THE ARIZONA CASE

The readers of The Commoner will pardon Mr. Bryan if he derives a large amount of satisfaction from the action of congress on the admission of Arizona. The plan adopted by congress was suggested by Mr. Bryan last February.

In its issue of February 17—just after Arizona ratified her constitution—The Commoner contained the following editorial:

"The people of Arizona have ratified their constitution and await the approval of the authorities at Washington. That approval can not be withheld; the constitution suits the people of the new state and does not violate the federal constitution—that is all that can be required. The people of Arizona think it good, but whether the Washington authorities like it or not they have no reasonable excuse for delaying statehood. If there is any provision in the constitution which is objectionable to the people of Arizona it can be easily removed through the initiative and referendum—what more can President Taft ask?

"During the recent campaign some of the officeholders, who are about to lose their salaries; some of the corporations that do not like to be regulated, and some of the newspapers that are controlled by foreign capital assumed to speak for the president and threaten disapproval, but it would be a reflection on the chief executive to believe that he would permit these self-appointed mouth-pieces to speak for him. Mr. Taft has read the constitution; if he had intended to disapprove it he should have said so and pointed out the parts to which he objected. It is hardly good faith—certainly not generous—to keep silent until the people speak and then withhold statehood because of personal objection to one or more provisions.

"IF HE THINKS THAT ANY PROVISIONS ARE OBJECTIONABLE LET HIM POINT OUT THOSE PROVISIONS AND ASK CONGRESS TO AUTHORIZE A SEPARATE VOTE ON THOSE PROPOSITIONS AT THE TIME STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS ARE ELECTED.

"This will give the peple a chance to vote on those particular propositions, and he would hardly take the position that the people should not be allowed to have them if they desire them."

The next week's issue, February 24, contained the following open letter to the president:

"To President Taft: Arizona stands at the door and knocks—will you admit her to the sisterhood of states? She deserves well at the nation's hands. Her people are the bravest of the brave, and they are as intelligent as they are brave, and as industrious as they are intelligent. They have forced the mountains to give up their wealth of mineral treasure; they have converted vast stretches of desert into gardens and fields; and, they are patient, too. They have desired statehood for years and they have deserved it, too, but hope has been deferred. At last, an enabling act was passed, and a constitutional convention was elected. That convention prepared a constitution and that constitution has been ratified by an overwhelming majority. Will you extend the hand of welcome or will you use your position to deny them the recognition that they crave? A corporation-controlled press and some ambitious office holders seemed to speak for you and threaten the people of Arizona if they dared to adopt such a constitution as they desired, but they did you honor to believe that you would have spoken to them directly, rather than through such agents, if you had desired to warn them. It ought to be gratifying to you to know that they have shown an independence which proves their capacity for self-government. If their constitution contains anything repugnant to the constitution of the United States, the supreme court can be trusted to nullify it. Can you ask more? If, however, there is any provision which, while not a violation of the federal constitution, is so objectionable to you that you wish it submitted separately, ask congress to authorize a vote upon it where state officers are elected. If there is any provision so objectionable as in your judgment to justify you in rejecting the constitution unless amended, do not put the people to the delay and trouble of writing a new constitution, ask congress to make the elimination of such provision a condition precedent to admission. They can eliminate it when they hold their state election. Make any conditions you please, but do not reject their constitution. Let them come in, and the career of the state will be such that you will find increasing pleasure in the fact that you proclaimed Arizona a state.

W. J. BRYAN.

The plan was adopted and it satisfied the objections of those who personally opposed the recall as applied to judges.

The application of the idea in the case of Arizona gave an opportunity to release New Mexico from the bondage which her corporation constitution had fastened upon her. Welcome Arizona and New Mexico.

TWO GOOD BILLS

Mr. Boehne of Indiana has introduced in the lower house two particularly good bills. One of these measures seeks to prevent intimidation or coercion of a member of congress and the other seeks to prevent intimidation or coercion of employees by employers during political campaigns. Both these measures ought to pass.

Read them carefully and then write your congressman urging him to take interest in these measures and help Mr. Boehne enact them into law. The bills follow:

House Roll No. 11176. A bill to prevent the intimidation, coercion, or undue influence of a member of congress in the performance of his official duties.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled:

That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons, firm, association, co-partnership, or corporation, or any director, manager, superintendent, officer, or agent of any such person or persons, firm, association, co-partnership, or corporation, to cause a suspension of the business of such person or persons, firm, association, co-partnership, or corporation, in whole or in part, or to threaten to cause such suspension for the purpose of or with the intention of coercing, intimidating, or unduly influencing any member of either house of congress to perform or to not perform any act or to pursue or to not pursue any policy in his official capacity as a member of congress.

