

The Commoner

ISSUED WEEKLY

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

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

One Year.....\$1.00	Three Months.....25c
Six Months.....50c	Single Copy.....5c
In Clubs of 5 or more per Year.....75c	Sample Copies Free Foreign Postage 52c Ex- tra.

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 this effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

RENEWALS.—The date on your wrapper shows when your subscription will expire. Thus, Jan. 31, '06, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1906. 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 the NEW address.

ADVERTISING.—rates furnished upon application. Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb

It is not yet too late to sign a primary pledge, and it will never be too late to keep it.

Senator Aldrich feels quite confident that he can take care of the denaturized alcohol bill.

It is very evident that the Sioux City Journal is taking the campaign of Mr. Perkins somewhat seriously.

Mr. Jerome of New York is giving a very correct imitation of a man who exhausted his ideas in the preface.

President Roosevelt would not make a good witness for the prosecution in case the beef trust sued Upton Sinclair for slander. The president is on record in the "embalmed beef" cases.

A Commoner reader asks where the song "Rolling Home to Bonny Scotland" may be obtained. Any one having this information will kindly send it to Alexander Nicholson, Holstein, Iowa.

Just as the pessimist is about to convince us that the old world is all wrong something happens to prove that it is all right. The splendid contributions for the relief of San Francisco, for instance.

In view of recent developments the financiers who allowed themselves to be fried for fat in 1896 and 1900 will probably agree that it would have been far cheaper and much better had they played the game honestly.

Just about the time the g. o. p. managers thought the life insurance contribution scandal was forgotten, along came the national bank contribution exposure, and once more the managers had to work their explanation and denial department overtime.

"There is more personal liberty in Russia than there is in America," says Maxim Gorky. If by "personal liberty" he means the liberty to do what he has done, perhaps he is right. And if he is right the American people are well content to let it go at that.

WHY NOT LET HIM PAY IT?

Bills are being introduced in congress providing for the remission of the tariff duties on structural iron and steel and other materials necessary for the rebuilding of San Francisco.

We have all along been told by our republican friends that "the foreigner pays the tax."

Why, in the very moment of their affliction, deprive the people of San Francisco of the great advantages of a high protective tariff?

Why not require the foreigner to "pay the tax" for the benefit of San Francisco?

WASHINGTON CITY LETTER

Washington, D. C., April 30.—Democrats in congress are greatly pleased over the nomination of Ex-Senator William A. Harris for governor of Kansas. Those longest in service here know that in accepting the nomination Mr. Harris will have to give up business plans that mean a pecuniary sacrifice on his part, but they say that in yielding to the wishes of his party in the "Sunflower" state to lead the fight for the democracy it is characteristic of the man. It will be recalled that in 1892 Mr. Harris was elected a congressman-at-large from Kansas. He was a combination candidate—supported by all the parties, state and national, opposed to republican policies. He received a tremendous majority. It was a remarkable result by reason of the fact that Mr. Harris had fought in the confederate army, and up to that time the Kansans had never been known to give their support to any one who even sympathized with the losing side in our memorable civil conflict. Mr. Harris was born in Virginia and immediately after the war when everything was in collapse in the Old Dominion and prejudices were supposed to be not only bitter but unreasonable in Kansas, he went out there to make a living. He was a civil engineer by profession and lots of railroad building was then going on in the west. Mr. Harris did not know what treatment he would receive at the hands of the Kansans. He has often related to the writer, however, that no stranger was ever shown more kindness by the people of Kansas. Intense as they were in their union sentiments they gave to the hopeful and ambitious young Virginian a friendly hand. They encouraged him in his work. They said nothing in his presence to wound his feelings or to indicate that a southern man was not welcome in their midst. Mr. Harris prospered, and after acquiring a sufficient amount of money he invested his savings in a farm. For twenty years or more farming and the breeding of the best cattle have been his principal occupation. The farmers more than any other class of citizens, first sent him to the popular branch of congress by a majority so large that the republican party of Kansas received a jolt from which they did not recover for many years. Then they transferred him to the senate, and he served a full term in that body, making a record which won for him the respect, regardless of political affiliation, of every man in that august body. Democrats at the nation's capital have a firm belief that the voters of Kansas are going to show this year that they have just as much faith in William Alexander Harris as they had when they conferred the honors upon him which are mentioned above. They somehow feel that with Mr. Harris at the head of the ticket and with such strong and popular men running with him as Mr. Farrelly for lieutenant-governor, Mr. Overmeyer for attorney general and many others regarded as acceptable candidates as the Kansas democracy could possibly have selected to make the great fight this year, he can not be beaten.

