

The name of the new club will be the 'Democratic Hub,' and its eventual membership will consist of two representatives at large from each ward and a representative from each voting precinct. The two members at large will be chosen at a mass meeting of democrats to be held April 14, following the city convention. At that time the permanent organization will be put under way. The objects of the club, as stated in the constitution, are the formation of ward clubs and the fostering of steps which will bring about the unification and co-operation of these clubs. The central body will enable the democrats from all parts of the city to become acquainted and to profit by the interchange of ideas. By a section of its constitution the club must confine its efforts to the formation and unification of these clubs and the good of democracy generally. A letter, received from William J. Bryan, stated that he hoped the movement would be a success and that it would spread over the entire country. He enclosed blanks and membership rolls of other similar clubs and wished the new organization every success."

A Shameful Situation.

One of the most shameful spectacles upon which the people of a great state were ever required to gaze has recently been presented at the capital city of Nebraska.

In 1902 at a conference of corporation lawyers, the man who was subsequently chosen by the republican state convention as its nominee for governor was picked for that honor.

Representatives of the corporations selected, very generally, the republican nominees for the legislature.

The republicans carried the legislature by an overwhelming majority, electing more than one hundred out of the 133 members.

In spite of the fact that it was known that the republican candidate for governor was chosen by the corporation lawyers, he was elected, although by a reduced majority.

The corporations promptly accepted the republican victory as a triumph for corporation rule and it seems, also, that a majority of the republican members of the legislature agreed with the corporation agents on this point.

Three corporation lobbyists were on duty in Nebraska's capital city, openly directing this republican legislature.

There has been a general demand on the part of the people for a revision of the revenue law and a very general complaint because the railroads of the state were not paying their proper proportion of the taxes.

In response to this sentiment, a revenue bill was framed by the republican legislature in which bill new and larger burdens were placed upon taxpayers generally, while the corporations were given everything they demanded with respect to the method of corporation assessment.

The situation is so humiliating to republicans who do not indorse such methods that even republican newspapers have found it necessary to enter bitter protest. The Omaha Bee, a republican paper, has entered frequent protests against these proceedings, a fair sample of these protests being an editorial in a recent issue in which the Bee said:

If any man or set of men should deliberately concoct a scheme to set the town on fire or blow up its public buildings with dynamite the community would rise up as one man to have them thrown into prison or lynched, but when men set about deliberately to undermine and destroy self-government, the people tamely allow them to proceed with their devilish work. And yet this is precisely what has been going on at Lincoln for the last sixty days under the leadership of John N. Baldwin, the head pusher of the most rotten lobby that has ever infested the state capitol.

Corporation lobbies have infested various state capitals at various times; and yet, as a rule, they have done their work in a covert way. But in Nebraska the mask has been entirely

thrown aside and upon the theory that the people will indorse whatever may be done by the republican party the corporation agents have demanded of the official representatives of that party the fruits of the victory which the corporations won at the last election.

The republican editorial to which reference has been made was entitled "Shameless Betrayal of the People." The situation is, indeed, a shameful one, and yet when men had good reason to believe that the republican candidates were chosen by the corporations, what reason did they have for placing confidence in those candidates? What reason did they have for believing that those candidates, if elected, would do anything to provide the people with relief from corporation imposition?

If the people of Nebraska shall become aroused because of the manner in which the corporation lobby dominated republican representatives at Nebraska's capital city, then even out of this shameful condition great good to the people may result.

Figs may not be gathered from thistles; and measures designed for the greatest good to the greatest number may not be expected at the hands of public officials who owe their office to corporation influence.

Victory For Working Men.

Organized labor won a decided victory in the United States circuit court at St. Louis when Judge Adams refused to make permanent the temporary restraining order which he had issued in which order the railroad men were forbidden to quit work.

