

braska. In the latest issue of the Trade Review Mr. Bushnell speaks of Senator Burkett in these words:

"Why should business men of Nebraska, who have constantly to advance trust-made goods which they sell, make more and more burdensome their business by sending men to Washington to vote with Aldrich and Crane and the Louisiana senators, instead of voting with men of the west and for home interests? Why should Nebraska, the business men of Nebraska, keep in the senate of the United States a senator to vote for that which Rhode Island wants rather than for the things of vital interest to this state?"

"Why should a senator from Nebraska vote to make barbed wire higher to the consumers of this state, to make cotton and woolen goods higher, to make rubber goods higher, vote against free lumber, vote with the harvester trust and with the sugar trust, and then expect business men to vote to return him to misrepresent them into an indefinite future?"

Here is another pestiferous progressive republican who gets his facts from the Congressional Record rather than from Senator Burkett.

His seditious utterances right at this time give fresh point to the moral that a senator who is standpat in Washington and insurgent out on the hustings has a hard row to hoe.—Omaha World-Herald.

#### SENATOR DOLLIVER'S DEATH

The death of Senator Jonathan P. Dolliver is a real loss to the country. He was stricken down in the very zenith of his power, and his place will not be easily filled. His long experience in public life and his large acquaintance, together with his great ability, gave him a commanding position in the senate and in the political world, while the zeal with which he attacked and exposed the predatory interests made him a tower of strength to the progressive element of the country.

The cause of tariff reform seemed to arouse his energies to their maximum—he was at his best when he was inveighing against the monstrosities of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and his fame, like the fame of Senator Hoar, reached its highest point in opposing rather than in defending the policy of his party.

Democrats who formerly feared Senator Dolliver as the most brilliant and resourceful of the republican orators, have been drawn toward him during the past year as they saw him measuring swords with the leaders of privilege and favoritism. The deep and universal sorrow expressed at his sudden taking off is evidence that devotion to the public welfare is really appreciated by the people.

#### THE SUPREME QUESTION

There is one issue—and only one—which manifests itself everywhere and at all times; it is the conflict between the organized few who clamor for privileges and favors, and the unorganized many who ask nothing but the right to enjoy the proceeds of their own toil under laws which guarantee equal and exact justice. This is the never ending struggle which is going on in all lands in the United States as well as in other countries.

It is of vital importance that every senator and congressman shall be on the side of the people; that every one who represents the people at Washington shall say what the people want said and do what the people want done. See that the men you support for congress and the senate are on your side. See that their hearts are right, for out of the heart are the issues of life. A man's head may lead him astray on some questions but his heart is wrong if he takes the side of those who want to use the government as a private asset in business.

#### POLITE

An average of 89 per cent duty on woolen goods makes such goods cost nearly twice as much as they ought to. If, instead of substituting shoddy or cotton for wool, the men wear only one woolen sock out of courtesy to a high tariff law they would soon know what it costs to be polite to the protective principles.

Our government can not be accused of undue haste in recognizing the republic of Portugal. If Portugal had been as far south as Panama or as far west as Hawaii the president might have acted more quickly.

## The Nebraska Situation

In speaking at Lincoln, Neb., on Monday night, October 31, Mr. Bryan discussed national issues, following the line of his Indianapolis speech. He concluded with a statement of his position on the local situation as follows:

After what I have said in regard to the importance of national issues I need hardly add that I regard them as paramount when we are considering the claims of those who are candidates for national offices. Our democratic candidates for congress and the United States senate in this state all stand for democratic principles and policies as those principles and policies are set forth in the democratic national platform of 1908, and I believe that they are entitled to the votes of democrats whatever their position may be on local questions and on minor national questions.

I have on former occasions stated my position on county option and the eight o'clock closing law, and it is not necessary to reiterate what I have said on these subjects. Neither is it necessary to discuss the initiative and referendum since all parties have endorsed it in this state, and I take it for granted that candidates for the legislature are all committed to it. Our United States senator must be elected by the legislature, and therefore we must elect him when we elect the legislature, but fortunately our state has adopted the Oregon plan, which enables us to separate local issues from national ones if the legislators are willing to do so. In any district in which the republican candidate refuses to sign Statement No. 1, agreeing to support the senatorial candidate receiving the highest number of votes at the election, in such district the democratic candidate should, in my judgment, be elected, no matter what his position may be on state issues. Where both candidates sign Statement No. 1 national questions are eliminated and voters can be governed by their views on local issues. In such districts I would advise democrats to vote against democratic candidates committed to the program of the liquor interests, provided the opposing republicans are committed against the liquor program.

The state officers, except the governor, have nothing to do with legislation and but little to do with shaping the policy of the party on public questions, and I shall support the democratic candidates.

