

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
 RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor
 CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
 Editorial Rooms and Business Office 224-230 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
 Six Months......50
 In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75
 Three Months..... .25
 Single Copy..... .05
 Sample Copies Free.
 Foreign Post. 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

DISCONTINUANCES—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year.

PRESENTATION COPIES—Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '10, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1910. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application. Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

Wilson to attend the state fair at Dallas, was extended. It is expected Governor Wilson will be at Dallas Saturday, October 28. Prominent ministers of Dallas churches are trying to persuade the New Jersey executive to address them the following day.

Congressman Robert L. Henry of Texas, sent a telegram, in which he said: "Woodrow Wilson is the overwhelming choice of Democrats in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and New England. He is very strong in New York, Georgia, the west and northwest. Mr. Wilson stands for a people's government as against one dominated by special interests. He is democratic to the core and will make a great president. Congratulations on your early organization in his behalf."

The Houston (Texas) Chronicle printed the following editorial: Bailey's Houston organ, in a double-leaded editorial, sneers at and challenges the movement to organize Woodrow Wilson presidential clubs in Texas.

It broadly intimates the purpose of these clubs is hostile to Senator Bailey.

Can you beat it? Did you ever see such arrogance? Do these people think Bailey owns Texas, and that Texans have no right to speak with favor of any other man but Bailey?

Harris county democrats who think they are still free to act on their own political intelligence will assemble at the city hall Thursday night, notwithstanding the Post's editorial warning to stay away.

Woodrow Wilson is a gentleman, a scholar, a statesman, a splendid son of the south, and the successful democratic governor of an American state. He is a candidate for the democratic nomination to the presidency. He has not asked permission of Senator Bailey, nor of any other man, to be a candidate.

A good many Harris county democrats, seeing in him the making of a great president, and seeing in him also an excellent opportunity to seat a southern man in the white house, favor his candidacy.

Bailey's Texas organs knock the Wilson clubs because they favor Harmon, the man who bolted Bryan and helped elect McKinley, for the democratic nomination.

CAN'T BE ALL BAD

Houston (Texas) Chronicle: Bryan has not been able to win a presidential race, but every president in office since Bryan first ran has been praised by the people chiefly for policies borrowed from Bryan's platforms.

STATEHOOD IN THE SENATE

Special dispatch to the Kansas City Times: Washington, Aug. 8.—The New Mexico and Arizona statehood bill, with the provision that allows Arizona to recall its judges by popular vote, will be put up to the president. The senate passed the bill today with the recall safely entrenched in the Arizona constitution. And the vote in the senate was surprising, 53 to 18.

The president, who is opposed to the recall in relation to the judiciary, is expected to veto the bill, but it has a majority in the senate sufficient to pass the measure over the executive veto, it is believed. Under these circumstances it is possible the president will not use his prerogative.

The Nelson amendment, striking from the Arizona constitution the provision for the recall of judges, was voted down after senators individually had expressed themselves as opposed to this feature of the document.

By the terms of the resolution as adopted, the people of the territory will have to vote separately on ratifying that provision, and the people of New Mexico will have to vote again on the extremely difficult provision made for amending their proposed constitutions. But no matter how they decide, the territories will be admitted.

After the bitter assaults made on the recall feature of the Arizona constitution the overwhelming vote for the unamended measure came as a surprise. Nine regular republicans joined eleven insurgents and thirty-three democrats to make up the fifty-three for the measure, while only fifteen regulars could be mustered against it. These, with one insurgent, Kenyon, of Iowa, and two democrats—O'Gorman of New York and Bailey of Texas—made up the strength opposed to the measure.

Two democrats, Senator Bradley of Kentucky, and Senator O'Gorman of New York, voted for the Nelson amendment. The same two members with Senator Bailey, voted against the final passage of the measure, as did two progressive republicans, Senator Bristow of Kansas and Senator Kenyon of Iowa. The others who voted against the admission of the territories were Brandegee of Connecticut, Burnham of New Hampshire, Crane of Massachusetts, Curtis of Kansas, Dillingham of Vermont, Heyburn of Idaho, Lippitt and Wetmore of Rhode Island, Nelson of Minnesota, Oliver and Penrose of Pennsylvania, Root of New York and Smoot of Utah.

That provision, although the debate of the last two days had made it plain that it was distasteful to nearly every senator, was retained in the Arizona constitution by a vote of 43 to 26 on the ground of the right of the people of the territory to decide for themselves. Two insurgents, one democrat and twenty-three regulars voted for the amendment eliminating the feature and ten insurgents, one regular and thirty-two democrats voted against it.

