

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

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor
Editorial Rooms and Business Office 224-250 South 12th Street

One Year \$1.00 Three Months .25
Six Months .50 Single Copy .05
In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75 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...

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...

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.

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.

The democrats ought to see now what it has cost them to put a tariff on wool.

Senator Reed, of Missouri, is winning his spurs. His amendments to the publicity bill are all right—they ought to be accepted by the house.

President Taft says that the majority is not always right and yet he draws his salary as if he felt quite certain that the majority was right in 1908.

If all the bills are to show as much concession to protection as the wool bill does it is easy to understand why Mr. Underwood prefers to delay their introduction.

No, the majority is not always right—believers in popular government admit that; but the opponents of the recall seem to believe that the majority is always wrong.

Well, Brother Watterson has been turned down by the "drys." Will he rejoice over it as much as he did over the turning down of Mr. Bryan by the "wets" last year?

The president had a splendid opportunity to repeat in his veto message the arguments he made four years ago against the initiative and referendum in Oklahoma's constitution—BUT HE DID NOT.

Do the independent steel companies undersell the trust, or do they allow the steel trust to fix prices? If the independent companies take advantage of the trust scale of prices are they not as much interested in the tariff as the steel trust?

The people in the gallery do not pay as much as the people in the parquet, but they pay something and that which they do pay swells the receipts. Why should they be ignored? They are in the same class with the small tax payer—they can not get the attention of the parquet statesmen.

Mr. Underwood quoted a telegram sent to Mr. James congratulating him (Mr. Underwood) on an interview he gave out when the steel trust closed down one of its factories, but he did not explain why he failed to use the incident to secure the passage of a measure making it unlawful for corporations to close down for the purpose of coercing congress.

"ASK THE CANDIDATE"

Commoner readers everywhere are advised to submit to the various presidential candidates questions something like the following:

1 Question—Do you favor tariff for revenue only?

1 Answer .....

2 Q—Do you favor free raw material and the placing of a revenue duty only on manufactured goods?

2 A .....

3 Q—Do you believe that in the revision of the tariff the element of protection should be given consideration?

3 A .....

4 Q—Do you believe that the three branches of government are co-ordinate and that each one should keep within its constitutional sphere?

4 A .....

5 Q—Do you approve the recent Standard Oil decision wherein the United States supreme court legislated the word "unreasonable" into the Sherman anti-trust act?

5 A .....

6 Q—Do you favor the repeal of the criminal clause of the anti-trust law or do you believe that in view of supreme court legislation congress should make it clear that all restraint of trade is unreasonable?

6 A .....

7 Q—Do you favor the election of senators by the people?

7 A .....

8 Q—Do you favor the income tax?

8 A .....

9 Q—Do you believe that it is the duty of the American people to promise independence to the Filipinos immediately and to give it in the same way in which they gave independence to the Cubans?

9 A .....

10 Q—Do you believe in the publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures both before and after election day in order that the people may know in advance the

character of support each party and candidate receives?

10 A .....

11 Q—Are you willing that the source of every dollar of contribution made to your campaign fund either after your nomination or during the contest for the nomination shall be made public prior to election day?

11 A .....

12 Q—Do you believe in the support of the state governments in all their rights?

12 A .....

13 Q—Do you indorse the labor planks of the 1908 platform?

13 A .....

14 Q—Do you believe in the strict regulation of railroads?

14 A .....

15 Q—Do you indorse the democratic platform of 1908 respecting trusts wherein it declares that "a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable" and presents a remedy?

15 A .....

16 Q—Do you approve the plan known as the Aldrich currency scheme?

16 A .....

17 Q—Do you favor asset currency in any form?

17 A .....

18 Q—Do you believe in the establishment of what is known as a central bank?

18 A .....

19 Q—Do you favor legislation compelling banks to insure depositors?

19 A .....

Let democrats everywhere ask questions and secure answers, thus finding out just what every candidate stands for. In this way democrats may be able to determine with some degree of intelligence as to the available candidate.

The Commoner will be glad to print the replies made to these questions by gentlemen whose names have been mentioned in connection with the democratic presidential nomination.

GOOD, BUT NOT ENOUGH

Senator Pomerene is insisting that the officials of the Standard Oil and tobacco companies should be prosecuted criminally. That is all right, they should be, but that is not enough. It will take years to settle that question and it is probable that the court will hold that, as the law has not yet defined "unreasonable" restraint, the defendants could not entertain a criminal intent to violate the law.

MISSOURI AND FOLK

William Marion Reedy, editor of the St. Louis Mirror, has this to say of the Folk-for-president movement:

"A Folk-for-president organization has been formed in Missouri. There is not much it can do but this: send to the editors of the non-machine politicians of the democracy of the nation a simple statement of what Mr. Folk has done as circuit attorney of St. Louis and governor of Missouri. There is a record against which nothing to be urged by Harmon or Wilson

or any other possibility can prevail. It is democratic—every entry upon the docket. It is progressively democratic. It is in absolute accord with popular government and ringingly anti-monopolistic. It is a record that will give all the gangsters the colly-wobbles. And when "they" say the record is all right but Folk is not an expedient candidate, there's this answer: Missouri is a doubtful state. Folk was the last democrat to carry it for governor and he did it when Roosevelt carried it for president.

ARISTOCRACY CRUMBLING

The house of lords has bowed to the inevitable: it has passed the bill shearing itself of its power. Henceforth it can delay a measure for two years but it can not longer obstruct the will of the people. It is a great victory for democracy—a victory which is likely to have far-reaching consequences. Other European countries have their hereditary bodies and the degradation of the British house of lords is sure to arouse public sentiment in favor of curtailing their powers. Aristocracy is crumbling—democracy grows.