

SENATOR BAILEY'S RETIREMENT

Senator Bailey's announcement that he will not be a candidate for re-election is the sensation of the hour. No reason has been given to the public and therefore, there is much conjecture as to the cause. He says he will continue to reside in Texas. The public will wait for an authoritative declaration from him before passing upon the sufficiency of his reasons. Until better informed the public can reasonably look to his resignation (afterward recalled) at the close of the last congress for an explanation. He gave as his reason then his unwillingness to serve with democratic senators with whom he could not agree upon fundamental questions. The differences between him and the other senators have been accentuated by an increase in the number of progressive democrats in the senate. He has taken the wise course, although those who differ from him recognize his great ability. His convictions are deep and he would have found increasing friction in his association with the growing senatorial group of earnest and aggressive exponents of popular government. The confidence of the people in themselves is increasing; they are demanding and securing a firmer hold on their government. This trend is apparent throughout the world and it is permanent. Many conscientious men of great ability honestly fear that evil will come from a nearer approach to a pure democracy, but these fears have been expressed every time a step in advance has been taken—they have proven groundless before—they will be again. Men may come and men may go but democracy goes on forever. Its principles are becoming more widely understood each year here and throughout the world.

A GOOD EXAMPLE

The St. Louis Republic printed in its issue of February 2, a line across the first page of its paper as follows: "No whisky advertising will be printed in this paper after March 2, 1911."

A Commoner reader who sent a slipping from the Republic to this effect, says: "Find enclosed clipping, to the effect that no more whisky advertisements will appear in the Republic. Please comment on same as result of good example set by The Commoner. May God grant that the good work may go on until no whisky advertising will be accepted by the press."

ROOSEVELT ON THE TREATY

Ex-President Roosevelt, in a lengthy article in the Outlook, attacks one clause of the treaty. He is opposed to allowing a tribunal to decide what questions shall be submitted to arbitration. There is some force in the objections he raises but he exaggerates the dangers. The question is not important, however, if the clause providing for investigation of ALL QUESTIONS is broad enough. If all questions are investigated the chances of war are very remote. All questions ought to be investigated by an impartial tribunal and then an agreement can be reached without a resort to arbitration.

IN OLLIE JAMES' HONOR

Special dispatch to the Kansas City Times: Washington, Sept. 5.—Representative Ollie James of Kentucky is one of the largest members, physically, of congress. He stands six feet high and weighs almost as much as President Taft. His tremendously large head, with practically no hair on it, is a famous sight.

One of James' most intimate friends is Representative Thomas Heflin of Alabama, another six-footer of large frame, who boasts of one of the heaviest crops of hair of any member of congress. A few days ago Heflin approached James and told him that he had just learned that a postoffice in Arkansas had been named after the Kentucky member.

"Is that so?" James replied. "Well, well, I am certainly getting famous. Not long ago a friend of mine named a race horse after me, calling it 'Congressman James.' By the way, Heflin, what did they call this town in Arkansas?"

"Bald Knob," Heflin replied.

BRYANISM, BUT NOT BRYAN

It is interesting to observe that the very nation which rejected Bryan as a candidate for the presidency is coming to regard the ideas for which he stood as desirable. Save for his fatuous advocacy of free silver Mr. Bryan has stood for few propositions which are not coming into popular favor.—Winnipeg Tribune.

THE LESSON OF 1910

Where there are two great political parties the voter has but one alternative. If he finds himself betrayed by the party which represents the principles in which he believes, he can only resent the abuse of his confidence and register his protest by voting against the public official—the agent of his party—who has violated his trust.

The voters in 1908 voted against standpatism. They did more; by their votes they directed the representatives to revise the duties high enough to measure the difference in production cost.

Wherever republican voters had the opportunity at the polls in 1910 to vote directly for the re-election of progressive republican candidates, who had been faithful public servants, they returned them by greatly increased majorities. Wherever standpatism was strong enough to renominate standpat representatives who had violated the republican campaign promises of 1908, there was nothing left for the independent republican voter but to rebuke the betrayal by voting for the democrat instead.

It was not a democratic victory. It was a republican protest.—La Follette's Magazine.

THE PRESIDENT'S DEFENSE

"My fellow republicans of the old Bay State," the president said in effect in his speech at Hamilton, Mass., recently, "I come to denounce to you the perfidy of the democrats and the progressive republicans, and to point out that only the standpat republicans can be trusted with the government.

"The reciprocity bill—which I must admit was framed with only partial information from the tariff board—was a statesmanlike measure. But everything else passed by congress was worthless, or worse than worthless; it was playing politics. And you must bear in mind that playing politics is a crime—when done by democrats.

"Take the wool bill, for instance. The wool bill was thoroughly vicious. Why, it was framed in the same way that the Payne-Aldrich bill was made. The only difference between the two bills is that those who voted for the Payne-Aldrich bill were actuated by lofty and patriotic motives, while those who voted for the wool bill were playing politics, because they revised downward.

