

The Norfolk Weekly News-Journal
 The News, Established, 1881.
 The Journal, Established, 1877.
THE HUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY
 W. N. Huse, President.
 N. A. Huse, Secretary.
 Every Friday, by mail per year, \$1.50.
 Entered at the postoffice at Norfolk, Neb., as second class matter.
 Telephone: Editorial Department, No. 22. Business Office and Job Rooms, No. 1122.

TO EXPAND CITY LIMITS.

Announcement that the city administration views with favor the suggestion that Norfolk's legal city limits should be speedily expanded so as to include the entire town, will be received with approval by every resident of Norfolk and by a majority of those living outside the present imaginary boundary. This is one of the most important steps that it would be possible for Norfolk to take at this time.

As has been pointed out in The News frequently of late, there are a very large number of people living just outside the limits of Norfolk but who are to all practical purposes citizens of the town. It will work to their advantage as well as to the benefit of Norfolk when these outsiders join hands with the city proper for the good of all. Many privileges that do not extend to these residents living just outside the city, will be gained for them by this expansion. Sidewalks, water, sewer, lights, cheaper insurance, city mail delivery and many other advantages will go hand in hand to them with the extension of the town's limits. And Norfolk will gain in population, so far as the federal census is concerned. There is not a foot of property in town that will not be benefitted when Norfolk's population shows up in the federal census as it really ought to be. Everybody will benefit.

The news that this matter has been definitely taken up for immediate action is good news to all Norfolk.

CROP FORECASTS PROSPERITY.

And still comes the good word of crop abundance and consequent assured prosperity for the coming year.

General reports of the agents of the New York Central lines from Buffalo west to the Pacific coast and south to the Gulf of Mexico breathe prosperity in every line and forecast its continuance for the next year. Every summer the traffic department of the New York Central and other trunk lines gather information of the business outlook for the purpose of preparing for the movement in the fall and winter.

The outlook, without exception, is reported as bright. Fall orders already booked by merchants and manufacturers indicate a heavy merchandise movement. The steel industry presents gratifying conditions with large tonnage already booked and a feeling that heavier orders will be the rule now that a good crop is assured in many sections.

Manufacturers generally feel that factories will be open all winter. There is some doubt as to the last six months of 1908 on account of the election. Fear of short crops in the west, north-west and southwest has been removed by favorable weather of the last few weeks and the improvement has put a healthy tone into the business outlook in the agricultural states. Wheat crops in Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Oklahoma have been harvested and enough threshed to form a fairly accurate estimate of the yield. In Kansas returns indicate a crop of 65,000,000 as against 90,000,000 bushels last year but it compares favorably with the average of 55,000,000 bushels for the last ten years. The Oklahoma wheat crop was reduced 30 per cent by bad weather. Nebraska and Missouri both have good average crops.

Reports from the spring wheat states, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Iowa and Manitoba indicate a 10 per cent reduction as compared with last year, but this may be overcome if present favorable weather continues. The total yield for last year was 250,000,000 bushels. The corn crop last year in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri and Minnesota amounted to 1,584,000 bushels, Illinois leading with 383,000,000 bushels. Reports this year indicate a good average crop, though it will be a little late. There is some danger of an early frost in more northern sections, but reports from Kansas indicate a 25 per cent increase over its crop of 200,000,000 bushels last year. It is confidently asserted that the Nebraska crop will be large, as it has matured sufficiently to overcome any slight unfavorable conditions.

The oats crop in Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa and Kansas last year aggregated 468,000,000 bushels, Illinois leading with 133,000,000 bushels, but reports indicate the aggregate will be reduced to 6 per cent. Early bad weather damaged the crop irreparably.

DESTROYS PARTY ORGANIZATION

Since they have come to realize that this primary system is going to cost many counties on an average of \$2 for every vote that was cast, many sound-minded voters have begun to study the situation and have come to the conclusion that they had just as much

influence under the old caucus system in nominating officials as they do now. For it was always possible for every voter to attend the caucus and there to cast his vote and help frame the ticket.

More than that, the public at large has always exercised a powerfully direct influence upon caucus nominations, even when those caucuses were attended by no more interest than was displayed in last week's primary election. For political parties seek to win. In putting up a candidate, every political party has a desire to carry the election. Every political party, therefore, sensitive as a barometer to the pressure of public sentiment, seeks out such men as candidates who will "run well" at the ballot box. What more does the primary do? And the party which selects men who do not enjoy the confidence of the voters at large, loses in the election. Fear lest the wrong man be beaten, and knowledge that to win a candidate must be qualified by traits that will appeal to the public, dictates to all parties, therefore, the men who shall appear on the tickets and thus it will be difficult for an expensive primary system to bring the choice any closer to the people at large than it has always been.

