

states which are contributing armed force on behalf of the league.

The council is to recommend what amount of force, if any, should be supplied by the several governments concerned, BUT THE APPROVAL OF THE LATTER IS NECESSARY. (States not members of the league will be invited to accept the obligations of the league for the purpose of particular disputes, and if they fail to comply may be forced.)

(F) Not to consider any treaty binding till it has been communicated to the league, which will then proceed to publish it, to admit the right of the assembly to advise the reconsideration of treaties and international conditions which do not accord with present needs, and to be bound by no obligations inconsistent with the covenant.

A state which breaks its agreement may be expelled from the league by the council.

4. The covenant does not affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the MONROE DOCTRINE, for securing the maintenance of peace.

5. The former German colonies and the territories of the Ottoman empire are to be administered in the interest of civilization by STATES WHICH ARE WILLING TO BE MANDATORIES of the league, which will exercise a general supervision.

6. The member states accept certain responsibilities with regard to labor conditions, the treatment of natives, the white slave traffic, the opium traffic, the arms traffic with uncivilized and semi-civilized countries, transit and trade conditions, public health and Red Cross societies.

7. The league is recognized as the central body interested in co-ordinating and assisting international activities generally.

8. Amendments to the covenant require the approval of all the states in the council and a simple majority of those in the assembly. States which signify their dissent from amendments thus approved are not bound by them, but, in this case, cease to be members of the league.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMER

Question—Will ex-President Taft be the republican presidential candidate in 1920?

Answer—No.

Question—Why?

Answer—There are several reasons, any one of which is sufficient.

Question—Can you name one?

Answer—He vetoed the Webb-Kenyon bill. It became a law over his veto.

Question—Will you name another?

Answer—He opposed prohibition until the amendment was ratified.

Question—Can you name a third reason?

Answer—He opposed woman suffrage, giving as one reason that the women would vote for prohibition.

Question—What domestic reforms did he ever advocate?

Answer—None.

Question—But is he not a delightful gentleman?

Answer—Yes, one of the most pleasing personalities in the country.

A REASON

If the post-office department had recognized the right of each community to own and operate its local telephone exchange—the federal government owning and operating the long distance lines—government ownership would have made more progress.

WHY NOT LEASE THEM?

Chairman Hurley, of the shipping board, recommends the sale of government ships to private corporations at a loss of something like \$150,000,000 to the government.

Why not lease them, instead of selling, if the government does not want to operate shipping lines? Leasing would have several advantages over selling.

First—The government could better control the companies operating them.

Second—The government could, if it ever needed them, take them back without paying an enormous profit for the privilege.

Third—As it takes less capital to OPERATE a ship line than to OWN it there would be more competitors in leasing than in buying, and more competition between the lines SELLING would probably be the republican plan, but democrats ought to prefer leasing.

W. J. BRYAN.

Providing for the Soldiers

The following editorial from the Pittsburg Dispatch, under the caption "Unpatriotic New York," challenges attention:

"The members of the New York legislature who are about to start out to get the facts about bolshevism in their state and largest city might have gathered some information by attending the first session in some years of a bread line Tuesday. According to reports of the pitiful procession, the legislators could have gained useful elementary facts from the remarks of the men in line, 800 all told, about their experiences in not getting jobs. According to the records of the crowd's registration, 10 per cent of the 800 were returned soldiers, and 80 per cent former war workers representing a wide range of occupations, and the general statement of experiences was strikingly similar. Among the soldiers the words were somewhat terse and to the broad effect that they do not want bread lines, or charity, but a man's chance to do a man's work without asking odds. Supplementary to the re-appearance of the bread line, from which even New York has been free for some years, is the announcement of Dr. Kirchwey, in charge of what official effort is still in action to reinstate soldiers in civil jobs, that there are almost 4,000 soldiers of the Twenty-seventh division, just given a public welcome, still hunting work with no prospects. In a few days more another division, the Seventy-seventh, will be home and contribute more thousands, and Dr. Kirchwey candidly admits that the outlook is not cheerful.

"It seems incredible that states and the nation, which computed its funds by the billions, should find themselves helpless before the problem of at least temporary assistance to returning soldiers. It is unfortunate that the men who fought civilization's battles have begun to make bitter comments upon the failure to have provided in advance for a safe covering of their retreat to civilian employment. And the misfortune is not lessened by the contrasts the soldiers draw, which makes their appearance in the bread line seem almost a calamity. Perhaps New York needs a prod."