The governor, however, stands in a different position, and I owe it to the democrats of the state to define my own attitude and to set forth the reasons for withholding my support from Mr. Dahlman. It might be sufficient to say that he was not the choice of a majority of the democrats who voted at the primary. He received considerably less than half of the democratic vote polled and owes his nomination to the support of wet republicans who entered our primary and converted a democratic minority into a combination majority. Even then his majority was only about two hundred, and while this majority, secured in the open primary through the aid of republicans, gives him a legal right to the nomination, it does not give him a moral right to the democratic vote of the state. He received 27,591—including the votes of the wet republicans—a little more than one-fifth of the democratic vote cast two years ago. On the strength of this kind of an endorsement he proceeds to announce that he will veto, if passed, the proposition which the last democratic state convention—and he was a member of it—refused, by a vote of 638 to 202, to condemn. And not content with that, he announces that he will sign, if passed, a bill repealing the daylight saloon law, a law endorsed by the last democratic state convention by a vote of 710 to 163.

Surely no democrat should be asked to vote for Mr. Dahlman on the ground of regularity. He does not expect it, for he presents the issue which he embodies as a non-partisan issue and justifies his determination to veto a county option bill on the ground that his election will mean that a majority of the people want him to veto it. Since the issue is presented upon its own merits and not as a party issue, each voter is at liberty to cast his vote regardless of the party affiliations of the candidate. In the exercise of that right I withhold my support from Mr. Dahlman. National issues are not involved, and the subordination of all other local issues to the liquor question makes it impossible for a democrat to vote for him without endorsing the position which he has taken in regard to the liquor legislation.

I am not willing to turn the democratic party

over to the breweries and make it the open and avowed champion of the liquor interests—our party has a higher mission than that. It is not necessary to consider Mr. Dahlman's good qualities, and he has many of them, but no man is good enough to be intrusted with executive power when that power is conferred by those who constitute the controlling influence back of his campaign. As democrats we are opposed to allowing the tariff barons to make the tariff laws; we are opposed to allowing the trusts to make and enforce laws against private monopoly, and we can not endorse the doctrine that the liquor trust—the basest of all trusts—should control the making and enforcing of liquor laws.

The liquor business is on the defensive; its representatives are for the most part lawless themselves and in league with lawlessness. They are in partnership with the gambling hall and the brothel. They are the most corrupt and corrupting influence in politics, and I shall not, by voice or vote, aid them in establishing a reign of terror in this state. Even before the election they are impudently attempting to question the democracy of every member of the party who refuses to allow them to censor his speeches. They will, if successful in this campaign, insist on controlling the party.

We must meet the conditions that now confront us, and each one must act as he thinks best. I shall neither speak for Mr. Dahlman nor vote for him. I hope to see him defeated by a majority so overwhelming as to warn the brewers, distillers and liquor dealers to retire from Nebraska politics and allow the people to act upon the liquor question as they do upon other questions.

But whether Mr. Dahlman is elected or defeated I shall continue my protest against the domination of our party by the liquor interests. I shall contribute whatever assistance I can to the effort which will be made to put an end to the spree upon which our party seems to have embarked. I am not willing that the party shall die of delirium tremens. An appeal will be made from Philip drunk to Philip sober, and I am confident that the appeal will be successful, that the party will rise again to the high plane upon which it has conducted its campaigns in this state for nearly two decades and appeal once more to the conscience and moral sense of the people.

#### GLOSSARY OF CURRENT POLITICAL TERMS

**Initiative**—A method of popular lawmaking by which a certain proportion of the community initiates legislation without the intervention of the legislature.

**Referendum**—The submission of a public measure or law, passed by a legislative body, to a vote of the people for ratification or rejection.

**Payne-Aldrich Tariff**—The rates of duties on imports into the United States under the customs tariff act of August 5, 1909.

**Cannonism**—The term applied to the almost absolute control of the house of representatives through the speaker and the committee on rules.

**Standpatter**—One opposed to any modification or revision of the tariff.

**Insurgent**—A republican favoring a more thorough revision of the tariff, and hostile to various policies of the Taft administration and the republican organization.

**Friar Lands**—The estates in the Philippines formerly held by religious orders, amounting to about 400,000 acres, which were bought for \$7,000,000 by the government.

**Direct Nominations**—The system by which members of a party directly select its candidates instead of electing delegates to a convention to choose the party candidates.

**New Nationalism**—The body of doctrines laid down by Mr. Roosevelt in his speech at Osawatimie, Kan., August 30 last.

**"My Policies"**—The term applied by Mr. Roosevelt to the various measures which he favors.

**Inheritance Tax**—A tax levied on estates passing to heirs of former holder.

**Plank**—That part of a party's platform or declaration of principles that relates to a particular subject like the tariff, the trusts, publicity of campaign expenses, etc.

**"The Big Stick"**—Mr. Roosevelt's expression. The threat of force or violence or coercion.

**The Old Guard**—The term applied to such republican bosses in New York as opposed Mr. Roosevelt at the Saratoga convention.

**The Machine**—A combination of political bosses and their creatures who assume the power to control their party's action.—New York World.