One of the virtues of the old caucus system over this new luxury, too, lay in the party spirit which was engendered by the public meetings and which has been destroyed by the primary. This country has always believed that rival political parties, one to keep its watchful eye on the other, was essential to public protection. Any system, therefore, which tends to destroy party lines is a detriment and an actual injury to society. Under the old caucus system gaps in the tickets used to be filled up from top to bottom, and each campaign saw a complete army of candidates, all working alike for party success. In the field. Under the primary only candidates who take the initiative, are put on the tickets and the result is that many over-modest men, who would accept a nomination on their own accord, fall to be drawn into the public service and fail to help complete the party ticket. In many counties this year the republicans will have only two or three candidates. In other counties the same is true of democrats. As a result, there will be party indifference and that indifference will increase, to the injury of both parties.

Again, factional bitterness in both parties is made an undesirable feature under the primary. Before the primary election, factions are formed to support this man or that for a nomination. In the heat of the campaign things are said which render it impossible for some members of the losing faction to consistently support the successful nominees, against whom bitter attacks have been made.

But even more dangerous is the peril of factionalism after the nominations. A nomination goes not to the liking of one element in the party, and bolting becomes easy. Under the old caucus system, where men got together and talked things over, there was more patriotism aroused and more loyalty to the party as a whole. Party organizations, it would appear, can but suffer under this new system.

No state yet has successfully solved the primary election problem. Many of its ideals are theoretically well and good if they could work out practically. But the system that Nebraska is experimenting with has not solved the problem and there is a growing sentiment that the state ought to save that \$200,000 a year until the plan ceases to become an experiment.

GIVES CITIES POWER.

As more and more defects in the new statewide primary system, tried out last Tuesday in Nebraska, are coming to light, there comes a stronger and stronger sentiment among the people of the state who pay the taxes, that the law must be repealed by the next legislature. There is in northern Nebraska, at least, a growing sentiment that the taxpayers are already too heavily burdened to add a couple of hundred thousand dollars a year to the state's expenses when no improvement is accomplished.

We are told in a dispatch from Alnsworth that there is a bitter feeling among republicans of the "west end" to "hog" all the nominations, and that they did this as nearly as their numerical strength would permit. "It was generally conceded," says the report, "that one candidate should come from the west end and one from the east end." And, since the west end "tried to hog the whole thing," there are "even those who say that a nomination is not an election."

In other words, it was generally understood before the primary was pulled off that a political trade—helms things, the primary framers called them—was to be made. The west end was to take one candidate and the east end the other. Barter, pure and simple, it was to be. Just like the old days of the caucus. But the west end had the votes. The west end could bunch its votes and land every nominee, it thought. And it did, as nearly as it could. As a result

there is soreness down in the east end. There is bitterness in the air and there are threats that when the November election rolls around, some of the good old republicans may swing over to the opposite ticket in order to soak the west end faction who tried to steal all the nominations.

And so here we have already factions created, strife aroused and tendency to wipe out party lines, as a result the feature of them all which was painted by the primary's founders as virtue. Here we have sectional ire stirred up, two factions of the party split in twain and threats to bolt the ticket in November because a political trade which was down on the slate, failed under the primary election to go through successfully. As a result of the game as it worked out, you couldn't convince the west enders, who had the strength to nominate all their own candidates, that there is anything good about an "understanding" beforehand as to where the nominees shall come from. It is a beautiful theory, from the viewpoint of the section that owns the bulk of votes, that there should be absolute secrecy about this nomination business, and that no trades should prevail. But how about the east end? With trades wiped out and with the majority of votes in the west end, the east enders apparently have no chance now or forever of being represented on the party ticket. For under the primary system the section which has the numerical strength can "hog all the nominations" and there's no getting away from it. That, from the viewpoint of the cities, is one of the beauties of the primary system.

The Lincoln News tells us that "so far as Lancaster county is concerned, the first trial of the direct primary was an unqualified success. Lancaster will be found to have cast a greater percent of republican votes than any other county."

