

THE COMMERCIAL

Marshall & Baird, Union City, Tenn.

Entered at the post office at Union City, Tennessee, as second-class mail matter.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1910.

The Party of Hooperism.

The Republican convention which nominated Hooper for Governor Aug. 16 declared first that it endorsed the administration of President Taft and then that it endorsed him for recommending so many wise measures recently enacted by Congress.

The Commercial has suggested many times that Hooper is an Administration Republican and that he has no cause in common with the Democratic party. We have also ventured to speak of the evils, the bold, extravagant and reckless career of the Republican party. What we referred to can be plainly understood in a more extensive argument extracted from W. J. Bryan's speech recently delivered in Indiana in support of Mr. Kern, the Democratic candidate, against Mr. Beveridge for the United States Senate. The speech is quoted in part. It appears as an answer to ex-President Roosevelt, but it deals with many things that President Taft and the Republican Administration stand for. These are the things you get in exchange for your vote for Hooper if elected Governor of Tennessee:

MR. BRYAN SPEAKS.

But a little more than a week ago I saw an extract from his own magazine, the Outlook, and in this extract Mr. Roosevelt himself had condensed his new nationalism into four sentences. When I read these sentences I was amazed; I was astounded. And you will be both amazed and astounded when you find out what new nationalism means.

Before I read the three sentences that I desire to comment on I will read the fourth, which is not so important. He says:

"New nationalism demands of the judiciary that it shall be interested primarily in human welfare, rather than in property."

Well, there is nothing new about that demand. It is now more than sixty years since Lincoln coined the phrase which is the most apt expression of this doctrine; he said that when the dollar and the man come into conflict he was for the man before the dollar. Now the Democratic party has been preaching that doctrine for years; that is all that fourth sentence means. You do not have to advocate new nationalism to get that old doctrine. But let me give you the three sentences which contain the essence of new nationalism.

"First, the new nationalism is impatient of the utter confusion that results from local legislatures attempting to treat national issues as local issues."

WHAT DOES "NEW NATIONALISM" MEAN?

What does that mean? It means that new nationalism wants to deprive the State of some of the powers that they now have and transfer those powers to Washington. One of the things desired is the national incorporation of railroads. Mr. Roosevelt has recommended it in one of his messages, and one of the reasons he gave was that it would relieve the railroads of annoyance by local Legislatures. President Taft is now preparing, through his attorney general, a bill that provides for the national incorporation of corporations engaged in interstate commerce; and why? Because the State restrictions are objected to by these great corporations. The first step toward the new nationalism is to concentrate power in Washington, to increase the proportional power of the Federal Government and decrease the proportional importance of the States. It means that when you want to deal with a railroad, or with the big corporations that come into your State, instead of doing so by your State Legislatures, you must wait until Washington acts. And remember that when you wait on Washington you wait on the Senate as well as the House; and that Senate now has so many representatives of predatory interests in it that it is the bulwark of the exploiting interests of the country. Are you willing to surrender the power you now have and put your government farther away from you? The Democratic party says that Federal remedies should be added to the State remedies, not substituted for State remedies. The Democratic party says, let the State exercise the power it has, and let the nation exercise the power it has. When both State and nation have acted you will not have any more regulation than you need. Let me illustrate this. The home, the church and the school join in developing the character of our boys. What mother would be willing to strike down either the home, the school or the

church and leave it all to the other two? And yet, my friends, the advocates of new nationalism would diminish the power of the people of a State to protect their own rights, and make it more difficult to secure redress, by removing the seat of power to Washington. And the second:

"The new nationalism is still more impatient of the importance which springs from the over-division of government powers."

You are not only to concentrate power in Washington, but you are to consolidate the power of government. Instead of having a division of powers such as the fathers thought necessary for the protection of liberty you are to have a rising executive and a diminishing court and Legislature. That is step number two. And what is the third step? It naturally follows:

PERNICIOUS DOCTRINE.

"Third, the new nationalism regards the executive power as the steward of the public welfare."

There you have it, my friends. First, put everything in Washington. Second, put everything in the hands of the President. And then he is to stand as a sort of earthly father and take care of us. How do you like the new nationalism, my friends, when you find out what it is? This is the doctrine from which the world has been moving. It has cost the lives of millions of patriots to get away from this doctrine. God forbid that he should go back to it.

I doubt if there is another man in the United States who would desire to exercise the power that Mr. Roosevelt wants to vest in a President. I do not believe there is another; and even if you are willing to trust him with this power I beg you to remember that he is only human and may die; you must trust another man to exercise it when he is dead. You cannot judge a monarchy by a good king. There have been good kings, but there never was a good monarchy. The doctrine is bad, and never since the days of Alexander Hamilton has such a doctrine been promulgated in the United States by a prominent man as is now advanced in the name of new nationalism. You need John Kern there to vote against these initial steps toward a one-man power. You need John Kern there to vote against national incorporation of railroads. You need John Kern there to vote against the national incorporation of great corporations that are now hard to deal with, and will be stronger still if they can rid themselves of all State restrictions and stalk, uncontrolled, across the land.

