

**HOW? WHY?** A recent deliverance of the populist presidential candidate at Lincoln reads thus:

"It will be a great victory for popular government when the selection of United States senators is taken away from legislatures and given into the custody of the voters where it rightfully belongs."

How does it rightfully belong where the constitution—as signed by George Washington, president of the convention, on September 17th, 1787,—bestows it not? How did the presidential candidate—whose reputation is like that of a quick-rising yeast powder or the little early riser pills—ascertain so definitely that the men who made the constitution were mistaken, and that Hamilton, Madison, Franklin, the Pinckneys, Rufus King and Roger Sherman should be sized up at the ratio of sixteen-to-one against the Croker-Tillman-Altgeld standard of statesmanship in these brisk days of Bryanarchy?

And how can popular government win a great victory over itself? Popular government, or self-government, elects state legislators. Popular government delegates to those legislators the power to elect United States senators. But if the people do not know enough—as their greatest and commonest commoner intimates—to send decent, able, honest men to the state legislatures, how shall the same voters be better qualified to choose United States senators? And how, by what authority, shall the duty of selecting United States senators be "taken away from legislatures?" And when "given into the custody of the voters" why may not the voters become amenable to the same charges, direct and indirect, that were made against masses of American voters during, and subsequent to, the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, as to their susceptibility to the influences of bribery and intimidation by corporate power? May not the same surprised and disappointed candidate for the presidency make charges, as to the plutocratic power electing United States senators, cogently and vehemently as he made them in 1896 and 1900? How can he trust a mass of voters who were so dishonest as to elect McKinley over Bryan and the second time, too, by a largely increased majority?

**SHEEP SHEARING.** A butcher and wool merchant formed a co-partnership to run a sheep ranch. They were very kindhearted. They did not wish to shear or slaughter any of the simple sheep which they owned and managed. All the butcher and wool-grower asked was food and raiment from the bleating flocks. And this they said, in orations delivered to the sheep, they could easily secure so delicately

that the metamorphosed carcasses and fleeces would really experience beatitudes of the most celestial character.

The butcher and the wool merchant were candidates for high offices and the sheep were populist voters. The proprietors of the ranch have failed in business. The live sheep closely sheared are scurrying over the country to find new folds wherein they may be warmed and cared for. Meantime the leading flock-master of the old firm has invented a forage-ration made out of words, air and assumption; and has begun its manufacture at Lincoln with the hope of finding unlimited market therefor among the wandering lambs. The first few bales of this new nutrient for sheep was extruded from the press by wolf-power, Uncle-Jake-Wolfe-power, and some sheep see that shearing is again near at hand, notwithstanding the clip taken in November, 1900.

**REPEAL.** The legislature of Nebraska, now in session, can attract or it can repel capital from this state. The immediate repeal of the so-called anti-trust-law, under the unconstitutional provisions of which, Smyth, Bryan and Company assaulted the starch industry and other enterprises during the last campaign, ought to be demanded. It has never benefited anybody except the lawyers. It has harmed everybody. It has been invoked only by politicians and place hunters. And they have invoked it as a means of appealing to the envy and malice of the vagabond voters of the country, the tramps and hoboes who regard all property as robbery. No decent property-owning citizens of Nebraska ever petitioned Smyth, Oldham and commoner demagogues with whom they fused, to bring an action to drive the Standard Oil Company, the Cracker Company, Argo, United or National Starch Company out of this commonwealth. No sensible citizen ever desired the vote-hunting aggregation, then holding office, to exile from Nebraska all these great corporations. No man wished all the hundreds of employees of those corporations thrown out of wages by the action of Smyth, Oldham & Co. And yet if the so-called anti-trust law with all of its unconstitutional provisions can be enforced in Nebraska there will be not a single manufacturing plant of any importance left within the borders of this state. And this law never did a citizen—except an attorney—one cent's worth of good. It ought to be repealed.

Is there in the legislature enough moral courage, combined with a clear insight of the best, most essential and vital interests of the state to repeal the law in question and all the other laws which repel manufacture and commerce?

**CHANDLER.** Now that Senator Chandler of New Hampshire is about making a temporary exit from that honorable body and public life in general many of the peculiarities which distinguish him are brought to mind. His ability as a thinker, talker and writer is unquestioned. Equally unchallenged is his capacity for caustic criticism. His power of vehement, irritating, lacerating and exasperating denunciation of men and measures was so frequently brought into use and exercised upon so many individuals that the gentleman from New Hampshire was shunned or repelled by a number of his fellow senators. A few of these anti-Chandler statesmen were one day drubbing him and his manners and methods, in a cloak room of the United States senate, and just as a most vituperative reprobation of Chandler was being concluded with the statement:

"Nobody likes him!" Senator Proctor of Vermont joined the party, and, at once, somebody said:

"Well there's Proctor who sits right next to Chandler and I will ask him:

"Proctor, 'Do you like Chandler?'" And in a moment the deep bass voice of the like-Uncle-Sam Senator from Vermont responded:

"Wal yes, I guess I do; but its an acquired taste."

**GOOD SPEECHES.** Among the most erudite and complete of many great speeches made at the John Marshall festivities of February 4, 1901, that of Mr. James M. Woolworth of Omaha ranks very high for research, candor and elegance of style. Mr. Woolworth is an ornament to the state, and the fact that he stood at the front of his profession in 1856, and that he still maintains his precedence in 1901, although ten thousand lawyers, and more, have become members of the Nebraska bar since he began his career, proves that he was always a man of extraordinary intellectual powers, high resolves and tireless industry.

Mr. Albert Watkins of Lincoln recently delivered, at the obsequies of Queen Victoria in that city, a most thoughtful, beautiful and logical address. It is a classic in eulogy. It is a credit to its author and reflects honor upon the citizenship of this entire commonwealth. There is no man in Nebraska who thinks more philosophically, reasons more logically and expresses himself with more charming lucidity of diction. In the discussion of the tariff and finance Mr. Watkins is head and shoulders above any other economic thought-teller in the state. His only fault is that he writes too infrequently for publication. He is a miser of ideas which he ought to put into circulation.