All of which tallies with the news from Alnsworth that the west end "hogged the nominations." There is no getting away from the fact that under the primary system, the cities which have great bulks of votes can "hog" all of the nominations on the state tickets, and no power on earth can counteract them. Lincoln and Omaha can get together and put up a candidate for every nomination on both republican and democratic primary tickets. Self interest will direct that Omaha and Lincoln voters of all parties make their marks opposite the names of Omaha and Lincoln men. The farmers and country voters are not going to leave the cornfields at this busy time of year to take a hand. And as a result it is physically possible for those two large cities to "hog" every single officer in the state. And, no matter how it "may be conceded in advance" that some candidates are to come from the country, some from the cities, the people of Nebraska may confidently expect that when the returns roll in the cities, with their numerical strength, will have taken the big bulk of plums.

And for the sake of creating this big nominating machine in the cities, we of the country are paying \$200,000 each year more in taxes.

Is it any wonder that there is a growing sentiment for the repeal of this primary luxury?

HUGHES VS. ROOSEVELT.

Governor Hughes takes exception to President Roosevelt's doctrine for national supervision and regulation of corporations doing an interstate business. Governor Hughes is just now making a tour of New York county fairs and is dealing out opposition to the president's federal supervision theory. It is said that politicians in the east believe that this active opposition from a republican so prominent as Governor Hughes will tend, if nothing more, to bring the matter to an issue in the next session of congress. Governor Hughes may make this plank upon which to seek the presidential nomination, but it is pointed out that his opposition coincides with that of Bryan.

It is believed by supporters of the president's theory that agitation will only tend to strengthen the view of the administration that federal supervision must eventually come. One wrong argument just now being used by those who agree with the president in this view is that the forty-five sovereign states would much better, for their own good, entrust supervision and regulation of interstate corporations to the senators and representatives in congress, who give all of their time to the science of government, than to state legislators elected to serve the public 100 days out of two years and whose study of governmental science, as it relates to interstate corporations, is therefore much more limited than that of the senator or congressman giving his exclusive time and energy to these questions.

Those favoring the president's views point out the fact that many national laws regulating interstate matters have already been enacted by congress and beneficent ones at that. Among these are pointed out the laws for the control and establishment of sani-

tary methods to prevent yellow fever in the south; the regulation and maintenance of a system of national irrigation wherein the state and private land owners become beneficiaries; the national pure food law; the national forest reserve policy; and the proposed national drainage.

The president's followers are also pointing to last winter's radical and prejudiced legislation, enacted from malice and without investigation, as an argument that more progress and saner progress would be made under a system of uniform law-making for interstate business, than under the present unequal and uneven system of state regulation.

As an instance of this haphazard state method, the Kansas railroad commission's act of a few days ago stands out a conspicuous example. The Kansas railroad commission reasoned that Nebraska had a two-cent fare law and Missouri, too. They argued that conditions were the same in Kansas as in Nebraska and Missouri and that therefore they were entitled to the reduction. So, after investigating the question for two weeks, they chopped down railroad fares thirty-three and a third percent. It took the Wisconsin commission eleven months to obtain the evidence needed upon which to base a passenger fare and then, because that fare, based on scientific calculation, did not suit the legislators, the state legislature threw scientific figures and evidence over the transom and reduced the fares to suit itself. The point is this: Kansas figured that it was entitled to a two-cent fare if Nebraska was. Nebraska figured it was. And so, without going into the question logically or reasonably, the fare was reduced. In New York Governor Hughes vetoed such a bill, declaring that the matter had not been investigated thoroughly enough to show whether the reduction was or was not just. Nebraska did not stop to investigate, but enacted the reduction law. Kansas followed suit, for the sole reason that Nebraska had done it. The whole action was the result of a desire to punish the railroads for past political sins, rather than a desire to fix a rate whose justice was established by sound judicial reasoning.

In time the legality of those reductions, however, will be settled by the courts. The federal supreme court will finally determine. And the point that President Roosevelt makes, the point which Governor Hughes objects to, is the contention that more thorough investigation and more rational results would have been obtained in the national congress than in the several state legislatures; and that, having found a sound basis upon which to work, the national congress would have passed laws affecting all states alike instead of making rates thirty-three and a third percent higher in some states than in others, as has been the result of the unequal actions taken by various individual states.