"That they were playing politics is evidenced by this fact: When I convoked the special session I wanted only the reciprocity bill passed. But those treacherous democrats actually had the audacity to take advantage of the situation and introduce bills revising the tariff downward. What business had they to do that?"

"The men who supported these wretched bills professed to be actuated by a desire to give a measure of relief to the country. Hypocrites! I can hardly find words to express my reprobation of their conduct. And I believe the New England manufacturers, who were so well taken care of by the Payne-Aldrich law, will heartily agree with me.

"It remains for me to point out that the revision measures were compromises between avowed free-traders and avowed protectionists; measures conceived in an unnatural alliance; measures the product of log rolling for the purpose of obtaining their passage. Horrible!

"Of course there will be ill natured persons who will insist that with a democratic house and a republican senate only compromise measures of that sort could possibly pass. We will not discuss that side of the question. I am going to urge revision based on the tariff commission's report at the next session. New England manufacturers need not be afraid, however. It must be scientific revision. And heaven knows whether such revision can get through a divided congress. But the manufacturers may be assured that I will permit no other kind to become law. Better stick to the Payne-Aldrich act than accept relief from democrats and progressive republicans.

"Have I not made it clear that this administration is New England's friend? Look what you New Englanders got in reciprocity. Also look what I saved you from getting when I vetoed the wool bill, the cotton bill and the farmers' free list bill—that loosely drawn free

list bill, with its free lumber and free shoes, framed with odious sectionalism to favor the western farmer.

"Does not New England see that it needs my administration, supported by such stalwart republican tariff revisionists as Senator Penrose, Senator Lodge and Senator Crane, to take care that its interests are safeguarded?" (Loud applause from the assembled woolen and cotton manufacturers, with cries of, "The Aldrich law is good enough for us;" "Good for you, Mr. President, don't let those western revisionists bluff you;" "Don't worry, if you can't get scientific revision through congress, we're doing pretty well as it is," and such.)—Kansas City Times (rep.)

THE PRESIDENT CHALLENGES MR. BRYAN

The following is an Associated Press dispatch: Detroit, Mich., Sept. 18.—President Taft today plunged into the political phase of his long trip through the west and delivered one of the set speeches which may have a determining effect upon his future. Mr. Taft chose the "trusts" for his first speech and outlined at length his position regarding this issue. In a second speech he answered the charge that he has used patronage to further his own ends and challenged the man who had made the charge to come forward and join him in an extension of civil service practically to all the appointive offices, under the government. Mr. Taft's free use of the words "I challenge" gave a campaign ring to his utterances which seemed to delight his hearers.

The president announced his unqualified opposition to any amendment of the Sherman anti-trust law designed to overthrow "the rule of reason" laid down by the United States supreme court in the Standard Oil and tobacco trust cases and challenged William J. Bryan and all other critics of the court to cite a restraint of trade which they would condemn and which would not be condemned under Justice White's definition of the law.

Mr. Taft said the department of justice at Washington is conducting an investigation of all corporations suspected of operating in defiance of the anti-trust law, and added that the law as interpreted by the supreme court would be found sufficient to cause the breaking up of any illegal combinations. The president entered into his defense of the supreme court with more than usual vigor, and his speech, although read from manuscript and devoid of oratorical effort, was frequently interrupted with applause.

The "trust" speech came near the close of nine busy hours spent by the president in and about Detroit. Wherever he went today, in Detroit proper, at Pontiac and at the state fair grounds, Mr. Taft was compelled to make his way through dense crowds. His welcome into Michigan which is regarded as wavering on the brink of insurgency, seemed to please the president immensely, and he was in a happy mood when he left at 4:30 p. m. for Saginaw, where a half hour stop was made and for Bay City, where he spent the remainder of the evening and dedicated the new armory.

"THE SECRET CAUCUS MUST GO"

P. O., Wentworth Location, N. H., Sept. 9, 1911.—Editor The Commoner: I have lately made use of Mr. Bryan's suggestion of inquiring as to the stand our congressmen take on the questions now before the public and herewith enclose the reply received from the congressman representing the district in which I live, which you have my permission to publish in The Commoner if you wish. I do not think Mr. McGillicuddy would have any objections, as the reply is straightforward and right to the point. You can return me the letter by mail, postage for which I enclose. Yours very truly,

H. W. FICKETT.

Lewiston, Me., Aug. 30, 1911.—H. W. Fickett, Esq., Wentworth Location, N. H. My Dear Sir: Replying to your inquiry as to my opinion of secret caucus, etc., will say that I have no use for a secret caucus. I favor open caucuses and shall vote for it when it is brought up in the next session of congress. I know of no reason why such things should not be open to the world and am fully convinced that such publicity will result in good to all.

As to the other questions to which you refer, to-wit, the tariff, I am for a revision of the tariff downward, in accordance with the platform of our party in 1908. I favor the initiative, referendum and recall, also the income tax and have voted for them all whenever they have come up. Very truly yours,

D. J. MCGILLICUDDY.