

must lie in breaking down sectionalism and appealing to the broad patriotism of the whole people.

For us to make the state control of senatorial elections a condition of permitting popular election of senators would be bad in law and worse in politics. As a practical means of protection to the whites of the south, in the event we should ever need such protection, it would scarcely be worth a continental.

We have had white supremacy since we emerged from reconstruction, and we intend to hold on to it. Our people are united on that. The only real difference is that some of us believe that in the long reach of events the best way to preserve our racial supremacy is to treat the negro honestly as an American citizen under the constitution, while some others appear to prefer a less commendable method of procedure.

Let us not act as if we were outside the union. We are back in our "fathers' house" to stay. Let us show that the south is an integral, living, energizing part of our common country, ready in a generous spirit of patriotism to think and act for the common good.

Why should we permit this sectional bugbear of imperiled white supremacy to defeat this almost triumphant movement in behalf of the great masses of the people?

It is more like stating a truism than venturing a prophecy, to say that the American people, either now or in the near future, are going to force popular elections of senators by the individual states. The only open question is, whether they are going to elect enough democrats to surrender federal control according to the house plan, or elect enough republicans to retain federal control, according to the senate plan. Who doubts which plan will succeed?

For a nation with our history behind it to knowingly at this stage increase state power at the expense of long established federal power would surely be a political anachronism. The controlling forces are pulling in the opposite direction.

"The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." So will it be with southern democracy when it undertakes to force the nation to surrender to the states a power given it by the fathers in 1787.

Apparently the wisest course for house democrats to pursue would be to recede from their position and vote for the resolution as it came from the senate. A great many of their constituents would endorse such a course.

**LA FOLLETTE ASSAILS TAFT**

Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, delivered a scathing speech in the senate July 13th and 14th, assailing President Taft. Referring on the first day to the Canadian reciprocity measure Senator La Follette said:

"Considered as a measure of reciprocity it violates every tariff principle of reciprocity heretofore expressed in the platform declarations of the republican party and recommended by former republican presidents. Considered as a tariff bill, it violates every tariff principle and platform promise upon which William H. Taft was elected president.

"In the beginning, it was heralded as a blessing to the consumers; so was the tariff bill of 1909. It promised to reduce duties for the benefit of the people. It reduces no duties, the effect of which can ever reach the people, but it does reduce duties for the millers, the packers, Standard Oil, the brewers, the coal combines and in some measure for the already grossly protected interests. It is nothing that it pretends to be and professes to be nothing that it is. It is a little brother

to the Payne-Aldrich bill, the greatest legislative wrong inflicted upon the American people in half a century."

The speaker said that the pending legislation on the Canadian act was so "related to the strange course of Mr. Taft upon the tariff question and the protective policies which he was elected to maintain," that the real, stable worth of his recommendations could not be fairly judged without reviewing the more important issues involved in his election and the most important acts of his administration.

Continuing his criticism of Mr. Taft's administration Senator La Follette said:

"Through the first pages of his general message, he found no space to say a word for the great measures that had made the name of his predecessor revered and loved everywhere in the United States. Is it to be wondered at that the republican voter in 1910 felt that he had several scores to settle? A president whom he had elected and whom he believed to be the custodian of the Roosevelt policies, dismissed the Roosevelt cabinet and appointed in their places men, in the main, of known hostility to these policies.

"In all the record of this administration, no more glaring example is presented of the complete surrender to special interests and the complete reversal of Roosevelt's progressive policies than that shown in dealings with the amendments to the interstate commerce act. It would have been difficult to have framed a piece of legislation affecting interstate commerce more harmful to the public interest than the bill drafted by the attorney general and recommended to congress by President Taft."

After reviewing the declaration of the republican platform of 1908 on conservation, Mr. La Follette went into the record of the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy and the general administration of the interior department down to the recent disposal of the Cunningham claims.

"The congressional investigation of the Alaskan coal scandal," he said, "confirmed the public opinion which had early reached the stage of conviction that Ballinger was using his official power to aid the Morgan-Guggenheim interests in wrongfully acquiring control of the Alaskan coal fields. The subsequent history of the Alaskan coal lands scandal simply confirms the bad faith and betrayal of public interest which the earlier testimony so clearly established.

"Heir to the Roosevelt policies as presidential candidate, Mr. Taft was a pronounced progressive and the leading and most enthusiastic Roosevelt champion from the first to the last of the campaign. Three months after he was inaugurated he seemed to have forgotten that there ever had been any well known Roosevelt policies. He had no sooner taken his oath of office than he sacrificed the progressive cause for the support of Aldrich and Cannon and their reactionary program.

"Reciprocity is a popular catch word. The president seized upon it. He made an executive compact the basis, not of a reciprocity treaty, but of a tariff bill. Upon this false basis he seeks to force it through congress without amendment or change. As a treaty it should have come to the senate for ratification. As a tariff bill, it should have been considered by the house and senate with due regard to every industry affected and subject to whatever amendment is required to make it just and fair legislation.

"In letter and in spirit this measure violates every principle and promise in the republican platform, express or implied, and every printed or spoken word and inducement em-

ployed to secure the votes necessary to elect William H. Taft. This bill and the Canadian pact are cruelly unjust to thirty-three million people engaged and dependent upon agriculture. Since the president's admission at Indianapolis, on July 4 that the bill promises nothing for the consumer, the real parties to profit are beginning to be a little more clearly distinguishable.