2-CENT FARE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Pennsylvania, together with a large number of other states in the union, enacted a two-cent passenger fare law at the last session of the legislature. In Pennsylvania, as in other states, the enactment of this two-cent fare law was more the result of agitation than of investigation. As might have been clearly foreseen by the Pennsylvania legislators, the two-cent fare law had no chance to stand permanently if the railroads of the state could demonstrate to the courts that the thirty-three and a third percent reduction in passenger income was unreasonable, confiscatory and unjust. The case has already come to a test in the Pennsylvania courts and, the Pennsylvania railroad having demonstrated to the satisfaction of the court that a two-cent fare was not compensatory, the new two-cent fare law has been declared invalid. The case will now go to the United States supreme court and if that tribunal affirms the judgment of the lower court, the people of Pennsylvania will be compelled to return to the old three-cent passenger fare. In other words, if the two-cent law is held invalid in the higher court as it has been in the lower court, the people of Pennsylvania will have a perfect right to hold their last year's legislature absolutely responsible for depriving the public of a reasonable reduction in passenger rates.

As the result of a campaign begun against the railroads for the purpose of abolishing rebates and discriminations, and obtaining equal rates for all, there swept over the country a wave of agitation demanding not equal rates but lower rates all along the line, not through any claim that lower rates would be reasonable rates but through a desire more than anything else to punish the railroads for past sins. This plan of action was deplored by many who saw that such a campaign of adverse legislation, based upon no investigation or logical evidence, was the wrong kind of procedure for bringing any lasting benefits to the public at large.

State legislatures which enacted two-cent laws did so without knowing whether two cents a mile was too high or too low a charge to be exacted from the traveling public. If these two-cent fare legislatures had gone at the matter calmly and soundly, they would have investigated the cost of carrying a passenger a mile and then, after allowing a fair profit to the railroad for the work, would have fixed the rate accordingly. There was no way of knowing whether conditions would justify a passenger fare so low as two cents in Nebraska, nor was there any way indeed of knowing that two cents was not excessive and that, as a matter of fact, the railroads ought to be compelled to carry us for one cent a mile or for a half a cent a mile or for less.

And since any law fixing the passenger fare rate at a certain amount must be based sanely and absolutely upon the cost of such service to the carrying company, with a certain specified margin of profit added, it stood to reason that no law thus blindly enacted could stand permanently if the railroads could demonstrate to the courts that two cents a mile was not compensatory. In Pennsylvania that demonstration has been made by the Pennsylvania railroad and in case the higher court of the United States upholds the decision of the lower court, the people, because of the hasty and baseless action of their legislature will be compelled to go back to the three-cent rate, whereas it is possible that, if the logical investigation had been first held, the legislature might have made a reasonable reduction which, with solid knowledge of conditions for its foundation, could not have been shaken in the courts.

Wisconsin has a peculiarly able board of railroad commissioners. That board was composed of men versed in legislative science and in railroad rates. Its members were appointed by Governor LaFollette. That commission went at the rate business in a calm and sane manner. They held an exhaustive investigation into the cost to the railroads of carrying passengers. The investigation required eleven months and was most exhaustive. The testimony covered several hundred pages. As a result, that commission declared that at two and a half cents a mile, railroads in Wisconsin could earn from four to five and a half percent on their passenger service investment. That commission held, as all reasonable men will agree, that a railroad company is entitled to earn a fair percent on its investment. And so, having found the exact cost, this commission decided to establish a two and a half cent fare in that state.

The railroad companies agreed to make the reduction, declaring that they could collect no evidence for an appeal to the courts which had not already been collected and digested by the commission. As a result, if the Wisconsin legislature had been consistent and had been cool enough to fight off the fever of agitation which was going the rounds, the traveling public of Wisconsin would have the benefit of a twenty percent reduction in passenger rates, and there would have been no fight made upon that reduction by the railroads. But Wisconsin legislators got the epidemic, the governor signed the bill and a law was passed, in the face of the investigation that had been made, making a thirty-three percent reduction and establishing a two-cent fare. In Pennsylvania the two-cent fare has been declared unreasonable and therefore invalid, so that as much may be expected in Wisconsin and back to three cents the traveling public may expect to go.

In New York the legislature passed a two-cent law but Governor Hughes held that a proper investigation upon which to base the reduction had not been made and that therefore the measure should not become a law. He vetoed the bill and his judgment has been upheld in the Pennsylvania case. It seems reasonable that if a two-cent fare law in thickly settled Pennsylvania is non-compensatory, unreasonable and confiscatory, a similar law can not permanently stand the test of the courts for more sparsely settled Nebraska.

