

Election Results

President Wilson was re-elected November 7 by the largest popular vote ever given a candidate for that office. He carried a majority of the states, and received a majority in the electoral college of 10 votes, with a possibility of adding Minnesota (now doubtful) to the list. A partial estimate of the popular vote gives President Wilson 8,563,713 votes to 8,160,401 for Charles E. Hughes, or a plurality of 403,313.

The senate remains democratic. Four present democratic members, according to the latest indications, have been defeated. They are Senators Kern and Taggart of Indiana; Martine, of New Jersey, and Chilton, of West Virginia. Four republican senators, Lippitt, of Rhode Island; Clark, of Wyoming; DuPont, of Delaware, and Sutherland, of Utah, have lost their seats on the basis of the returns.

The status of the house of representatives remains in doubt at the present time. The republicans gained a number of seats, and an official count in some of the districts may be needed to determine the control of the next house. A Washington dispatch, dated November 14, states that Representative Doremus of Michigan, chairman of the democratic congressional committee, predicts that despite unofficial returns indicating the election of five more republicans than democrats, that the final canvass would give the democrats control and that the present speaker would be re-elected. Representative Doremus claimed that 212 democrats and only 211 republicans had been elected and that there are nine doubtful districts. The present unofficial results now indicate the election of 217 republicans, 212 democrats, two progressives and one progressive-protectionist, one independent, one socialist and one prohibitionist.

Prohibition was successful in Nebraska, Montana, Michigan, South Dakota, Idaho and Alaska. Prohibition lost in Missouri and California. Missouri is reported dry by 6,000 votes outside of the city of St. Louis, which returned an overwhelming wet majority. Prohibition carried in Kansas City, and Jackson county, in which Kansas City is located.

Woman suffrage lost in South Dakota by a small majority.

Oregon defeated the proposition establishing the single tax in that state.

Senators Elected

Following are successful senatorial nominees, as indicated by the returns at hand:
 Arkansas—W. F. Kirby, democrat.
 California—H. W. Johnson, republican.
 Connecticut—G. R. McLean, republican.
 Delaware—Joseph O. Wolcott, democrat.
 Florida—P. M. Trammell, democrat.
 Indiana—H. S. New, republican; J. E. Watson, republican.
 Maryland—I. J. France, republican.
 Massachusetts—H. C. Lodge, republican.
 Michigan—C. E. Townsend, republican.
 Minnesota—F. B. Kellogg, republican.
 Mississippi—John Sharp Williams, democrat.
 Missouri—J. A. Reed, democrat.
 Montana—H. L. Meyers, democrat.
 Nebraska—G. M. Hitchcock, democrat.
 Nevada—Key Pittman, democrat.
 New Jersey—J. S. Frelinghuysen, republican.
 New Mexico—A. A. Jones, democrat.
 New York—W. M. Calder, republican.
 North Dakota—P. J. McCumber, republican.
 Ohio—Atlee Pomerene, democrat.
 Pennsylvania—P. C. Knox, republican.
 Rhode Island—P. G. Gerry, democrat.
 Tennessee—K. D. McKellar, democrat.
 Texas—C. A. Culberson, democrat.
 Utah—W. H. King, democrat-progressive.
 Vermont—C. S. Page, republican.
 Virginia—C. A. Swanson, democrat.
 Washington—Miles Poindexter, republican.
 Wisconsin—R. M. LaFollette, republican.
 West Virginia—Howard Sutherland, republican.
 Wyoming—John B. Kendrick, democrat.

Governors Chosen

States which elected state tickets chose the following governors, as indicated by present returns:
 Arizona—G. W. P. Hunt, democrat.
 Arkansas—C. H. Brough, democrat.
 Colorado—J. C. Gunter, democrat.

ELECTORAL VOTE FOR PRESIDENT

State	Dem.	Rep.	State	Dem.	Rep.
Alabama	12	..	Nevada	3	..
Arizona	3	..	N. Hampshire	4	..
Arkansas	9	..	New Jersey	14	..
California	13	..	New Mexico	3	..
Colorado	6	..	New York	45	..
Connecticut	7	..	N. Carolina	13	..
Delaware	3	..	N. Dakota	5	..
Florida	6	..	Ohio	24	..
Georgia	14	..	Oklahoma	10	..
Idaho	4	..	Oregon	5	..
Illinois	29	..	Pennsylvania	38	..
Indiana	15	..	Rhode Island	5	..
Iowa	13	..	S. Carolina	9	..
Kansas	10	..	S. Dakota	5	..
Kentucky	13	..	Tennessee	12	..
Louisiana	10	..	Texas	20	..
Maine	6	..	Utah	4	..
Maryland	8	..	Vermont	4	..
Massachusetts	18	..	Virginia	12	..
Michigan	15	..	Washington	7	..
*Minnesota	W. Virginia	8	..
Mississippi	10	..	Wisconsin	13	..
Missouri	18	..	Wyoming	3	..
Nebraska	8	..			
Montana	4	..	Totals	276	243

*Doubtful, 12. Necessary to elect, 266.

