

POLITICAL CORPORATIONS. In his letter of acceptance Mr. Bryan stated that "the democratic party does not seek to embarrass corporations engaged in legitimate business, but it does protest against corporations entering politics and attempting to assume control of the instrumentalities of government. A corporation is not organized for political purposes and should be compelled to confine itself to the business described in its charter." Notwithstanding this assurance, the populist attorney-general of Nebraska, under instructions from Mr. Bryan, began suit against the corporation operating the starch factory at Nebraska City to compel the abandonment and closing of the local factory. The starch company is a corporation that has never "entered politics." It never attempted to "assume control of the instrumentalities of government." It never sought in any way to influence legislation in its favor. It never asked or received any bounty, bonus or special privilege from the state. In short it did confine itself exclusively to the "business described in its charter." But this did not protect it from the attack of populism.

Several months have now elapsed since the filing of the petition against the starch company.

Why Delay? In the meantime this petition has been used as the text for numerous declamations against trusts by both the attorney-general and Mr. Bryan. But no effort has yet been made by the trust smashers to get any of the parties into court. No summons has been issued or asked for. If the law has been violated why have not the guilty ones been apprehended and brought to trial? Why all this delay? Can it be that the following sentence, from Mr. Bryan's letter, immediately after the one quoted above, suggests the reason:

"Honest corporations engaged in an honest business will find it to their advantage to aid in the enactment of such legislation as will protect them from the underserved odium which will be brought upon them by these corporations which enter the political arena."

Mr. Bryan evidently did not mean it when he said that corporations must not enter politics. **Must Aid Bryan.** He gives them all a cordial invitation to get into politics and "aid in the enactment of legislation." He frankly says they will find it to their "advantage" to do so. In other words Mr. Bryan objects not so much to corporations "entering politics" as he does to the way they go about it. Corporations will find it to their "advantage" to "enter politics" to aid Mr. Bryan to make laws but they must not aid anybody else to make laws. Can it be that Bryan and Smyth filed their petition against the starch

works as a gentle hint to that corporation to get into politics the "right way?" Has the prosecution been delayed to give the offending corporation a chance to "come around" and help Mr. Bryan to make laws? And if it repent, even at this late hour, will it be guaranteed that immunity which seems to belong to the silver trust of Omaha, a corporation that has found it materially to its "advantage" to enter politics and aid Mr. Bryan to make laws?

THE MONEY TRUST. Mr. Bryan has vehemently denounced every kind of a trust save one (the "money trust") and about this he has not a word to say. In 1896 he thus indicated what the "money octopus" was like:

"We are confronted today by the most gigantic trust that was ever formed among men. Talk about trusts in various articles which we produce, my friends, all the trusts together fall into insignificance when compared to the money trust."

A few days ago some one asked him how he would construe a law relating to the "money trust." He declined to answer. This was his reply:

"I want the republicans who want that question answered to find out first what the law requires, and then I want them to know that if elected president I will enforce that law just as I will enforce the law against trusts, and put striped clothes on big thieves as well as little thieves. But if you ask me to construe a republican law I reply that I shall not construe a law until it becomes my duty to enforce it."

It is unprecedented for a candidate for the presidency to make a political distinction in laws. **Party President.** The president of the United States is the chief executive officer. It is his duty to faithfully execute alike all the laws of congress, republican as well as democratic laws. But should the ambition of Mr. Bryan be realized the laws of the United States will all be classified according to the party which proposed them and he will have one way of *construing* republican laws and another for democratic laws. Do the people want a narrow, bigoted, partisan president, who will look for the label on a statute of congress before he will execute or construe it?

CORPORATIONS. While addressing a New Jersey audience, Mr. Bryan propounded this question, so ridiculous that it would be unworthy of notice had it come from any other man than one who aspires to be president:

"Why should a corporation organized in this state be permitted to enter into interstate commerce until it first shows that it is going out to do a legitimate

business and not going out as a highwayman?"

It is pathetic in the extreme that Mr. Bryan, who, it is reported, was at one time a student of the law, should have so completely failed to grasp one of the most fundamental legal propositions, viz, the presumption of innocence on the part of the accused until proven guilty.

Mr. Bryan reverses this principle and presumes the accused guilty until he

Revolutionary. proves his innocence. He presumes that every corporation doing business in several states, no matter if organized in a perfectly legal way, no matter how honest and legitimate the business may be, is presumed by Mr. Bryan to be a highwayman, a thief or a robber. In other words Mr. Bryan would base his prosecution upon the *intent* and not upon the *overt act*. He assumes that every growing corporation seeks to extend its business not for the purpose of honestly acquiring wealth along the lines of legitimate enterprise but is impelled by motives on a par with those of the man who holds up a train or robs a bank. Every corporation that should, by selling good goods at low prices, create a demand for those goods in another state, would, if it attempted to meet this demand, immediately be placed under arrest by Officer O'Bryan on the charge of highway robbery, confined in some dark dingy cell until it proved that it was not a highway robber. The method just mentioned is the only way a corporation could do business outside of the state in which it was organized. It could not go into another state and by force compel the citizens of that state to take its product any more than Mr. Bryan could force people to take his book if they did not want it, and he generously admits they are not compelled to take it.

If Mr. Bryan was more of a lawyer and less of a demagogue he would know that neither an individual nor a corporation can be convicted of crime upon the ground of mere "intention," unsupported by an overt act to prove the intent. When a corporation violates the law it may be prosecuted and convicted but it cannot be convicted upon the theory of intending to violate the law. How then could this novel suggestion of Mr. Bryan prevent corporations from entering other states?

WHAT FREE SILVER MEANS. It means that every wage earner must either double his wages, or live on half what his day's labor will now buy because it would reduce the purchasing power of a dollar to that extent. Can you double your wages? And if you could would you be any better off than you are now?