ment, give to the nation all the advantages which can be derived from federal ownership and operation of all the roads, and, at the same time, avoid the dangers involved in such federal ownership, viz.: A dual plan under which the federal government will own and operate a system of trunk lines running into every state (and except in the case of border states through the states), with the states owning the local lines.

The ownership and operation of all lines by the federal government would not only enormously increase the number of employees directed from Washington, but would go far toward obliterating state lines.

Our nation has been described as "an indissoluble union of indestructible states," and no better description has been given. If the state is to remain "indestructible" its activities should be increased rather than diminished. The ownership of intrastate lines by the states would greatly strengthen the positions of the states without in the least lessening the advantages of government ownership and operation of the railroads.

Each state, having access to a federal trunk line connecting it with every other state, would be able to collect all merchandise intended for other markets and to forward it on a trunk line for distribution in other states or in foreign countries, and it would also be able to take from the trunk lines merchandise from without the state and distribute it to any point within its borders.

This independence would put it in position to deal advantageously with neighbor states and such states would find it to their mutual advantage to arrange for shipment over local lines meeting at state boundaries. In Europe independent nations are able to join in traffic arrangements in spite of differences in government and even in language; how much easier it ought to be for our states to act in harmony.

The dual plan has three advantages over the plan involving the federal ownership of all lines. First, the federal investment would be very much less. It would cost a very large sum to purchase, even at a just price, all the railroads of the United States. The dual plan would limit the investment to the amount necessary to buy or build a system of trunk lines.

Second, the dual plan would accommodate itself to public sentiment in the various states. In some sections of the country the sentiment in favor of government ownership is much stronger than in other sections. The dual plan would permit the government ownership of local lines in states desiring it, while states not ready for government ownership could leave the local lines in the hands of private corporations as they now are. Privately owned local lines being able to connect with a federal trunk line would have an outlet for freight and passenger traffic and be set free from the coercion which has been a considerable factor in the consolidation of railroad systems.

Third, the ownership and operation of local lines by the several states would give an opportunity for greater initiative and for a comparison of ideas which would be helpful in perfecting railroad operation.

If it is contended that federal ownership of all lines is necessary in time of war, a sufficient answer is found in the right of congress to reserve to the President in time of war the same authority over state systems that he now has over railroad corporations.

If it is difficult to adopt the dual plan, which adjusts itself to the different degrees of public-ownership-sentiment in the several states and distributes the burden over all the states and the effort over several years, it will be found still more difficult to resist the great financial interests to compel a return to private ownership of railroads supported, as they will be, by the metropolitan press and able to appall the public with the indebtedness which national ownership of the entire railroad system would involve. While national ownership of all lines would be preferable to a return to private ownership with its interminable contest between the railroads and the people, it would be still better to have a system that would give effective federal control of interstate commerce at little expense and without establishing at Washington a gigantic bureau for the control of an industry which employs nearly one-tenth of the adult males in the United States. W. J. BRYAN.

Great Britain has not been stampeded into universal military training, why should we be?

The Last Refuge

The contest between the advocates of prohibition and the supporters of the liquor traffic is an old one — so old that all the bypaths of the latter are well known. They have now been driven to their last refuge — pretended love for local self government. They will oppose EFFECTIVE state legislation on the ground that the local authorities in each community should be trusted to enforce the state law. Such hypocrisy will deceive no one. It is a wornout fraud. Wet cities which voted against state prohibition and were made dry by votes outside their borders will elect wet officials to enforce prohibition laws and the enforcement will be a farce. If a state has the power to pass a law covering the whole state it ought to have the machinery to enforce it throughout the whole state — otherwise it invites anarchy.

In some states the democratic party "died in the ditch" with the saloon. Those in power should recognize the mandate of the people and obey it. Prohibition laws, like other laws, MUST BE ENFORCED. W. J. BRYAN.

STRENGTHENING THE STATE

Those who are interested, as all should be, in making the state an "indestructible" unit in our "indissoluble" union, should not overlook the fact that the dual plan which contemplates a federal trunk-line system with state ownership of the local network of railroads is the only plan proposed in a hundred years which looks toward strengthening the state and increasing its relative importance. All other plans have tended toward centralization.