- Connecticut—M. H. Holcomb, republican.
- Delaware—J. G. Townsend, republican.
- Florida—W. V. Knott, democrat.
- Georgia—H. M. Dorsey, democrat.
- Idaho—Moses Alexander, democrat.
- Illinois—F. O. Lowden, republican.
- Indiana—J. P. Goodrich, republican.
- Iowa—W. L. Harding, republican.
- Kansas—Arthur Capper, republican.
- Massachusetts—S. W. McCall, republican.
- Michigan—A. E. Sleeper, republican.
- Minnesota—J. A. A. Burnquist, republican.
- Montana—Sam V. Stewart, democrat.
- Missouri—F. D. Gardner, democrat.
- Nebraska—Keith Neville, democrat.
- New Hampshire—H. W. Keyes, republican.
- New Jersey—W. E. Edge, republican.
- New York—C. S. Whitman, republican.
- New Mexico—E. C. De Baca, democrat.
- North Carolina—T. W. Bickett, democrat.
- North Dakota—L. J. Frazier, republican.
- Ohio—J. M. Cox, democrat.
- Rhode Island—R. L. Beeckman, republican.
- South Carolina—R. I. Manning, democrat.
- South Dakota—Peter Norbeck, republican.
- Tennessee—T. C. Rye, democrat.
- Texas—J. E. Ferguson, democrat.
- Utah—Simon Bamberger, democrat.
- Vermont—H. F. Graham, republican.
- Washington—Ernest Lister, democrat.
- West Virginia—J. E. Robinson, republican.
- Wisconsin—E. L. Phillip, republican.

The various prohibition campaigns disclosed very plainly the inherent crookedness of the liquor business. In one of these campaigns did the advocates of the saloon pay the least attention to facts, but spread their networks of lies in the hope of catching enough ignorant persons in them. Their inability to fight squarely and decently was shown by the devices they employed to mislead voters into voting contrary to their wishes. In Nebraska the liquor men got out cards telling voters that the way to vote dry was to put a cross in the prohibition party circle, a clear loss to the dry amendment when done. A cause that bases its hopes for success on such rank fraud can not make any headway.

The investments made by a number of eminent republicans in various parts of the country panned out very poorly on the seventh of November. They will be unable to exchange any of their campaign fund contributions for ambassadorships to London, et al.

San Francisco formerly objected seriously to being referred to as the earthquake city, but since the last election, when Wilson carried the county by a tremendous majority, they can scarcely refuse to admit its descriptive character.

There will be a life-time feud between Mr. Hughes and Mr. Roosevelt; each will insist that the other did it.

A DEMOCRATIC RESPONSIBILITY

The state of Nebraska has declared with a note of finality for the banishment of the liquor business. While doing this, it has placed the state government, including probably the legislature, in control of the party which has hitherto been dominated by the liquor interests. This result occurs partly because of the tremendous sweep of Wilson sentiment in the state. A strong ticket head always helps along the ticket tail. The result occurs in part, however, because many "dry" democrats trusted the pledges of Mr. Neville and of the party candidates in general that they would do their full duty in the enforcement of prohibition if that should carry. In the light of experience the "drys" have been justified in an unwillingness to entrust the administration of dry policies to wet men. In every legislature and in other offices there have been wet men who owned their own souls and could not be herded by the liquor managers. But they have been noble exceptions. The rule has been to the contrary. Wet legislators have usually taken liquor orders, not only in matters pertaining directly to them, but in others as well. That is to say, the greatest number of the wets have not only been wet, but they have been slaves of the special interests involved in the liquor issue.

Nevertheless, until their conduct proves the contrary, the "wets" who have been elected to make and administer the prohibition laws are entitled to the benefit of the doubt. They will have a harder task than if they were drys. If Mr. Neville gives himself whole heartedly to making the prohibition policy a success in Nebraska, he will have to turn his back on the men who have been most active in nominating and electing him governor. He will have to be a strong and self reliant man with a high sense of duty to do that, for it will carry with it loss of friendships and bring upon him bitter political and personal opposition. We do not refer here to the great mass of anti-prohibitionists, most of whom will accept the situation and loyally support the enforcement of the law. We refer to the business interests which will be hoping for prohibition to be discredited and which will expect the men they helped into office to assist them in the discrediting. Attorney General Reed in particular will have to change his ways if he is to be a successful official in this respect. His career thus far as attorney general has given the impression of a weak lawyer and a four flusher. But Mr. Reed, too, is entitled to have the best expected of him. We say the same of the new Lancaster county sheriff. Sheriff Hyers was beaten because the voters thought, mistakenly or not, that he was trying to play both the dry and the wet. They said they preferred an avowed wet to a doubtful dry, trusting that his sense of duty would overcome his personal predilections. Until Sheriff Simmons shows inability thus to rise to his duty, he is entitled to be assumed to be an honest man and will be a faithful officer.

The democratic party in Nebraska now faces a crisis. It has been the liquor party. It can continue to be the liquor party and sink, in a state which shows a wholesale aversion to the liquor business, to the insignificant position which it occupied in Nebraska before Mr. Bryan built it into a formidable opposition. Or it can "get wise," as the democratic party in Kansas and Iowa has finally done, put itself in harmony with the moral and economic sense of the state, and remain in position to do its share in making the Nebraska of the future. Which choice is to be made we shall know definitely when the new legislature and the new state administration get to work. We hope with all our heart that the party chooses the better part. — Nebraska State Journal (Rep.).

The real importance of the war news that is coming from Europe these days was disclosed when the election returns began to come in. Even a torpedoed liner was unable to get more than a few lines on the front page.

Extra copies of this issue will be mailed in bulk to one address or to list of separate addresses at the rate of 2 1/2 c per copy.