

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN Editor and Proprietor
RICHARD L. METCALFE Associate Editor

CHARLES W. BRYAN Publisher
Editorial Rooms and Business Office, 324-330 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
Six Months......50
In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75

Three Months..... .25
Single Copy..... .05
Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus 1912. Two weeks are required after money has ceased to and including the last issue of January, January 21, '12 means that payment has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

ing upon the demonstration of his grip on the leadership, is apt to unsettle things in the house, unless, indeed, Chairman Underwood is swept along in the stampede Bryan precipitated. If Underwood stands pat on his tariff program and continues to discountenance radical changes in the Sherman law, his boom will have the Bryan steam roller to reckon with. It is characteristic of Bryan—perhaps the weakest point in his leadership—that he never tries to find common ground for the party factions to stand on.—Washington (D. C.) Post.

LET THE CANDIDATES REPRESENT THE VOTERS, NOT THE INTERESTS

The following editorial appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 2nd: There are still a few ultra-conservative democrats who cling to the idea that a man who abandoned the party in 1896; a person allied for a lifetime with the combined interests of the country which opposed the party in 1896, 1900, 1904 and 1908; an individual with a record of nonenforcement of the Sherman law when he was directly charged with that duty, can be nominated for the presidency in a democratic national convention.

These gentlemen reside mostly in the southern and the eastern states and usually are close to the interests which would be benefited by such a nomination.

They have never been contented since the democrats of the country ousted them from control of the party in 1896.

No statements as to political sentiment of the country will ever move them to admit they were ever in error; they may conceal their antipathy to progression, but are always ready to respond to the call of the wise men of Gotham, the Captains of industry, with headquarters in Wall street.

Of course, they desire to name the candidate for the party.

They need to name candidates for both political parties, and then they would be certain of safety from the law and what they term radical aggression.

They did that for years and were supremely comfortable.

When they could name both they selected the one they believed most amenable to their claims and their wishes.

The democratic party will have neither their policies nor their candidate.

Such a candidate can not be nominated, but if nominated would drag down to defeat the candidates upon the national, state and local tickets in every doubtful state and in many claimed as democratic.

The democrats who might be able to win positions in township, city, county and state elections should not be barred from success by a national nomination that would surely prevent it.

In prior articles we have alluded to the dis-

The Commoner.

Fighting for Popular Election of Senators

Friends of the popular election of senators are making a strong fight for that reform. Following is a special dispatch to the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal.

Washington, Jan 16.—Indications are that there will be an agreement between the house and senate on the bill providing for the direct election of United States senators. A conference was held today without complete success, but the house conferees appeared confident that the senate managers will, within a day or two, ask for instructions to agree on the house resolution with the Bacon amendment superseding that offered by Senator Bristow.

If this authority is granted by the senate the resolution will be whipped into shape at once for passage by both houses. The long fight waged by Senator Borah, of Idaho; Representative Ollie James of Kentucky; Representative W. W. Rucker, of Missouri, and others will be near an end. With the Bacon amendment added, the Bristow amendment rejected, the law will provide for the direct election of senators and will stipulate that in states, where this action is not taken, congress may step in and organize the election. The Bristow amendment, conferring on congress the power to organize state elections whenever it chooses, has met with the solid opposition of southern democrats, and the house has instructed its conferees under no circumstances to agree on that. It was to mitigate the force of the Bristow amendment that the Bacon amendment was proposed.

When the legislation was last before the senate, the vice president broke a tie and made possible the passage of the Bristow amendment. Southern democrats fear that this amendment

asters brought to the democrats of Ohio in 1904 through the refusal of the voters to support a nomination they deemed reactionary.

Below we give the pluralities in each of the congressional districts in Ohio at that election.

1—Republican plurality	20,526
2—Republican plurality	17,627
3—Republican plurality	6,032
5—Republican plurality	324
6—Republican plurality	2,337
7—Republican plurality	9,378
8—Republican plurality	11,265
9—Republican plurality	18,640
10—Republican plurality	11,781
11—Republican plurality	9,984
12—Republican plurality	7,177
13—Republican plurality	1,050
14—Republican plurality	9,869
15—Republican plurality	532
16—Republican plurality	9,589
17—Republican plurality	2,276
18—Republican plurality	20,467
19—Republican plurality	30,335
20—Republican plurality	12,389
21—Republican plurality	29,786

Twenty republican congressmen elected and their democratic opponents snowed under, not through their unpopularity, but through the dissatisfaction with the supposed control of the combined interests at the national convention. The gallant Fourth district was the only congressional district in the state to send a democratic congressman, who was elected by 1,795 plurality.