Section 2. That any person or persons, firm, association, co-partnership, or corporation, or any director, manager, superintendent, officer, or agent of any such person or persons, firm, association, co-partnership, or corporation, found guilty of a violation of this act shall be fined not more than five thousand dollars or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

House Roll No. 11177. A bill to prevent the intimidation, coercion, or undue influence of employees of individuals, firms, associations, co-partnerships, or corporations during political campaigns or at elections.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled;

That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons, association, firm, co-partnership, or corporation, or any director, manager, superintendent, officer, or agent of any such person or persons, association, firm, co-partnership, or corporation, to attempt, either directly or indirectly, to influence the political actions or views of any employee of such person or persons, association, firm, co-partnership, or corporation during any political campaign preceding any primary election at which representatives in congress or presidential electors, or both, are to be nominated; or preceding any general election at which representatives in congress or presidential electors or both, are to be elected; or at any such election, by paying such employee any salary or wage due him in any form of pay envelope upon which there is written or printed any political motto, device, or argument containing threats, express or implied, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions, views, or actions of such employees; or by exhibiting or causing to be exhibited in the establishment or place where any such employee is engaged in labor any handbill, placard, or notice of whatever nature containing any threat, notice, or information that if any candidate for representative in congress or presidential elector, or any ticket upon which is borne the names of any candidates for representative in congress or presidential electors, is elected or defeated, work in such establishment or place will cease, in whole or in part, such establishment or place will be closed, or wages of such employees will be reduced, or other threats express or implied, or any intimidation or coercion whatsoever, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions, views, or actions of such employee during such campaign or at such election.

Section 2. That any person or persons, association, firm, co-partnership, or corporation, or any director, manager, superintendent, officer, or agent of such person or persons, association, firm, co-partnership, or corporation, found guilty of a violation of this act shall be fined not more than five thousand dollars, or may be imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, in the discretion of the court. Any individual found guilty of a violation of this act may in addition be disfranchised for any period of time not to exceed ten years.

THREE QUESTIONS

First—Why do the republican papers take so much interest in the democratic nomination? Because they want the democrats to nominate their weakest man. They praise the democrat whose nomination will give the republican party the best assurance of success—whom are the republicans praising most?

Second—Why do the big railroad attorneys take so much interest in the democratic nomination? Because the president has the appointment of interstate commerce commissioners, and United States judges. The commissioners regulate rates and the judges suspend state laws—it is desirable, therefore, from a railroad standpoint that the president be "a friend." Whom are the railroad attorneys supporting?

Third—What interest does Wall street have in the democratic nomination? Wall street always has irons in the fire. Wall street always wants some bills passed giving favors or other bills defeated and is, therefore, always in politics. Whom is Wall street urging just now?

When you find out whom the republican newspapers and Wall street are supporting for the democratic nomination you can oppose that candidate with confidence. By the way, what do the republican papers, the railroad attorneys and Wall street think of Governor Harmon?

WOOL TAX RAISES TARIFF

Those who think that a tariff on WOOL is a tax on the MANUFACTURERS are invited to read the following from Mr. Underwood's speech.

"I say that if the raw material that the manufacturer must use is taxed, and his competitor gets his raw material free, it is not protection, but justice, to put such a tax on the competitor's finished product as will equalize the tax placed on the home manufacturer's raw material. Therefore, when the tax is put on the raw wool as a mere matter of justice to the American manufacturer, you are compelled to lay that much tax, at least, on the foreign competitor who gets his wool free. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Cannon) will differ with me in that."

This shows that the tariff on wool is ADDED to the tariff on the manufactured article. In other words the rate would have been made lower than it is if wool had been put on the free list.

AN ARKANSAS SUGGESTION

F. H. Layman, Magazine, Ark., —The culmination of the sixteen years' campaign that has been waged by the democracy of these United States under the peerless leadership of Mr. Bryan will reach fruition in 1912.

Democracy will then win out nationally and in most places locally. But I have a suggestion to make that precludes the necessity for any considerable campaign funds for next year. It is this: Resort now to the necessary means to get The Commoner into the hands of most of the voters. Let this be done at once. I would suggest this plan. There are at least 400,000 wide-awake democratic patriots that would give $5.00 each for assured success next year. Let them now select five men each of another political leaning, republican, socialist or mixed, whom they know to be honest and send their names and addresses with $5.00 to The Commoner for a subscription to run from now until after next year's election. This will obviate the necessity for a campaign fund for educational purposes, for no honest man can regularly read The Commoner and fail to indorse with his vote true democracy. But when the time arrives for the vote we must have a democratic platform and a democratic ticket. Not a Joe Bailey platform and a Wall street ticket. And this plan will also assure the right kind of platform and ticket.