

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor
CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
Editorial Rooms and Business Office 324-330 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
Six Months......50
In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75
Three Months..... .25
Single Copy..... .05
Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 5c 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 21, '10, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1910. 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 will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

ty option. You say it is unfair in the county but not in the state? You dare not put your argument to the test. When we get county option you will not be willing to submit it on what you call a fair basis. Why? Because you want to defeat county option with the argument that any town can have prohibition if it wants it. And why is it not fair to have saloons everywhere when a county goes wet? Because there is nothing fair about the saloons. You do not talk about fairness and justice when you talk about the saloon. The saloon is an outlaw and a nuisance, and it lives by sufferance where it lives at all. You do not defend the saloon as an institution, you tolerate it, if you tolerate it at all, on the theory that if you tried to abolish it you might get something worse. And yet the saloons exert more influence in politics than ten times as much capital invested in necessary and helpful industries.

Are the farmers not to have any voice in deciding the saloon question? You can not build a slaughter house in your block without consulting the people around you, because you can not confine the odors to your own land, and yet you would establish a saloon and fill the air with poison and then say to the people who must breathe it and suffer from it, that they have no right to protest. When you fight county option you ought to have argument to present, and no arguments have yet been advanced against it. The farmers have been taxed without representation; they have been taxed to support the paupers turned out by the saloons. I was interested tonight in the indorsement given to the eight o'clock closing law, I was on the committee and I voted for that resolution. I drew the platform in Lancaster county, which indorsed the eight o'clock law. I am glad that it passed by so large a majority, but I ask you who voted for it, how could you support the eight o'clock closing law and then oppose county option on the ground that it interferes with home rule? If you can make an argument against county option on the ground that it interferes with personal liberty, with how much greater force can you make an argument against the eight o'clock law. Under county option, we say to the people in Douglas county that they can decide for themselves whether they want saloons or not, but under the eight o'clock law, we tell them what time to go home. I believe in eight o'clock closing, but I believe also in county option, and I submit it is much easier to defend county option than it is to defend eight o'clock closing.

You will find a number of these questions that will be interesting when you get beyond Judge Oldham's stage, and commence to study this question in earnest. There are people who

talk about this being a legitimate business; well, it depends altogether on how you define legitimate. I recently met a farmer from a county that instructed against county option; he said a man came to him and asked him to sign a petition for a saloon, and he refused on the ground that they did not treat the saloon keeper fairly. The man asked him what he meant and the following dialogue ensued: "You want to start a saloon in this town?" "Yes." "To help the town?" "Yes." "To improve business?" "Yes." "To increase trade?" "Yes." "Well now if you are going to do all that good for this town, I think they ought to give you a subsidy instead of putting a tax upon you." If the saloon is such a good thing for a town, why is it we treat it as we do? Why do we require the would-be saloon keeper to secure a petition? Why do we tell him when to open and close, how many chairs he can keep in the room, and require him to give bond for all the damage done? Can you not see some difference between the saloon and other lines of business, and does not this difference justify different treatment? County option lets the county decide whether to license the sale of liquor or not.

I will go a step further and ask you to bear in mind that if the people who can have saloons under county option are not satisfied with that, but insist on forcing them upon counties that do not want them, they will arouse resentment. I know of nothing that will hasten prohibition more than to have the liquor interests contend that a county can not be dry even when the people want it to be dry.

The issue is here and we must meet it. No party is big enough to govern a state that is not big enough to decide the questions when they arise. This question must be decided, and you must decide one way or another. Do not deceive yourselves by thinking that you can avoid a decision by silence. Do not deceive yourselves by thinking that you can refer this to the districts and escape responsibility. The governor must act, and it makes a great deal of difference whether we have the influence of the state convention and the state organization in favor of county option or against it. As one who favors county option I am not willing to have the influence of our state ticket, of our state committee, and of our entire campaign thrown against every democrat who is a candidate in a district on a county option platform. I do not want every democrat who stands for county option to be branded as undemocratic, and as opposed to the policies of his party.

More than that, there is now only one way to get this question out of politics and fight our campaign on national issues. Our platform says that the tide is turning toward democratic victory, and that we can win on national issues. If so then victory is within our reach. The republican party has acted; the populist party has acted; if we act against them county option is an issue. If we act with them it is not an issue. You can no longer insist that you want to make this fight on national issues if you refuse to remove this question from the campaign. You have a chance to make it on national issues. If instead of that you prefer to make it on the liquor question then cease talking about national issues. You are to decide whether this question is more important than these national questions that will become paramount as soon as this question is disposed of. I shall put it on a higher ground. I believe it is expedient for the party to do this, that it promises victory to do it, and I see no other path that gives so much promise of victory.