FREE SPEECH AND FREE PRESS.

And then there is the question of free speech and a free press. Is it a part of new nationalism to commence libel suits in Washington and drag editors across the continent to defend themselves for criticism of an administration? If we are to increase the importance of the Federal Government by concentrating all power there; if we are then to increase the powers of the Presidential office by consolidating all power there, and then be required to reverence it as the guardian and steward of the people—if that is to be the doctrine then you need not be surprised if you are told that you must not frown when you look up towards this source of power; that if you do frown you must not speak; that if you speak, they can take you from your home and make you defend yourself at such a distance from your home that even a victory will be bankruptcy for you and your children.

There is another matter that will come before your Senators. It is the ship subsidy. Mr. Roosevelt is for it. Mr. Taft is for it. Mr. Beveridge has voted for it; it is a part of their plan. They do not always put it in their platform but they are for it; and you need John Kern there to vote against this new kind of graft that will be worked upon you whenever they think you are able to bear it.

And there is another menace, there is the central bank. They have wanted it for years. They have planned for it for more than a decade. Last year a letter was sent out by the National City Bank of New York—the biggest bank in the United States. The letter was handed to me by a man who is now a candidate for Congress in Kansas. He obtained it from a national banker. This letter, sent out by the biggest bank in New York, contains the statement that one of the provisions of the postal savings bank law was intended to form the basis of a central bank; and that letter says that Mr. Taft favored the law because it had this provision in it. You do not want a central bank. If that central bank is established, with its branches throughout the country, it will run out of business every other bank in the town, or compel the other banks to do business on the terms prescribed by the central bank. It will be the greatest

We Have Only a Few Choice Farms

ON OUR LIST

FOR SALE

THAT POSSESSION CAN BE HAD THIS YEAR

One 135-acre tract level land $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles northwest of Union City, $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of Woodland and $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of Jordan, Ky., in fine neighborhood, near good school and church, has two-story frame dwelling, seven rooms, hall, two verandas, barn 40x50, hay shed 32x36, 15-acre woods lot, fine well and cistern, five ponds, all necessary outbuildings, all in good repair, under good fence. This farm is in a high state of cultivation. This is the first time offered for sale. Priced right, half cash, balance one and two years, low interest.

One 60-acre farm two miles southeast of Union City, in high state of cultivation, lays well, has a 5-room dwelling, two verandas, new potato house and cellar, large new barn, finest of well water, good pond, 5-acre woods lot, 300 young fruit trees, 1,400 locust trees, $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres in Alfalfa—made four crops this year. This is an ideal place. Can be bought—worth the money—on easy terms if sold at once.

One 125-acre farm about one and one-half miles of Harris, Tenn., on the Jacksonville and Fulton road, in good state of cultivation, about 20 acres in timber, land lays well and has been cared for but can be made better, and at the price we are offering this farm it is sure to make the purchaser money. Must be sold at once. For price and terms see us.

One tract of 197 acres second bottom land with medium improvements, under good fence. This land will produce as well if not better than some that is priced two and three times as high. Situated about one mile northeast of Hickman, Ky. Will sell for a small payment down, balance one, two, three, four and five years at 6 per cent. See us for price. Will trade for Union City property.

One 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ -acre tract, lays level, about three miles northeast of Union City, has new six-room frame dwelling, hall, veranda, new smoke house, milk house and chicken house, good medium-sized barn, good well, nice 1-acre woods lot, orchard, some berries, under good fence. See us for price and terms. Other lands adjoining can be bought worth the money.

One tract second bottom land of 1,142 acres, 142 clear, balance in fine timber estimated to cut 50,000,000 ft., principally white and red oak, poplar, hickory, ash, cottonwood, white gum, satin walnut, walnut, sassafras, hackberry and cypress. This land when cleared will be worth the price, as it lays well and is as rich as cream—will grow anything; Alfalfa growing on cleared land fine now. Price \$120,000. To show what we think of this proposition, we will go in with reliable parties and buy same, as we believe there is a bunch of money to parties able to handle this proposition. Situated in District No. 5 of Obion County, in three miles of railroad.

A few small farms near the city, some larger ones farther out. Will be glad to show YOU any or all of them, and at prices that will make you money.

We have a number of good farms for sale that have been rented for the next year which we can sell with rent contracts. Our price is right for the class of land offered.

Any and all kinds of city property for sale or trade, some on long time and low interest.

See us when in the market to buy, sell, rent or insure property of any kind. We think we can make it to your interest to do business with us. We gladly refer you to those we have sold to and those we have sold for.

Satisfaction guaranteed at this shop.