VICTORY OF THE "COMMONS"

In England, the government long ago took over the telegraph lines.

In England, the government makes railroad rates. The railroads have nothing to say about them.

In England, the government has just taken over the telephone lines.

In England, the government has monopoly on the express business through its parcels post.

These economics are now accepted, orthodox doctrines.

In the United States private interests own the telegraph, telephone, railway and express lines—and make their own rates.

For the government to own these utilities would be "socialistic."

In the United States the land is owned by millions of small holders—AND IT IS TAXED.

This is accepted, orthodox doctrine.

In England, 2,000 people own one-half of the land. In the British isles, 5,000 people own over half the land.

Over there, land was never taxed until Lloyd-George passed his budget a year and a half ago. Now it is taxed but lightly.

In England, a land tax is held up to the public as "socialistic."

Thus the tory, who derives profit from special legislation, rears his flag in all countries. "Socialism" is used to scare the timid, whether to ward off land taxes or any other reform in the public interest.

Fundamentally, the struggle in England is identical with the struggle in the United States. It is the conflict between the people and privilege. Today, the people of England have given privilege a smashing blow. What is known as the "veto" bill has been accepted by the house

of lords, who have been driven to a corner by popular sentiment, twice expressed at the polls, and by the threat of the king to create enough new peers to overcome the tory majority if the bill isn't passed.

The effect will be to make the house of commons practically the sole legislative body of England. The lords will retain their titles and dignity, but not much else.

And the commons is what we Americans call "progressive." The victory means the ultimate freedom of the masses from the land-owning, liquor-controlling, privileged reactionaries. Things will happen rapidly in old England from now on.—Omaha Daily News.

WHICH IS THE DANGEROUS ONE

The president is reported to have let it be known that he will veto the statehood bill because it permits the people of Arizona to determine by special vote whether they will adopt the provision for the recall of the judiciary. "Mr. Taft," the dispatch continues, "has no objection to the New Mexico constitution."

Now the New Mexico constitution would impress the average man as a curious sort of document. It doesn't intend that any of the new fangled notions shall ever get a hold in New Mexico—not if it can help it. For instance, under the proposed constitution the state of New Mexico can never provide an educational qualification for the ballot or for jury service unless the constitutional amendment making such a provision is approved by a three-fourths vote of the whole state and a two-thirds vote in every county in the state—which means never.

Ordinarily amendments require a two-thirds vote of the members of each house of the legislature, and a majority not only of voters but of counties. This provision can not be changed by an amendment, but only by a constitutional convention.

It is provided further that if the constitution should some day unhappily be amended to permit the use of the initiative, the people may enact only such laws as the legislature has power to enact.

In the bill admitting the two territories to statehood congress provided that the people of New Mexico have the chance to vote at the outset on an amendment simplifying the amending process. A similar vote is provided for Arizona on the recall of the judiciary. Yet it is the Arizona constitution that the president objects to.

A curious viewpoint.

The New Mexico constitution might sew the state up as a corporation borough for years. The Arizona constitution merely proposes to adopt a provision which the Oregon constitution has had for ten years but which has never been used.

In which state is the public welfare really threatened?—Kansas City Times.

OLDFIELD SEEKS TO CURE DEFECT

The Washington correspondent for the Little Rock Gazette, sends to his paper the following:

"Representative Oldfield of Arkansas introduced a bill which seeks to cure the defect in the Sherman anti-trust law caused by the supreme court's recent decision in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco company anti-trust cases.

"Mr. Oldfield is firm in the conviction that the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan is the sound view of this matter. It is a well-known fact that because of the supposed minor changes, Wall street is highly elated over the opinion of the supreme court, notwithstanding the fact that the court held that the Standard Oil company and the American Tobacco company should be dissolved. The fact that the court inserted in the opinion the word "unreasonable" pleased the Standard Oil and tobacco companies, and within a few hours after the decision had been rendered, the stock and bonds of each of these companies jumped up several points.

"It is also a well-known fact that when the Sherman anti-trust law was written the great corporate wealth of this country tried to have congress put the word 'unreasonable' in the statute—the very word which, twenty years afterward the court read into the statute.

The bill provides that every contract in restraint of trade or commerce shall be adjudged by the court to be unreasonable and that every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any combination in restraint of trade or commerce shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for a period of not less than one nor more than ten years.

"Mr. Oldfield states that it is difficult enough