswered by Mr. Taft the amendment is in grave danger of rejection and the administration's reputation for good faith will suffer accordingly." The World approves Mr. Taft's suggestions for

amendment to the interstate commerce law, but condemns his national incorporation plan.

The New York Times denounces national incorporation and says that it will result in a federal shelter "under which the trusts would be allowed to continue and perpetuate those restraints of trade in the legal sense of which they are now guilty under the strict interpretation of the anti-trust act."

The Philadelphia North American, republican, referring to the president's railroad recommendation, says: "We hope that President Taft will obtain legislation on this subject even better than he recommends. And none will be better pleased than himself if such should be the outcome. But that is only our hope. Our fear is greater. For Cannon and Aldrich are in congress solely to serve the interests which the president desires to restrict. And if his alliance with them persists, they will be the framers of legislation that will prevent every one of his good recommendations that they do not reject."

Referring to the patronage threat, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says: "Can the republican congressmen submit to such dictation? If they do, what will their constituents think of them? Does the president fully understand the import of his statement? It is incredible."

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican says: "The announcement that insurgent congressmen are to be discriminated against by the administration in the distribution of patronage is lamentable if it is not erroneous. It is to be hoped that an error has crept into the news of the day. The president will never suppress what is known as insurgency in the republican party by peddling postmasterships contrary to the desires of unruly representatives."

Concerning the national incorporation plan, the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal says that the plan would be "essentially adverse to the principle in which the American government originated—that of a state's right to control its local affairs. The Providence (R. I.) Journal says that the scheme is "an entering wedge of grave importance."

The Chicago Inter Ocean says: "Think, if you can, of anything that would be left under a federal incorporation act for the American people to do except cry in public: 'O king, live forever!' and mourn in private for their bygone liberties!"

The Boston Herald insists that the control of business within the states must still remain within the province of state government.

"JUST REPUBLICAN"

John L. Wilson of Titusville, Pa., has written to the editor of the Philadelphia North American this interesting letter:

"To the Editor of the North American: Recently in your columns appeared an extract from The Commoner, which declared the North American to be 'a simple-minded republican sheet.' That the latter part of the accusation is true, is very apparent, but there is no evidence as to its simplicity or ignorance, and because of this its course is more vulnerable to criticism.

"The North American seems to possess the idea that its readers are simple minded. Pennsylvania is the keystone of the republican arch. The Vares, McNichols, the ruling powers in the legislature, Penrose, Oliver, State Chairman Andrews and every part of the corrupt grafting gang of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania are allies of the regular republican party.

"In a recent open editorial to President Taft,

you reminded him that it took two men and two policies to defeat Bryan: The Roosevelt policies in the west. These policies were stolen from democratic platforms and the financial policies of the east.

"The North American was strident in its support of Taft, but not simple minded enough to support openly either of these policies as it now divides them. You are not as simple as your readers might infer when, in the past, you tried to excuse Roosevelt for his part in the steel merger. No, you were just republican. You were not simple when you professed fear that Aldrich and Cannon would betray, cajole and hurt the 'judicial-minded' Taft in tariff legislation. When the new monstrosity was signed, and when Taft publicly praised the two North American bogle men and the bill as well, you still have hope for him and the conservation policy, trust-busting, financial policy for the people as against Wall Street, and so forth.

"This is not simple; it is republican. It is only when a man, or set of men, endeavors to publish a democratic newspaper in a state overwhelmingly republican that the charge of simple mindedness will stand, and the only way to catch the truly simple minded is to shout reform and support the republican national ticket.

JOHN L. WILSON,

Titusville, Pa., January 10."

THE PARENT OF ALL

Judge Lindsay, in the third installment of "Beast and Jungle," printed in Everybody's Magazine, says:

"I can not conclude this chapter without adding the final lesson I learned in our work with the children—the lesson that leads me back again into the quarrel with the beast. It is this; criminals are born and criminals are bred, but the conditions of which they are born and under which they are bred in Denver are the same conditions that debauch our legislature, our judiciary, our press, our business life, and our poor. I found no 'problem of the children' that was not also the problem of their parents. The young bud was blighted by the same corruption that infected the twig, killed the branch, and ate out the heart of the trunk. The rule of the plutocracy in Denver was the cause of three-quarters of the crime in Denver. The dependent and delinquent children who came into my court came almost wholly from the homes of dependent and delinquent parents who were made such by the hopeless economic conditions of their lives; and those conditions were made hopeless by the remorseless tyranny of wealthy men who used their lawless power to enslave and brutalize and kill their workmen. Legislatures, corrupted by corporate wealth, refused to pass the eight-hour law that would give the child's home a parent able to fulfill his parental duties—refused to pass the employer's liability law that would save the widows from starvation and the children from the streets—refused to pass even a three-fourths jury law that would allow the poor victim of corporate greed to obtain a little pittance of justice in the courts. The saloons, protected by the political power of the corporations, debauched the parents and destroyed the homes of our children, and the protected gambler hunted and preyed with the protected saloon. I could not do my duty toward the children without attacking the conditions that deformed the lives of the children. And when I tried to do this—as you shall see—the beast replied: 'Then you shall not be allowed to save even the little children!'"

Voters of the Sixth Missouri District,
Go to the Polls on February 1

The special election in the Sixth Missouri congressional district to choose a successor in congress to the late David DeArmond, will take place February 1. C. C. Dickinson of Clinton, Mo., formerly a state senator, is the democratic nominee. Mr. Dickinson comes highly recommended by those who know him intimately. His public record is clean and his private life above reproach.

The voters of the Sixth Missouri district ought to go to the polls in full force and give Mr. Dickinson that large majority to which his good character and principles entitle him. His opponent is not in sympathy with reform measures and, if elected, may fairly be expected to become a supporter of Cannon and Cannonism.

Mr. Dickinson, unlike his opponent, is willing to tell the people where he stands on all public questions. Unlike his opponent he may be depended upon to labor for the public interests.

In a letter recently written to The Commoner, Mr. Dickinson says: "I concur with Hon. William J. Bryan in his views upon the tariff, and especially do I agree with him that a platform is a pledge, to be kept and not violated, and that a consistent regard for party pledges is the safest rule. I favor a law revising the tariff downward in the interest of the west and the masses everywhere. Cannonism must end and a fair opportunity given for the enactment of just laws. The republican party should go out of power, and the trend toward centralization cease."