

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN
Editor and Proprietor.

CHARLES W. BRYAN
Publisher.

RICHARD L. METCALFE
Associate Editor.

Editorial Rooms and Business
Office 224-226 South 12th Street

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

One Year \$1.00	Three Months 35c
Six Months 50	Single Copy 5c
10 Copies of Five or more.	Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Postage 12 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.

observed by Him who "tempers the wind to the shorn lamb."

And, Mr. Chairman, I desire to here enter my protest against the false political economy taught by our opponents in this debate and against the perversion of language which we have witnessed. They tell us that it is better to consider expediency than equity in the adjustment of taxation. They tell us that it is right to tax consumption, and thus make the needy pay out of all proportion to their means but that it is wrong to make a slight compensation for this system by exempting small incomes from an income tax. They tell us that it is wise to limit the use of the necessaries of life by heavy indirect taxation, but that it is vicious to lessen the enjoyment of the luxuries of life by a light tax upon large incomes. They tell us that those who make the load heaviest upon persons least able to bear it are distributing the burdens of government with an impartial hand, but that those who insist that each citizen should contribute to government in proportion as God has prospered him are blinded by prejudice against the rich. They call that man a statesman whose ear is tuned to catch the slightest pulsations of a pocket-book, and denounce as a demagogue anyone who dares to listen to the heart-beat of humanity.

Let me refer again, in conclusion, to the statement made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cockran) that the rich people of his city favor the income tax. In a letter which appeared in the New York World on the 7th of this month, Ward McAllister, the leader of the "Four Hundred," enters a very emphatic protest against the income tax. Here is an extract:

In New York City and Brooklyn the local taxation is ridiculously high, in spite of the virtuous protest to the contrary by the officials in authority. Add to this high local taxation an income tax of two per cent on every income exceeding \$4,000, and many of our best people will be driven out of the country. An impression seems to exist in the minds of our great democratic solons in congress that a rich man would give up all his wealth for the privilege of living in this country. A very short period of income taxation would show these gentlemen their mistake. The custom is growing from year to year for rich men to go abroad and live, where expenses for the necessities and luxuries of life are not nearly so high as they are in this country. The United States, in spite of their much boasted natural resources, could not maintain such a strain for any considerable length of time.

But whither will these people fly? If their tastes are English, "quite English, you know," and they stop in London, they will find a tax of more than two per cent assessed upon their incomes; if they look for a place of refuge in Prussia, they will find an income tax of four per cent; if they search for seclusion among

the mountains of Switzerland, they will find an income tax of eight per cent; if they seek repose under the sunny skies of Italy, they will find an income tax of more than 12 per cent; if they take up their abode in Austria, they will find a tax of 20 per cent. I repeat, whither will they fly?

Mr. Weadock: The gentleman will allow me to suggest that at Monte Carlo such a man would not have to pay any tax at all.

Mr. Bryan: Then, Mr. Chairman, I presume to Monte Carlo he would go, and that there he would give up to the wheel of fortune all the wealth of which he would not give a part to support the government which enabled him to accumulate it.

Are there really any such people in this country? Of all the mean men I have ever known, I have never known one so mean that I would be willing to say of him that his patriotism was less than two per cent deep.

There is not a man whom I would charge with being willing to expatriate himself rather than contribute from his abundance to the support of the government that protects him.

If "some of our best people" prefer to leave the country rather than pay a tax of two per cent, God pity the worst.

If we have people who value free government so little that they prefer to live under monarchical institutions, even without an income tax, rather than live under the stars and stripes and pay a two per cent tax, we can better afford to lose them and their fortunes than risk the contaminating influence of their presence.

I will not attempt to characterize such persons. If Mr. McAllister is a true prophet, if we are to lose some of our "best people" by the imposition of an income tax, let them depart, and as they leave without regret the land of their birth, let them go with the poet's curse ringing in their ears:

Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned,
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim;
Despite those titles, power and pelf,
The wretch, concentered all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

DEMOCRATIC PATRIOTISM

A republican president proposes a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing an income tax and although the amendment was proposed for the purpose of preventing the passage of an income tax measure proposed by the democrats, every democrat in the senate and house supported the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment.

Query: Suppose Mr. Bryan had been elected and had proposed the constitutional amendment (as he would have done) would the republicans have voted for the resolution? The democrats are to be commended for their patriotism. They support a good measure even though a republican president recommended it.

MR. TAFT AND ELECTION OF SENATORS

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat is a republican paper. In fact it is one of the leading republican papers. In its issue of July 14 the Globe-Democrat prints an editorial which is so interesting that it is hereinafter published in full.