"Joined with the executive to force this bill through congress are the newspapers, frankly admitting their selfish interest, amounting to many millions of dollars; the railroads, the other protected manufacturers and practically every trust and combination backed by Morgan and Morgan influence."

**STAR OF BAILEY WANES**

The following dispatch was sent to the Denver Times by its Washington correspondent, John Callan O'Laughlin:

"Washington, July 13.—(Special.)—The star of Joseph Weldon Bailey, the intellectual leader of the senate democracy, is waning. No longer is Mr. Bailey permitted to speak unchallenged for his democratic colleagues. His assumption of the office of spokesman is being repudiated daily, his statements are criticised and even denied and his opinions are flouted.

The Texan has been placed in such a position by the verbal assaults of his colleagues that hereafter he will be regarded merely as one of the senators from the Lone Star state, and as expressing his own views rather than those of the combined democracy in the senate.

His support has dwindled to two senators—Simmons of North Carolina and Thornton of Louisiana. To these three men has been derisively applied the appellation of the Three Musketeers, with Bailey as Athos, Simmons as Aramis and Thornton as Porthos.

It has been apparent for some time that the fall of Mr. Bailey was impending. Equipped with a superb mentality, a gifted orator and able to handle himself effectively in debate, there were few senators, until the present congress, disposed to cross swords with him. His adroitness in emerging unscathed from an unfortunate position he had adopted, his quickness in turning verbal somersaults and his alternate use of irony and pathos, of sarcasm and appeal have been a source of admiration to the senate and the galleries and of confusion to those who interrupted him.

The Texan never has been troubled by the need of being consistent, and his course in the senate has been marked by astonishing about-faces, which in the case of a man of weaker mentality, would have precipitated his political ruin at once.

The first serious blow Mr. Bailey's assumption of leadership suffered was in connection with the Lorimer case last winter, when only ten democrats voted with him to retain the Illinois boss in the senate. The Texan was unable to hold even this following on March 4, when, at the instance of Senator Owen of Oklahoma, the senate voted on the proposition to approve the constitutions of Arizona and New Mexico. Only two democrats voted with Bailey, and the Texan became so piqued that he resigned his office as senator, but upon reflection withdrew his resignation a few hours later.

Senator Stone of Missouri has always been a thorn in the side of Bailey and never has hesitated to question the Texan's democracy. The new democratic senators, who assumed their seats at the beginning of the present extra session, have followed the tactics of Mr. Stone, with the result that Mr. Bailey is being subjected to some rough

handling in debate. He early announced his opposition to the Canadian reciprocity agreement, but has been able to obtain only two recruits—Simmons and Thornton.

The Texan has found himself assailed by Reed of Missouri, Hitchcock of Nebraska and others, and yesterday found his democracy attacked by John Sharp Williams of Mississippi. Mr. Williams has not the smooth oratorical flow of Bailey, but he is unquestionably one of the best rough and ready debaters in either branch of congress. While a member of the house he had ample opportunity for practice and as minority leader made a record which proved of value to the democracy.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Bailey differ on the tariff, and Mr. Williams, who is a deep student and a man of wide reading, is undoubtedly better informed on this question than is the Texan. Moreover, he is a good lawyer and has a lot of nerve.

The results of the bouts up to date have been favorable to the Mississippian and the anti-Bailey democrats, who having been looking for someone able to cope with the Texan, are wearing broad smiles of satisfaction. From now on it may be expected that daily sessions of the senate will be enlivened by frequent tilts between Mr. Williams and Mr. Bailey.

The men opposed to the latter make no secret of their purpose to expose his democracy and to make it clear to the country that he is not their representative and that if he claims to be he is making a false representation.

**MARTIN OF VIRGINIA IS NOW EXPLAINING**

(Continued from Page 12.)

by him at Woodstock in support of his charge that Senator Martin had been the distributor of the "yellow dog" funds of the railroads of Virginia, Representative William A. Jones said that he hardly saw a reason for the production of further evidence. The First district congressman was in Richmond on his way to Surry courthouse, where he was to make a speech.

He had not decided whether or not he would produce at Surry some additional letters which are in his possession, and which bear on the same subject. Probably, he said, he would not complete his speech until later.

"Since reading Senator Martin's reply," said Mr. Jones, "I hardly see the necessity for the publication of any more of these letters. I am satisfied with the effect they have produced. I may or may not read additional letters at Surry."

**Subscribers' Advertising Dept.**

This department is for the benefit of Commoner subscribers, and a special rate of six cents a word per insertion—the lowest rate—has been made for them. Address all communications to The Commoner, Lincoln, Nebraska.

**TO HELP HUMANITY**—A simple remedy for typhoid fever; I have not known it to fail even in epidemic; send \$1.00 bill or 93 cents postal money order; will save doctor bills and suffering; also, will send you free three valuable recipes; one a German sure cure for constipation. Address, Box No. 3, Palo Alto, Cal.

**FOR SALE**—Three splendid 80 acres, well located; all close to market; 240 acres, a model farm; buyers you will not look any further for a home. Address, Isenbarger & Fleming, North Manchester, Indiana.

**FOR SALE**—Large and small tracts timber and coal lands in Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and North Carolina; splendid investments. J. B. Thomas, Lock Box 214, Beckley, W. Va.

**TO EXCHANGE** for unimproved land, modern rooming-house, with furnishings complete. J. F. Whitehurst, Iola, Kansas.