And yet this is the city in which the soldiers were given the greatest welcome ever accorded a nation's soldier-heroes. How soon they were forgotten—eighty in the bread line within a week after the applause died out upon the street. It is an outrage on patriotism—it is a menace to law and order that these men, taken from their work by conscription (and it would be the same if they had volunteered), should find their places closed to them on their return. The cities, the states and the nation should AT ONCE—not after while but IMMEDIATELY—compel employers to take back the men called into the army. Any other course not only reflects upon the nation's honor but may react upon the government if soldiers are again needed.

And what shall we say of the patriotism of employers who close their doors to employes honorably discharged from the service? And what of civilians—men and women—who take advantage of the absence of soldiers to secure their places and turn them out upon the street? It is time for adequate legislation.

W. J. BRYAN.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

On another page will be found a Washington dispatch announcing the President's willingness that the Filipinos shall have immediate independence. Secretary Baker and Governor Harrison concur in the recommendation. It will be a great day when this nation sets the world an example in honoring the doctrine of self-determination—and no one will be happier than Mr. Bryan.

PROHIBITION GROWS

In the state of New York, Governor Whitman declared for ratification and was defeated by some 14,000 by a candidate who stood—not against ratification but for a REFERENDUM on ratification. Not so bad for New York. And now the wets of Chicago—the second city in the union—poll only 46,000 more than half the votes cast at the election, with no organized opposition. Not so bad for Chicago.

A REAL PROGRESSIVE REPUBLICAN

Keep your eye on Governor Sproul of Pennsylvania. It is not a promising section from which to expect a reformer. Quay, formerly, and Penrose, more recently, have given the state a BAD NAME. Then, too, the overshadowing power of gigantic corporations and the paralyzing influence of a large foreign element—these, combined with the corruption constantly employed by the liquor interests have made the Keystone state the last one to encourage reforms.

But there are surprises in the political world as well as in nature—sometimes the antidote is found growing near the poison. So it is in Pennsylvania today. A strong, brave, clear-minded statesman has appeared, of whom we may hear more unless the reactionaries who control the national organization are able to suppress him.

Gov. Sproul parted company with Senator Penrose on the question of prohibition. He came out squarely for ratification in his race for the nomination, made his own fight and won. Then, with his party indorsement to back him, he declared war on the wet candidate who won the democratic nomination and, with the aid of the dry democrats, carried the state by more than 250,000. He led the fight for ratification in the legislature and was instrumental in making his state number forty-five. He recommended woman suffrage, and has recently secured from his legislature a law which provides the machinery for enforcing prohibition but wisely leaves to congress the fixing of the alcoholic content to be permitted.

Governor Sproul marches forward manfully meeting the issues as they arise. The Commoner welcomes him to the political arena and hopes that he may be the beginning of a new epoch in republican politics. We need such political opponents to spur the democrats up to doing their best.

W. J. BRYAN.

THE BIG GRAVE

The contest between the home and the saloon is not child's play; it is a real fight and the opponents of the saloon are in earnest. For years the liquor interests had a black-list and threw their whole strength against any man who dared to oppose them. The tables are turned. In a short time there will be no liquor organization to threaten or reward. But the home still stands and its defenders are keeping books. They are finding out who can be trusted and who represent the liquor interest, and this information will be of value in the years to come. The grave dug for John Barleycorn is large enough to furnish a final resting place for all the wet politicians who have accepted employment as his bodyguard.

CHICAGO'S WET MAJORITY SMALL

Six hundred and ninety thousand votes were cast at the recent Chicago election—345,001 being necessary to make a majority. The wets polled 391,000, or only 46,000 more than half, with the dries making no contest. With war prohibition coming July 1st, the dries knew they could not arouse the people for a fight for only TWO MONTHS OF CITY PROHIBITION and wisely refused to contest the election. And, yet, with NO ORGANIZED OPPOSITION, the wets secured less than fifty thousand votes more than half the votes cast! The wets are welcome to all the joy they can get out of it.

A GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY

The legislators who failed to provide road building or some other form of public work for the unemployed must accept responsibility for what hungry men may do—and it is a grave responsibility for hunger is a hard thing to reason with.

THERE IS A REASON

The plutocratic press is gloating over what it calls the failure of government ownership of railroads. They will not deceive the public. The government took over the railroads when PRIVATE OWNERSHIP HAD BROKEN DOWN. It ran the railroads when private owners could not. It did the best it could, but it had to work through the railroad officials who WANTED GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP TO FAIL. Government ownership did not have a fair test under such conditions, but government ownership will come—I hope it will be the dual plan.

W. J. BRYAN.