The republican leaders in congress still persist in denying statehood to Oklahoma and Indian Territory. They talk as if they intend to hold up the bill indefinitely and permit the session to close without action on a measure of such vital importance to the inhabitants of the west. The republican bosses of the house of representatives profess to feel outraged because the senate would not accept the Hamilton bill, and unless they bow to the will of Mr. Foraker and other republicans in the upper branch the question will have to be carried over until the short session. The most prominent democrats in congress are certain that their record is straight so far as the statehood bill is concerned and they confidently expect an approval on the part of the people when the ballots are dropped into the boxes next November.

The senate republicans are dillydallying with the Smoot case from Utah. They seem to be more afraid of facing this issue than was thought possible up to the time the testimony closed. There is no earthly reason why the report should not be sent in and the matter brought to a head. Privately some of the republican senators admit that if they can carry the Smoot case over to the next session they are going to do it. They recognize that if it comes up this session it will cause a very long debate. In spite of the predictions of the house triumvirate that congress would adjourn before the middle of May they are now forced to admit that even after the railroad rate bill is out of the way and the regular appropria-

tion bills are brought forward the chances are that the session can not be ended before the middle of July, and it may run along until after August 1. The longest session of congress in the history of our government was in 1887-8. It lasted from the first Monday in December until October 20. In the following congress the session did not come to a close until October 1. That was the year in which the McKinley tariff bill was passed. In the congress before the Mills tariff bill went through the house but was held up in the senate as the latter body was controlled by the republicans. In the fifty-first congress the republicans controlled both branches and on account of the McKinley bill and the attempt to pass a "force" bill the republicans met with political disaster all over the United States.

There is a panic in the ranks of the "stand-pat" republicans so far as the revision of the tariff is concerned. They have the power to prevent any attempt at revision this session and they will undoubtedly use that power. Every speech made this session on the republican side of the house of representatives has clearly demonstrated that no matter what the pressure is they are going to carry the question over. What causes the uneasy feeling in the minds of Cannon, Dalzell, Grosvenor, Hepburn and others is that it is pretty well understood that if he lives to send in another message to congress at the opening of the second session President Roosevelt will demand that his party carry out the pledges made to the people. He intended doing this last December, but the wily, coaxing leaders in both the senate and house advised him to hold off. It is very well known that they told him the "grand old party" was having enough trouble in other directions without lugging in tariff revision. The democrats in the house have furnished, through speeches urging tariff revision, some excellent campaign documents which will be sent to every nook and corner of the United States for the careful inspection of the voters. It has previously been mentioned in this correspondence that Mr. Rainey, of Illinois, elucidated that subject to the discomfort of the republicans. They are so stirred up over his exposure of the watch trust that they undoubtedly have had dreams at night. Adam Byrd, of Mississippi, has also contributed a specially strong argument on the tariff, and his speech is already in great demand. John Sharp Williams has likewise discussed the question at much length, and still other speeches are to come that will make what is commonly called "mighty interesting reading."

The defeat of Representative John H. Bankhead at the recent primary election will remove from the house of representatives the democrat of longest continuous service in that body. Col. Bankhead is in his tenth term. As readers of newspapers have known many days before this letter was written he is to be succeeded by Capt. Richmond Pearson Hobson. The successful young man gave Col. Bankhead a close race two years ago.

The democrat in the house credited with the next longest service after Col. Bankhead is Mr. Robertson of Louisiana. He was elected to serve the unexpired term of his father, who died during the fiftieth congress. Col. Bankhead entered public life here at the beginning of that congress. Messrs. Lester and Livingston of Georgia, in point of service, are next to Messrs. Bankhead and Robertson.

If reports be true congressional nominations in the big and prosperous city of Philadelphia will not go to the highest bidder this year. It is due to the fact that the corrupt republican bosses over there no longer have it in their power to auction off in effect these offices to men who can afford to put up anywhere from \$20,000 to \$50,000 for the honor of filling a seat in the popular branch of congress. In the good old days when Philadelphia had men of real ability in congress no such thing as money for a nomination was heard of. It was only when Israel Durham and others of the dethroned "push" were at the head of affairs that candidates of the millionaire class were brought to the front solely for the amount of cash they were able to distribute among "the boys." That seems to be all over now and the expectation is that in the year of our Lord 1906 capable and decent republicans will receive the nominations, and the chances also are that one or more democrats will be elected in a city that heretofore has been so overwhelmingly republican.

ALFRED J. STOFER.