Carter & White

Real Estate and Insurance People

Office 229 $\frac{1}{2}$ S. First St., Rooms No. 1 and 2. Phone 77

UNION CITY, TENN.

financial despotism that this world ever saw, and all the business of the country will be under its control. It will suck money from the extremes of the country and pour it into the hopper of Wall street to carry on gambling transactions there. You need John Kern in the Senate to fight the central bank to a very death.

PARTIES DIFFER ON TRUST QUESTION.

The parties differ on the trust question. Mr. Roosevelt said at Osawatimie that it had been demonstrated that combinations could not be prevented. He said that instead of trying to prevent them we should simply try to regulate them. Think of it, my friends! How humiliating a confession that this nation of ninety millions of people can create corporations and give them every right that they have, and yet can not prevent combinations. I shall not make any such confession as that. I do not believe it to be true. Mr. Roosevelt says try regulation; that you can not prevent combinations. Well, if he had never been President he might tell us that, if we would just make him President, he would regulate them where others have failed, but he has been President. For seven years and a half he occupied the White House. He appointed the attorney-general. He had behind him a Republican Senate, and more than that, he had Mr. Beveridge in the Senate all the time. He had a Republican House behind him, and he had Republican judges in the United States courts; and yet in seven years and a half, with his party in absolute power he did not put one trust magnate behind the prison bars; and there were more trusts in the United States when he got through than when he commenced. That is his record.

Not only that. While he was President the representatives of the steel trust went to the White House. There was a panic on, and, my friends, I can never have any respect for that mean, contemptible panic that refused to wait for a Democratic administration, but had the impudence to come during a Republican administration. While that panic was on the representatives of the steel trust went to the White House, and convinced the President that they had the power to control the industrial situation; that, if they were not allowed to swallow their largest rivals and destroy competition, conditions were going to get worse. And they so frightened the President that he consented to what they wanted.

AN IMPUDENT PROPOSAL.

Never but once before was such an impudent proposal taken to a President, so far as we know only one, and that was when Andrew Jackson was President. Then the national bank of that day sent its president to him and told him that the bank could elect him or defeat him. And what did Jackson say? Did he say, "Oh, if that is the situation, you can do just as you please?" No, he said, "Mr. Biddle, if your bank has the power to elect a President or defeat him it has a blank sight more power than it ought to have, and, by the eternal, it won't have it long." That is the way that Andrew Jackson dealt with a similar situation. And if, in 1907, Andrew Jackson had been in Washington instead of Theodore Roosevelt and the representatives of the steel

trust had tried to frighten him he would have said: "Gentlemen, if your corporation is large enough to control the financial and industrial situation of this country; if you can turn panics loose and call them off at pleasure, you have more power than any corporation ought to have and, by the eternal, you will not have it long if I can prevent it."

Regulation! We have tried it, and it has failed. The steel trust's net earnings for one year were one hundred and fifty-four millions. One per cent of its net earnings that year would have financed a political party with a fund two and one-half times as large as we could collect two years ago from six million, four hundred thousand Democrats. What folly to create trusts and then try to control them by entering into such an unequal struggle when they are so powerful? The Democratic policy is so different. Our platform says that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. Our party says that God never made a man good enough to stand at the head of a private monopoly and arbitrarily fix the price that you must pay for that which you must have and which he alone can furnish. The Democratic party says, draw the line to these corporations. "Thus far shall thou go and no farther." The Democratic party says that the law should make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. That is the Democratic position. That is your position; and you need John Kern there to defend that position.

TARIFF QUESTION PARAMOUNT.

But Mr. Beveridge says that the tariff question is the paramount issue; and I am willing to accept that statement, although Mr. Roosevelt did not seem to think it worth discussing in his speech last week. Mr. Beveridge says that it is the paramount issue, and that he deserves credit for trying to get some reduction, but he says, "Beware, don't lay hostile hand on the principle of protection," and what is the principle of protection? It is that ninety millions of people shall be taxed for the benefit of a few of the people. According to the platform two years ago, and Mr. Beveridge helped to write it—at least he was a delegate in the convention that adopted it—and Mr. Roosevelt appealed to the people for the support of the candidates who ran upon it—that platform says that you must not only have a tariff high enough to cover the difference in cost of production, but a reasonable profit for the manufacturer besides. For what other class does the Republican party demand a reasonable profit? Does the Republican party demand that the laboring man shall be guaranteed that he shall have permanent employment? Does it guarantee that the merchants shall have a reasonable income? Does it guarantee that the farmer, who sells his wheat in competition with the cheapest labor of the world, shall have a reasonable profit? Does it guarantee that the farmer who raises corn for hogs or cattle shall have a reasonable profit?

HAIR GOODS

Full line Puffs, Switches, Pompadours, Curls and Rats. We also work up combings into everything desired on short notice.

LEXIE McDAVIS

416 F. MAIN STREET. PHONE 431



GODWIN BROS.

—SOLE AGENTS FOR—

Chase & Sanborn's
Famous Boston Teas and Coffees
Bulte's Excellence Flour

Ferndell
Pure Food
Products



TELEPHONES 79 and 516