Judge Adams holds that laboring men have the right to organize, that they have a right to demand higher wages and to quit work if their demands be not complied with. He holds that the effect of a strike in delaying the movement of freight or passenger trains would be too remote and incidental to make the authors of it even constructively guilty of conspiracy to interfere with interstate commerce or defy the authority of the United States by obstructing the transit of the mails, which were some of the allegations set up in the petition on which Judge Adams issued his temporary restraining order.

While the decision is a victory for the workingmen, Judge Adams undertakes to justify the temporary restraining order. That order should not have been issued even if the facts alleged were true; and we need go no further than the statement of the conclusions reached by Judge Adams himself to justify this claim. If workingmen have an unquestioned right to organize, if they have a right to demand higher wages and to quit work if their demand be not complied with—and Judge Adams says they have these privileges—then the court was not justified in issuing the restraining order forbidding these men to quit work even accepting the statements made in the railroad company's petition as being entirely correct.

This is true because it may be said, with respect to the temporary restraining order as Judge Adams says in his refusal to grant the injunction, that while the results of a strike might be delay in the movement of trains, interference with interstate commerce, and obstruction of the transit of the mails, these are too remote and incidental to make the authors of it even constructively guilty of a conspiracy; and it is also true because it was never intended to confer upon a court the privilege of interfering, by the issue of a writ, with the unquestioned rights of men.

The objection to government by injunction is not merely against the evidence on which the writ is based; it is against the writ itself, as it is applied in enabling powerful men to interfere with the plain rights of other men and as it represents that extraordinary power assumed by a

judge which power has, properly, no place in our system of government.

The very men who have been quick to resort to the writ of injunction against workingmen would become very indignant if the workingmen could summon sufficient influence to persuade a judge to issue an injunction in their behalf denying to the employer the exercise of his unquestioned rights.

One of the most striking utterances with respect to the temporary restraining order issued by Judge Adams was made by Edward M. Shepard recently in a speech delivered in Chicago. Mr. Shepard asked: "Is it anything less than calamitous that in the armory of law weapons should be found to restrain that kind of freedom, when thus far the armory of law has been ransacked in vain for weapons equal to the prevention of combinations expressly forbidden by statute?"

Men who have been ready to resort to the injunction in order to deprive laboring men of their plain rights would not only be indignant if they were made the victims of similar injunctions, but they have never been slow to give expression to their indignation when it has been suggested that the armory of law be ransacked for weapons in order to protect the people and in the effort to require powerful and influential men to abandon their impositions upon the weak and the helpless.

Addicks Ethics.

Senator Conner, one of the Addicks members of the Delaware legislature, in defending the voters' assistant law said:

"The voters' assistant system again comes in and commends itself for fairness. It insures delivery of the goods. When I buy a horse I want my horse. When a republican buys a vote he wants his vote. I contend that there is no politics in the matter, for when a republican or democrat wants to buy a vote he has an opportunity of thus securing it instead of being cheated out of it, as has been the case so many times in this state."

This is the most candid statement yet secured of the ethics of Addicksism and yet Mr. Addicks represents the republican organization in Delaware.

Then and Now.

Recently The Commoner congratulated the Des Moines Register and Leader, a republican paper, because it had summoned sufficient courage to print a quotation from Abraham Lincoln.

Commenting upon this compliment, the Register and Leader insists that no republican paper has reason in view of the party's policy to feel embarrassed by quotations from Lincoln's speeches and that the government that has been established in the Philippine islands is not in violation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The editor of this republican paper is, indeed, a genius if he can present intelligent argument in line with his contention. The principles of the Declaration of Independence should be well understood; but in this day when so many republican leaders are sneering at those principles and when a republican editor has the hardihood to insist that our Philippine policy is in line with those principles it will not be out of place to refer, in passing, to the great state paper which Moses Coit Tyler called "a passionate chant of human freedom."

That all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among these being life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, is the statement of the preamble; and it is further declared that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It is hardly necessary to dwell upon this point.