It will be seen that the Globe-Democrat says that Mr. Taft will not give his sanction to the election of senators by popular vote because "no republican national convention has ever sanctioned any such proposition." Neither did the republican national convention approve the income tax. Yet a republican senate (unanimously) and a republican house (with only fourteen republican votes in the negative) passed the proposed income tax amendment.

The Globe-Democrat lays great stress on the fact that republican orators and editors paid no attention to the election-of-senators-proposition during the presidential campaign. The Globe-Democrat says: "Larger issues were before the country at that time and for a like reason it will get no attention now. Bigger issues are before the country now than this question of the election of senators by the direct vote of the people." But the republican party leaders did not discuss the income tax in the recent campaign, yet the party in congress was forced by public sentiment to make a pretense of giving endorsement to the income tax. Why not

adopt, with it, the popular method of choosing United States senators?

This republican paper speaks quite frankly upon the republican party's real attitude toward the income tax. It says "the bulk of the party, however, will oppose it, and they will be supported by conservative democrats." Perhaps the Globe-Democrat is mistaken. The income tax proposition may be opposed by some of the trust magnates, financiers and politicians. But it is safe to say that the rank and file of the republican party, like the rank and file of the democratic party, favors it. The difficulty will be that, through the agency of papers like the Globe-Democrat, the will of the rank and file is misrepresented; and that through the agency of the politicians for whom the Globe-Democrat speaks the preference of the majority will not find expression in the acts of republican legislators.

The Globe-Democrat concludes that "Mr. Bryan's championship of the income tax will arouse republican disgust." Also "if, as now seems to be probable, he (Bryan) takes the stump in favor of the income tax amendment, that proposition will lose the votes of many republicans who otherwise might be inclined to accept the tax as a necessary evil." In another column of the same issue the Globe-Democrat, referring to the income tax proposition, says: "The question will be more important than any other which is likely to be before the people in those years." That being true this republican paper places a small estimate upon the intelligence and the patriotism of the members of its party when it assumes to say that their position on this all important question will be governed by the attitude of a particular individual rather than by the merits of the question at issue.

The Commoner gives republicans higher credit than this. It believes that republicans who understand the question will lead their fellows into the light. It believes that in the great contest now coming on in behalf of the income tax, republicans, democrats, and men of other parties will be found fighting shoulder to shoulder to put their state in line with that method of taxation, the adoption of which, we have the right to say, will mark for our nation distinct progress along the lines of popular government.

The Globe Democrat's article follows:

MR. BRYAN'S OFFER TO MR. TAFT

Addressing President Taft in an open letter, Mr. Bryan asks: "Now that the states are going to vote on the ratification of the amendment specifically authorizing an income tax, why not give them a chance to vote on an amendment providing for the election of United States senators by popular vote?" He refers to the circumstance that in his speech accepting the nomination in 1908 Mr. Taft said he was "personally inclined to favor such a change in the constitution." Then Mr. Bryan adds: "These constitutional amendments, one authorizing an income tax and the other providing for the popular election of senators, would make your administration memorable, and I pledge you whatever assistance I can render in securing the ratification of these amendments." Possibly Mr. Taft will gratify his ex-antagonist and urge congress to adopt a resolution to refer this senatorial election question to the states, but probably he will not. The income tax amendment to the constitution and the corporation tax as a statute are the only proposed new departures which have much of a chance to get a hearing at present.

Naturally Mr. Bryan would be glad to see a republican president give his sanction to the election of senators by the direct vote of the people. The democratic platform of 1908 had this as one of its planks. In 1900 Mr. Bryan also induced his platform makers to include this among his party's articles of faith. No republican national convention, however, has ever sanctioned any such proposition. Speaking for himself personally, Mr. Taft said in his speech accepting the nomination that he was inclined to favor the idea, but he added that it was hardly a party question. These words did not commit the candidate or the party to that proposition. Not one republican out of ten who read Taft's speech entire at that time took any notice of his declaration on the senatorial election question. Not one republican out of a hundred gave any thought to that question in the campaign. Larger issues were before the country at that time, and, for a like reason, it will get no attention now. Bigger issues are before the country now than this question of the election of senators by the direct vote of the people. The more the people see of the direct primary method of selecting senators the better they like the old plan. Mr. Bryan's proposition would carry this "popularization" in the choosing of senators a long step farther than it went in the case of Oregon and Illinois in their primaries of a year ago, and the thinking portion of the republicans are hardly inclined to take that step, at least until the recollection of some of the recent plebiscites on the senatorship fades. There are some things in the constitution under which we have been living for over a century which should be allowed to stand.

It is easy to see why Mr. Bryan is gratified at the submission of the income tax question to the states. The income tax is democratic and not republican doctrine. It will get many republican votes. The bulk of the party, however, will oppose it, and they will be supported by conservative democrats. Moreover, the Nebraskan's ostentatious indorsement of the proposition is calculat-