

ing the right to exercise their suffrages, to vote for directors of the company; and suppose the gainful corporation is, say, the Western Union Telegraph Company, would they not be asked: "have you any stock in this company?"; and, answering in the negative, would they not be kicked out from the place where directors of the Western Union are being voted for? What railroad, banking, manufacturing, or other gainful incorporation, permits people to vote for its directors and its officers who have none of its stock, who have paid no money into its treasury?

How long would a bank remain solvent or a railroad remunerative if non-stockholders were permitted to control its offices and expenditures by their ballots? And why should it be safer for a corporation called government, instituted to protect life, liberty and property within a certain area, to allow itself to be run and managed by non-stockholders—by those who pay no taxes, no assessments upon their citizenship—than it would be for a bank, manufacturing plant or railroad to be operated in that manner?

But how would THE CONSERVATIVE limit suffrage in the great cities, in all municipalities? By levying a citizenship-tax upon every male twenty-one years of age and upwards of five dollars a year, payable in December each year. It is nearly six months until the next mayoralty or municipal election comes around. None of the political aspirants for city offices at the ensuing spring election will take the chances and pay the taxes of impecunious voters so far in advance. The credit is too long, the result too uncertain. No man should be permitted to vote in any city election in April until he shall have shown a receipt for his citizenship-tax, paid in the preceding December. Those who have not paid are not stockholders and ought not to vote. Those who have paid have demonstrated their fidelity to the corporation called government and have proved themselves genuine stockholders.

Such a tax will work no hardship upon decent and thrifty citizens. A tax is merely compensation paid by the citizen to the government for a service rendered and the service rendered is the protection of his life, liberty, and property. The life of the poor man and the liberty of the poor man are far more valuable or essential to his family than that of the rich man. The latter may be killed and his family have income and support from his estate. The rich man may be imprisoned, his income continued to his family, and his property be still protected. But the family of the poor man depends even for daily bread upon his life and liberty. The citizen who cannot or will not pay five dollars each December for governmental protection to his life and liberty, is not worthy of the right to vote. He is not a stockholder in the

corporation called government. And all human governments are mere evolutions from man's natural right to life, to liberty, and to the earnings of his own person. In barbarism each defended those rights for himself. Emerging from savagery, they agreed that all men should stand for the rights of each man. This made government. Government, thus evolved, ought to be just. It ought to protect those who work and pay to support government, against all the idle and intemperate and thriftless who do neither.

In all the states where the rural population outnumbers the urban population, legislation to levy a citizenship tax can be secured. Each state ought to enact such a law. If Illinois makes the endeavor soon, it can carry such legislation into vigor and by such a statute save Chicago from the plundering by which it is now despoiled. Political pirates could not, under the operation of such a citizenship-tax, payable in December, each April elect the men to loot the public purse. Under the operation of a law, requiring each citizen to present, at the polls in the city election of April, his tax receipt of the December previous, the whole expense of registration could be avoided. The certificate of citizenship and of the right to vote would be the receipt for a tax paid to the government of the city, in consideration of the protection which that government had afforded to the life, liberty and property of the citizen and his family. Until Americans are taught that this government imposes duties, and that it is not merely a power granting privileges, there is no certainty of its perpetuity. Until men are taught that it is the duty of every American to contribute to government, and not the duty of government to contribute to him, there is no safety in the rule of the majority in cities or elsewhere.

Colonel Bowlby, of the Crete Democrat, seems to be incapable of understanding the difference between the swallower and the swallowee. In a recent number of his valuable periodical, he refers very unappreciatively to a proposition made by the editor of THE CONSERVATIVE, after the election of Hon. Jas. E. Boyd to the governorship in 1890. That proposition was to join and cement all the opposition to the republican party with the then triumphant democracy of the state of Nebraska. The letter to which he refers, proposed a meeting on Jackson Day, the 8th day of January, 1891, for the purpose of taking into the democratic folds all the opponents of the republican party in the state. Because at that time, it was deemed possible and

prudent to swallow the populist and all other political organizations which were fighting the G. O. P. in this commonwealth, it did not logically follow that it was good policy, fidelity to principle, or even compatible with decency, to be swallowed by the populists and free silver republicans.

Since then the democratic party has become the swallowee in this state and throughout the country.

Nationally there has been no democratic candidate for the presidency since 1892, who was not also the nominee of the populist party for the same position. In 1900 the populist party, at its national convention at Sioux Falls, dictated the nomination of the presidential candidate, for the ensuing sanhedrim at Kansas City. It even went so far as to name the vice-president in the person of Chas. A. Towne, of Minnesota. This political prescription was rather nauseating, even to the convention at Kansas City, so that it took only half the dose, and even attempted to sugar-coat that, by nominating Adlai E. Stevenson, who had once been elected vice-president through the popularity and strength of the Grover Cleveland ticket in 1892.

THE CONSERVATIVE has not changed as to political principles. It believes in a government honestly administered for the sole purpose of protecting the life, liberty and property of its citizens. It is opposed to all taxation except for public purposes. It is against the intermeddling of this country with the affairs of European or other foreign nations. It did not sympathize with Bailey, Chump Clark and other exponents of Bryanarchy in Congress, when they declared that they alone had urged the weak-kneed McKinley into war with Spain, and then boasted of having brought about the conflict. Neither did THE CONSERVATIVE rejoice with Grosvenor, of Ohio, because as he proclaimed, the war had been precipitated by McKinley, Hanna, Quay & Co. between this country and Spain. By the way, nobody seems to be claiming the merit at this time of having brought about the war, and there is no quarrel among statesmen of allegedly different political views, as to who shall have the honor of having caused all this tremendous loss of treasure, health, happiness and human life.

BUFFALO BILL'S MILITARY COLLEGE.

A military college, that is to graduate real rough riders, is the novel institution planned by Buffalo Bill and a number of retired officers of the regular army. It will be located at Cody, Wyo., in the heart of the Big Horn Basin, which will soon be made accessible through an extension of the Burlington railroad. Barracks of unhewn logs are to be built, and instruction in everything, from rough riding, to hunting big game, is to be provided. It is believed that a number of eastern families will send their sons to Buffalo Bill, to be transformed into thorough westerners.