If the Pennsylvania court decision may be taken as an indication of what will happen when the Nebraska law is finally settled in the courts, we of Nebraska may reasonably expect that we shall be compelled to go back to the three-cent fare because our last legislature was too busy to look before it leaped, whereas, for all that is known, a thorough investigation might have shown that we were really and reasonably entitled to some reduction from three cents.

It was not to be expected that the railroads of Nebraska would allow the two-cent fare to stand if it should prove unremunerative, and it is hardly to be anticipated that the two-cent fare will prove remunerative in Nebraska if it is unremunerative in Pennsylvania. Apparently President Roosevelt's theory that the federal government should have the right to regulate both interstate and intrastate commerce, insuring a regulation of merit because

based upon sound and sane investigation, has won another point.

AROUND TOWN.

Friday, the 13th, will be the hoodoo of either the lawyers or the trade promoters. Which?

If there's going to be any dispute about it, Norfolk could entertain both Judges Munger next week.

It will be worth the price of admission Friday afternoon just to see Umpire Charlie Smith umpire. This, by the way, involves no reflection upon Stadelman.

If there's one bunch more than another that always looks good to Norfolk, it's the commercial travelers. No wonder we're all glad that they've decided to hold an annual picnic in this town henceforth.

A Norfolk man expects to be right in style for the coming winter. He has a "straight figure, without hips," just as has been prescribed by the president of the American Dressmakers' Protective association.

Now, all in concert, we'll begin worrying for fear of a frost.

There were two straw hats on Norfolk avenue Monday morning; and one of them was on a hatter's head.

People who have to sleep late as a general proposition find little difficulty in getting up at daybreak on circus morning.

"The primary is decidedly primary," remarked a prominent Wayne county democrat, discussing the extra \$200,000 expense imposed upon the state and the lack of \$200,000 worth of improvement.

Automobilists agree that Norfolk streets would be smoother if they were properly paved.

Somebody on Norfolk avenue pickled peaches yesterday. You could tell it by walking down the street.

It does look like a real term of federal court next week in Norfolk. At all events, a real live jury has been drawn.

Herman Boche found that a friend in need was a friend indeed. Herman spent all day looking for a friend to sign his ball bond.

Did you ever hear that old yarn about the small boy who fed the elephant tobacco instead of peanuts? And did you believe it?

It's all over.

Everybody who owns a cur dog thinks that his cur isn't so bad, after all.

A Norfolk husband worries half his life away through fear that he will be hen pecked.

Three young women, past twenty, were the first spectators out to see the circus unload.

What is more fun than driving to town on circus day and eating lunch out of a basket, in the shade of the wagon box?

The boy who had no alarm clock tied a string to his toe on circus morning. The boy who did have an alarm clock woke up, dressed and went over to the neighbor's to pull that string. You've missed something if you've missed that experience.

The two cute looking girls on the street are the Du Monte sisters, who are part of the "Bachelor's Romance" farce comedy troupe, now rehearsing at the Auditorium.

ATCHISON GLOBE SIGHTS.

The smaller the man the bigger the chip he carries on his shoulder.

There are many people in every town who may have "come down a peg."

Children never appreciate their parents so long as life is a two-step.

"There are very few women," we heard a man say today, "that I suit."

When milliners put out a particularly young hat, all the old girls want it.

A public speaker, in order to become popular, must know when to quit.

What has become of the old-fashioned boy who stopped to spit whenever he saw a caterpillar?

There never was a woman who didn't occasionally pray for a change in her husband's disposition.

Open a door in summer, and flies slip in; in winter, it's cats. Always some reason for boys to keep the door closed.

State of Ohio, City of Toledo, Lucas county, ss.
 Frank J. Cheney makes oath that he is senior partner of the firm of F. J. Cheney & Co., doing business in the city of Toledo, county and state aforesaid, and that said firm will pay the sum of one hundred dollars for each and every case of catarrh that cannot be cured by the use of Hall's Catarrh Cure.
 Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence, this 6th day of December, A. D. 1886.
 W. Glesson,
 Notary Public.
 Hall's Catarrh Cure is taken internally, and acts directly on the blood and mucous surfaces of the system. Send for testimonials free.
 F. J. Cheney & Co., Toledo, O.
 Sold by all druggists. 75c.
 Take Hall's Family Pills for constipation.