

The Commoner.

VOL. I. NO. 10.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, MARCH 29, 1901.

\$1.00 a Year

William J. Bryan.

Editor and Proprietor.

Amendment by Convention.

Article V of the Federal Constitution provides: "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress."

The above mentioned provision makes it possible for the states to take the initiative in securing an amendment to the Constitution and is another illustration of the foresight of the early statesmen. For nearly ten years the people have been trying to secure an amendment providing for the election of senators by a direct vote of the people. In the fifty-second, Fifty-third, and Fifty-sixth Congresses the necessary resolution passed the House of Representatives but died in the Senate.

Not only did the resolution pass the House, but it passed each time by more than two-thirds vote.

Among the people there is practically no opposition to this reform, but the senate deliberately refuses to permit this change and defies public sentiment. The time has come for securing the amendment in spite of the senate's opposition. The voters, irrespective of party, should demand of the state legislatures such action as will result in compelling Congress to call a convention. When two-thirds of the states present their demand in a formal manner, the senate will yield and the victory will be complete. Now is the time for action. When United States senators are elected by the people, and therefore, directly responsible to them, it will be easier to secure any reform which the people desire.

Politics in Mexico.

Those who have watched the progress of Mexico during the last twenty-five years will earnestly hope for the recovery of President Diaz, about whose sickness such contradictory reports have been circulated. He has shown wonderful executive ability and under his administration great improvement has been noticeable in every direction. Education has become more general among the people; the army has been largely reduced—the number of commissioned officers as well as the

number of privates; business has prospered; human life and property rights have been made more secure, and the nation has constantly advanced in the opinion of the outside world. The Americans residing in Mexico have found in the president a just and faithful friend and his death would cause universal sorrow.

There is, however, no reason to predict, as some have done, disorder or revolution in case of his demise. Mexico has many able men. They are not well known abroad because the extraordinary merit of Diaz has overshadowed them, but they are men of education and executive experience.

General Reyes, who is often mentioned as "the next president," was for some time governor of Nuevo Leon, one of the larger states of the republic, and is now a member of the cabinet. At Monterey, the capital of his state, there is a considerable colony of Americans and General Reyes speaks our language fluently. He is a man of extended learning, courage and capacity.

Mr. Limenteur, the present secretary of finance, has also been mentioned as a possible successor to Diaz. He is of French descent and speaks that language in addition to Spanish and English. His management of the nation's finances has been very satisfactory and he is quite popular.

Whether the neighbor to the south of us is fortunate enough to retain the services of the present chief executive or is, by his death, compelled to choose a new president, there is every reason to believe that she has reached a point where she can count upon an indefinite continuation of her present period of development.

The Republic of Mexico is closely bound to us by political interests as well as by location, and her welfare must always be a matter of deep concern to our people.

Harrison's Last Words.

The March number of the North American Review contains an article from the pen of the late Benjamin Harrison. Having been written so shortly before his death, and dealing with public questions of the first importance, this article will probably be remembered as his last public utterance. It is fortunate for his memory and for the country that it presents sentiments so truly American and so thoroughly consistent with international morality, as well as with our nation's traditions. The following extract presents a glimpse of his argument, but it deserves perusal entire:

Mr. James Bryce recently said:

Indeed the struggles for liberty and nationality are almost beginning to be forgotten by the new generation, which has no such enthusiasm for these principles as men had forty years ago.

And the moment when two republics are in articulo mortis some of our journals congratulate us over the prospect of an increased trade with the

'Crown Colonies' that are to be set up in their stead and over the increased output of the Johannesburg mines. The emperor of Germany is reported to have forestalled President Kruger's personal appeal by the statement that Germany's interests would be promoted by the British conquest of the republics. And Bishop Thoburn asks: "Why should people lament the absorption of the small powers by the large ones?"

Never before has American sympathy failed, or been divided, or failed to find its voice, when a people were fighting for independence. Can we now calculate commercial gains before the breath of a dying republic has quite failed or the body has quite taken on the rigor mortis? If international justice, government by the people, the party of the nations, have ceased to be workable things and have become impracticable, shall we part with them with a sneer or simulate regret, even if we have lost the power to feel it? May not one be allowed to contemplate the heavens with suppressed aspirations, though there are no "consumers" there? Do we need to make a mock of the stars because we cannot appropriate them—because they do not take our produce? Have we deceived ourselves?

There was plainly no call for an armed intervention by the United States in South Africa, and perhaps our diplomatic suggestions went as far as usage would justify. But has not public opinion here been somehow strongly perverted or put under some unwonted repression? If we have lost either the right to denounce aggression or the capacity to weep when a republic dies it is a grievous loss.

On Dangerous Ground.

Hon. David B. Hill, like ex-President Cleveland, was invited to the dinner given a short time ago by the Crescent Democratic Club of Baltimore, and like Mr. Cleveland he sent his regrets. The letter which he wrote for that occasion contains several sentences which indicate that Mr. Hill is on dangerous ground. He seems to confess the criticisms made against the democratic party by the republicans and by the democrats who opposed the ticket.

He says "Labor and capital should be equally respected but neither should be unnecessarily assailed." The democratic party has never been accused of assailing labor, but it is a favorite pastime with the republicans to accuse it of assailing capital. The democratic party distinguishes between legitimate accumulations and predatory wealth but whenever predatory wealth is attacked it tries to shield itself behind honest capital.

Mr. Hill says "Opposition to dangerous corporate combinations should not be allowed to degenerate into indiscriminate attacks upon chartered rights." That is almost identical with the language used by the republicans in defending the trusts. They are always careful to assure the public that they condemn "hurtful," "injurious" and "dangerous" combinations, but they are solicitous about vested rights and are fearful lest the attacks may be "indiscriminate." The language used by Mr. Hill is generally employed