But it is more than expedient—it is right. The democratic party can afford to do right, the democratic party can afford to take the moral side of a moral question. The majority report says it is a moral question and there is but one side to a moral question. Which side will you take? Will you put the democratic party on the moral side, or will you put it on the immoral side? Learn from the popularity of the eight o'clock closing law the strength of a moral issue. A majority of the democrats in both houses voted against it, and yet by an overwhelming vote this convention commends the governor for signing it.

I am interested in the democratic party, I owe to the democratic party all that I am, or have, or hope to be. I expect to live many years to fight its battles; I want to strengthen that party, and to be strong it must keep time with the marching spirit of our times. You must remember that temperance is growing in this country and in the world. Since twenty years ago, when we last acted upon the subject, many states have declared for state exclusion of the liquor traffic, others have declared for county option, others have declared

for township option, but here stands Nebraska chained to its law of twenty years ago, and the people who passed it not only will not enforce it, but disobey it at every opportunity. Let Nebraska understand that the world is moving forward and not backward. We must appeal to the young men with their ideals, their hopes and their aspirations; we can not hope to win them if we take the liquor side of this question.

When a party takes a position on a new question there is a certain realignment. At this time there will be less than usual if all parties take the same stand. If it is made an issue, we shall lose some and gain some. No one can tell whether our losses will exceed our gains, but I am not willing to trade men who think so much of the home that they are not willing to march under the standard of the liquor interests for men who come simply for a drink and will leave us when the barrel is empty. If we drive out good democrats and secure in return men drawn merely by appetite—men who put the love of liquor above principles of government, we shall be weaker when the next moral question is to be met. I appeal to you, democrats, let us be strong now that we may be stronger tomorrow to meet the issues of tomorrow.

Pardon me for speaking at length, but I have not had a chance to speak to you on this subject before, and I wanted to present these thoughts. They are on my mind and on my heart.

Nebraska's democracy has been at the front for nearly two score years. Look back over that record, it is a record to be proud of. The question of bimetalism came up and Nebraska took the people's side, the side of justice; she was not afraid, and her courage made her prominent among the states. The trust question came up and Nebraska took the people's side, the side of justice; and we have seen the republicans of the nation forming upon the line that we established. We took our position in favor of railroad legislation, the people's side and the side of justice, and we saw the democratic party of the nation take that position. We saw republicans adopting our policy. We declared for the election of senators by the people; we took the people's side, and the side of justice, and we have seen three national conventions of our party indorse it, and the republican candidate for president admit two years ago that he favored it himself. On the income tax question, we took the people's side, the side of justice, and we have seen a republican president take the plank out of the democratic platform and put it through the senate. We have seen a republican senator from our own state embody this democratic plank in a constitutional amendment, and we see that amendment ratified by state after state. The question of imperialism came up, and we took the people's side, the side of justice, and now republicans admit that we can not forever hold those people in bondage, that a colonial policy can not forever be maintained. The guarantee of bank deposits became an issue and we took the people's side, the side of justice. We have seen three states, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas adopt the democratic idea and we have seen the republican party of the nation forced to adopt the postal savings bank bill as an alternative—and by adopting it, admit that after fifty years of power they have been unable to make the depositors secure. The question of campaign contributions came up, and we took the people's side, the side of justice, and we have seen Nebraska lead off, adopting publicity before election; we have seen the republican house indorse Nebraska's position. On the tariff question we took the people's side, the side of justice, and we have seen the republican party brought to its knees by the insurgent revolt against the high tariff policy. Cannonism came up, and we took the people's side, the side of justice, and there were enough insurgents in congress to help us to so modify the rules as to put the speaker off the committee on rules and increased the size of the committee, so as to make it represent the entire country. Look at Nebraska's standard! In every battle it has been on the firing line. By your command I have borne it most of the time. I have been proud of you, and proud of these things for which we have fought. Look at that standard; there is no stain upon it; it has never been trampled in the dust since you gave it to me. I shall not lower it now. We never espoused a more righteous cause than that which now appeals to us; we never faced an enemy more deserving of attack than that which is attempting to corrupt our party and control our state. If a retreat is to be sounded, it must be sounded by another. I shall not do it, never, never, never!