"PERSONAL LIBERTY"

The Brewers association (according to recent disclosures) carried "personal liberty" to the point of boycotting a manufacturer because he became president of a Sunday school association. It blacklisted a hotel for refusing to violate the Sunday closing law and a railroad for trying to keep its employers sober. This is the brewer's idea of "personal liberty."

REMEMBER THE WEST

Progressive republicans should remember that the people of the far west and central west have confidence in their states. They will not favor the surrender of state control of intrastate traffic.

Senator Underwood was very much afraid that prohibition of the liquor traffic by national amendment would interfere with the rights of the states; where does he stand on the question of surrendering all the state's power to regulate railroad traffic within the state? Why is he not alarmed at this REAL menace to the state?

OFF THE RUN

(Copyright, 1918, by Chicago Herald-Examiner.)

A HIGH NOTE

Lloyd George, the great British premier, struck a high note when, on November 12, the day after the signing of the armistice, he said:

"What are the principles on which that settlement is to be effected? Are we to lapse back into the old national rivalries, animosities, and competitive armaments, or are we to initiate the reign on earth of the Prince of Peace. It is the duty of Liberalism to use its influence to insure that it shall be a reign of peace.

"What are conditions of peace? They must lead to a settlement which will be fundamentally just. No settlement that contravenes the principles of eternal justice will be a permanent one. The peace of 1871 imposed by Germany on France outraged all the principles of justice and fair play. Let us be warned by that example.

"We must not allow any sense of revenge, any spirit of greed, any grasping desire to override the fundamental principles of righteousness. Vigorous attempts will be made to hector and bully the government in an endeavor to make them depart from the strict principles of right and to satisfy some base, sordid, squalid ideas of vengeance and of avarice. We must relentlessly set our faces against that."

A noble sentiment; brave words. Strength to his arm as long as he fights for such a peace.

It is encouraging to read that President Wilson was so impressed by the speech above quoted that he cabled as follows:

"May I express my sincere admiration of the admirable temper and purpose of your address of the 12th, just reproduced in part in our papers. It is delightful to be made aware of such community of thought and counsel in approaching the high and difficult task now awaiting us."

With the heads of these two nations in such hearty accord on principles so important the outlook is bright for a peace that will endure.

W. J. BRYAN.

INCONSISTENT MR. HUGHES

Late republican candidate, Mr. Hughes, is very much concerned about the temporary centralization developed in the conduct of the war. "In saving the world have we lost our republic?" he exclaims. No, Mr. Hughes, God is on his throne, the kaiser has abdicated, and the republic still lives. The war centralization will disappear with the coming of peace except as we shall profit by the lessons of the war and retain so much of the machinery as is necessary to protect the public from the greed of the monopolist. But what about Mr. Hughes' platform (1916) demand for the consolidation of all railroad control at Washington? That is a centralization that constitutes a real menace. In protesting against temporary war measures and at the same time advocating the railway magnates' program he is "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel."

FLORIDA RATIFIES

The federal prohibition constitutional prohibition amendment war ratified at the special session of the Florida legislature, on Nov. 27. The vote in the senate stood 25 to 2, and the house approved the measure by a vote of 65 to 1. The regular session of Florida's legislature does not meet until April 3, 1919, and action at this time not only prevented Florida from being left off the Roll of Honor but gives her a high place in the list.

Now watch the other states fall into line in January. Next month the legislatures of thirty-three states will meet in regular session. Of this number, twenty-two are dry states, and of the remaining eleven wet states only two are classed as doubtful by dry authorities. Which state will be the next?

Possibly the President has one reason for going to Paris just now that he could not well make public; namely, it enabled him to arrive in London before the elections, at a time when the reception accorded him may help elect a Lloyd George parliament.

If any southern senator wants to revive populism in his state he can do it by joining with the railway magnates (and the republican leaders) in the scheme to strip the state of all power to regulate the railroads within their borders.