Do the democratic members of our present delegation believe their constituents are in favor of reactionary candidates?

Do they believe they can carry their districts as democrats with a man desired by Wall-street interests, or a man who has for years been known as their agent, representative and recognized as their favorite at the head of the democratic ticket?

If they do, let them study the returns given above and they will feel less acutely the disappointments that will surely arrive next November if such a candidate should be nominated for president by the democratic party.

The democrats can elect the next president and control both branches of congress if they make no mistake in their nomination for the highest office in the republic. They can carry state after state and county after county.

What folly then to slaughter thousands of democratic candidates for the minor offices to gratify the combined interests or the ambition of one of their favorites.

will permit the voting of all negroes with the result, in states like Mississippi, of electing negroes to the senate. The "progressives," who hold the balance of power in the upper chamber, claim that they supported the Bristow amendment because had it not been passed the entire legislation would have failed. Their assertion is that above the controversy as to which amendment shall be passed, they want the principle of direct elections enacted into law. It is stated that the house resolution, as amended by Senator Bacon, will be agreeable to them, however, and if the senate conferees ask for such instructions, the "progressives" will vote to grant them.

Treachery may come from the regular republicans. These voted for the resolution as amended by Bristow because they did not believe that the house would accept it, and they hoped thus to kill the legislation. It requires a two-thirds vote to pass this legislation through either body, because it contemplates an amendment to the constitution. Should the regulars decide to absent themselves or vote against the resolution on final passage, while such action would cloud their own records, it would kill the legislation for this session. It is the consensus of opinion it will pass eventually, however.

The house conferees hope for action within a week. They believe that the move will be made in the open senate about as follows:

The senate, it is believed, will recede from the Bristow amendment by a majority vote and instruct the conferees to agree on the resolution in that form. When this is done the house expects ratification of the action in both chambers by the two-thirds vote required.

Harmon's Record

"Fifty Measures, Many of Them Distinctly Progressive Measures, Became Laws Because the Ohio Governor Did Not Sign Them Within the Period Required by the State Constitution."

The managers of Governor Harmon are endeavoring, through the medium of circulars and pamphlets widely circulated, to induce his acceptance as a progressive democrat. In this they ingenuously seek to show that it was the governor's strong personality and leadership that was responsible for the enactment of the many splendid laws by the 1911 session of the Ohio legislature, which was democratic in both branches. The record does not bear this out. A number of the claims put forward on Mr. Harmon's behalf have been proved, by the record of that session, to be unfounded. Fifty measures, as The Commoner has stated, many of them distinctly progressive measures, became laws because the governor did not sign them within the period required by the constitution of Ohio. Yet most of them are claimed in this literature as a presidential asset and proof of Mr. Harmon's progressiveness.

There were a number of other bills that became laws through the approval of the governor, and on the face of the record it is easy to claim them as due to his championship. One of the laws listed as "a measure which Harmon pushed through the legislature" is that providing for the direct election of senators by the Oregon plan. This requires candidates for the legislature, regardless of party, to either agree or not to agree to be bound in voting for senators by the popular result in the state.

It is true that Governor Harmon signed this bill when it was presented to him—a day or two before it would have become a law without his signature. It is also true that in a speech before the democratic members and in a special message he urged, in very mild terms, its passage. At no time does the record show that he was very much interested in its fate, and in none of the utterances he made upon the subject did he display any zeal or fire on its behalf. To show just what he did say, and how much actual interest he took in the subject, here are his words—all of them—to the democratic caucus:

"The Wyman bill for the election of senators by direct vote is not a local matter. The entire United States is aroused on the subject. I expect to see the day when the majority of the United States senators vote for an amendment of that sort, but even if they do that and submit the question to the states, how many years is