

TALKING OF MEN AND THINGS

ible for membership in the Lincoln Ad Club. His brief and pointed little speech at the Ad Club banquet Tuesday night left no doubt in the minds of the Ad Club members where Nebraska's chief executive stands on the matter of advertising Nebraska's resources and possibilities. Nor did the governor fail to demonstrate the fact that he knows a thing or two about publicity. Now, if Governor Aldrich will get behind the McKelvie publicity bill and give it the weight of executive influence, a lot of loyal Nebraskans who are tired of the pinch policy will be doubly grateful to him.

Some one—or a lot of them, rather—have mentioned Fred Kind of the Armstrong Clothing Co., as a likely candidate for the excise board. The nomination of Fred Kind would suit Will Maupin's Weekly to a nicety. If he is nominated and receives the vote of every man to whom he has shown courtesy and kindness, he will go through with the biggest majority ever received by a local candidate.

Several people have mentioned the name of Dan V. Stephens of Fremont in connection with the democratic gubernatorial nomination next year. Nothing doing! Not that Mr. Stephens would not make a strong candidate, for he would. None stronger. But Congressman Latta has announced that he does not want another re-election, and Mr. Stephens has indicated that a nomination to congress would not be disagreeable to him. And Dan V. Stephens has performed enough service to the democratic party in this state to warrant him in exercising some voice in the matter of nominations. If he says congress, then congress it is.

The Postoffice Department is running behind. Maybe this little incident will show why. On March 1, 1910, the deputy labor commissioner of Nebraska wrote the postmaster general asking for a ruling on a certain matter. On February 5, 1911, the commissioner, then retired, received the ruling. It was just eleven months in coming to hand.

The Lincoln Bryan Club purposes celebrating Bryan's birthday, March 20, by giving a "dollar dinner" in Lincoln. A committee is working up the matter now. Candor compels the statement that since the events of the last state campaign it will be more difficult to get a big gathering for such an occasion than it would have been a year or two ago. There are thousands of democrats in Nebraska who can not forgive Mr. Bryan for injecting the county option issue into the campaign at a time when such an issue could not be definitely settled, and could only result in strife and ultimate defeat. Without entering into any discussion of the wisdom of Mr. Bryan's action, it will be pretty generally admitted that the injection of that issue into the campaign resulted in defeating the democratic state ticket. Of course, if the democratic legislature of 1909 had enacted an initiative and referendum law—as it should have done—all would have been well with the party of Jefferson and Jackson. But it did not. And with the initiative and referendum the real issue, what did it matter whether county option was defeated or enacted into law? The losers would immediately appeal to the referendum anyhow. Those who believe that county option is a greater and more important issue than tariff reform and trust regulation are more likely to interest themselves in the "Bryan birthday dinner" than those who are

of the opinion that tariff reform and trust regulation are the big issues.

Those who profess to see in the Canadian reciprocity treaty signs of annexation of Canada by the United States, really ought to take something to clear their vision. Canadians would have something to say about annexation, and to become a part of Uncle Sam's domain is about the last thing the average Canadian would consent to.

Congressman Norris voted against the reciprocity treaty. Doubtless he had reasons for so doing that were sufficient for him. But if he based his opposition on the fear that the pauper wheat of Canada would come rushing across the border and swamp our own domestic wheat, then he ought to be ashamed to admit it.

The men and newspapers now demanding that a democratic legislature keep a platform pledge to establish a college of agriculture in the southwestern part of the state merely exhibit their ignorance of what political platforms are really for. Platforms are made to get in on, not to stand on.

Champ Clark says he is not running away from a presidential nomination that has not been tendered to him. There is only one reason for believing that Champ Clark is out of the running so far as having a chance for that nomination—his nomination would be an evidence of wisdom on the part of the democracy, and the democracy is noted for its proneness to do the fool thing just at a time when the fool thing will hurt it most.

Andrew Carnegie is quoted as saying that he has made forty-four millionaires. Doubtless that is true, but it is a small part of what he has made. He has made, through the operations of his big mills, hundreds of widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were slaughtered to make a holiday for remorseless greed. He has piled up fortunes on the bones of men whose bodies and souls were not taken into account as factors in the business equation. Mr. Carnegie may build libraries until their cornices touch across the continent, and he may give to peace funds and pension funds until they pile mountain high, but he can never give enough to wipe out the memory of Homestead and the blood that was shed there by men fighting as heroically against despotism as ever men fought at Lexington or Bunker Hill.

The Lincoln city council has refused to furnish current from the municipal lighting plant for the lighting of the city library, taking refuge behind the plea of economy. This is the same council that went enthusiastically into the cluster street lighting business without taking into account that it would cost \$11,000 to connect up the plant with the lights. The metropolitan alderman who moved that his city have a new jail built as far as possible out of the material in the old jail, and that the old jail be left standing until the new jail was completed—that alderman would have felt perfectly at home sitting among the wise gentlemen making up the city council of Lincoln.

Mayor Love's remarks about loyalty to one's home town, made at the Ad Club banquet Tuesday evening, were to the point. It is not surprising that the Star takes exceptions thereto, nor that the Star studiously

refrains from admitting the real facts. The Star asserts that Mayor Love, among others, has been furnishing the knockers with an excuse for knocking—a charge that is ridiculously untrue. The charge is made that the present policy of Lincoln is harmful to the commercial and industrial interests, but to date no one has had the temerity to submit figures pretending to prove the charge. On the contrary, it is easy to show that the year 1910 was the most prosperous in Lincoln's commercial and industrial history. It is not pretended that this was due to the "dry" policy; it is stated merely as a fact. A majority of the voters said they wanted a "dry" town, and the administration elected on that policy has been striving to carry out the mandates of the majority.

While that policy was in force the city prospered as never before. It may be only a coincidence, but there is more room for believing that the prosperity is due to the "dry" policy than there is for believing that the prosperity would have been greater under a "wet" policy. Mayor Love, who has about as many faults as the average man, and who is a veritable tyro in the game of "practical politics" has never been so foolish as to interpret as a "knock on Lincoln" every protest against the "dry" policy. The "knockers" are not so scarce as to require that method of identification. As one who believes that an excise policy, be it "wet" or "dry" has nothing to do with a city's business growth, Will Maupin's Weekly desires to enter a protest against having that issue thrust forward every time the question of standing up for Lincoln is broached. There are two classes of people who ought to be suppressed long enough for the rest of us to settle the vexed question of excise policy—those who insist that a town is commercially ruined unless it has saloons, and those who think a town is doomed to business ruin and hellfire unless it is "dry."

We would recall the remark of Tom Johnson's to the minds of those who can not see anything to settle but this "excise" problem. Johnson, who is noted as being a man who is bent upon achieving practical reforms, said that just about the time he had the people up to the point of forcing a reform, along came a bunch of prohibitionists, beating their tom-toms and sounding their hew-gags, and attracting the attention of the voters away from the main question of the moment. For heaven's sake, good people, can't we make this excise question an issue all by itself, without forever mixing it up with business, with social affairs and with industrial problems?

The senate on Monday passed the initiative and referendum bill without a dissenting vote. Of course this deceives no one, least of all the men who are thoroughly committed to the idea of government by the people. It simply means that a number of honorable senators have shouldered off upon house members opposed to the idea the responsibility of either defeating the measure or so hamstringing it as to make it ineffective. That fierce opposition will be encountered in the house is beyond question—indeed, it is expected—and the bill's easy sailing through the senate indicates that the senators expect the house to stop it. That is a favorite pastime with statesmen of a certain calibre. But Will Maupin's Weekly stops the press for a moment to warn a few representatives of the people that the people are wise to this little