

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 Three Months .25 Six Months .50 Single Copy .05 In Clubs of Five or more, per year... .75 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 postoffice money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

DISCONTINUANCES—It is found that a large majority of our subscribers prefer not to have their subscriptions interrupted and their files broken in case they fail to remit before expiration. It is therefore assumed that continuance is desired unless subscribers order discontinuance, either when subscribing or at any time during the year.

PRESENTATION COPIES—Many persons subscribe for friends, intending that the paper shall stop at the end of the year. If instructions are given to that effect they will receive attention at the proper time.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '06, means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1910. Two weeks are required after money 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.

- Alabama—1909, August; 10 by voluntary party regulations. Arkansas—1901, April 25; by voluntary party regulations. California—1908, April 10; directly through primary. Colorado—1901, April 1. Connecticut—(See table B.) Delaware— Florida—Directly (law of 1901). Georgia—By voluntary party regulations. Idaho—1901, February 21; directly through primary. Illinois—1903, April 9; directly (law of 1908). Indiana—1908, March 19; directly. Iowa—1907, March 12; directly (law of 1907). Kansas—1909, March 1; directly (law of 1908). Kentucky—1902, February 10; voluntary party regulation used in 1907. Louisiana—1907, November 25; directly (law of 1906). Maine—(See Table B.) Maryland—Directly by voluntary party regulations. Massachusetts—(See Table B.) Michigan—1908, March 11; directly. Minnesota—1901, February 9. Mississippi—Directly (law of 1902). Missouri—1907, March 6; directly (law of 1907). Montana—1907, February 21; directly (law of 1905). Nebraska—1903, March 25; directly (law of 1907). Nevada—1903; directly. New Hampshire—(See Table B.) New Jersey—1907, May 28; directly (law of 1908). New York—(See Table B.) North Carolina—1907, March 11. North Dakota—Directly (law of 1907). Ohio—Directly advise. (See Table B.) Oklahoma—1908, January 9; directly (law of 1908). Oregon—1908, March 12; directly (law of 1904). Pennsylvania—1901, February 6. Rhode Island—(See Table B.) South Carolina—By voluntary party regulations. South Dakota—1908, March 18; directly (law of 1907). Tennessee—1905, March 14; act of 1908 for

direct nomination was later held invalid. Texas—1901, April 17; directly (law of 1907). Utah—1903, March 12. Vermont—1903, March 7; (See Table B) Virginia—By voluntary party regulations. Washington—1903, March 7; directly (law of 1907). West Virginia— Wisconsin—1908, March 11; directly (law of 1903). Wyoming—1895, February 16.

TABLE B

States That Have Not Yet Passed Resolutions and Applications, But Showing the Real Endorsement of Popular Sentiment

Connecticut—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. Delaware— Florida—People directly nominate senators under law of 1901. Georgia—People by party regulation, through primary, instruct their legislature. Maine—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. Maryland—People directly nominate by voluntary party regulation. Massachusetts—On May 11, 1910, the lower branch of the legislature passed a resolution favoring election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, but this was defeated by the state senate. Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. Mississippi—People directly nominate under law of 1902. New Hampshire—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. New York—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. North Dakota—People directly nominate under law of 1907. Ohio—People directly advise as to United States senators. The state permits under the law of 1908 direct nomination of senators by primary. Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. Rhode Island—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. South Carolina—People nominate by voluntary party regulations. Vermont—Democratic platform of 1910 demands popular election of senators. Virginia—People nominate by voluntary regulations. West Virginia—

TABLE C

States That Seem to Have Disqualified Through Some Failure in Detail in Their Resolutions or Their Applications

Alabama—Application was made specifically to the Sixty-first congress. As this congress expires on March 4, 1911, there will probably be no time for it to act, so their application will be thrown out. It is further said that nothing on the subject from this legislature is on the files of congress. Arkansas—Did not send its application to congress, but to the president to be presented by him to the congress. California—Did not make application to congress, but its joint resolution read "that our senators be instructed and our representatives be requested to vote for the submission of an amendment, etc." Kansas—Did not send its application to congress, but to the vice president of the United States and to the speaker. Kentucky—Though its application seems properly made out to be sent to the president of the senate and to the speaker, it is said that the application is not on the files of congress. As this resolution was passed in 1902, over eight years ago, the application, if such were made, is probably lost. Missouri—The joint resolution of the state legislature did not mention any application to congress in any form whatever. Montana—Did not present its resolution and application to congress, but to the president of the United States, to the speaker of the house and to its representatives in congress. Nevada—In sending its resolution and application ignored the senate and applied to the president of the United States, the speaker and the state representatives in the congress. North Carolina—Did not send its application to the president of the senate, but to the vice president of the United States (a technical error which the senate would not overlook), to

the speaker and to the state's representatives in congress.

Oklahoma—Resolution and application does not state directly and specifically that its legislature desires a constitutional amendment on popular election of United States senators, but it "wishes to join with other states for a constitutional convention, and that at such convention Oklahoma will propose among other amendments the one on direct election, etc." Whether this technicality will pass the senate is, at least it seems, doubtful. It makes its application to both houses, not to the president of the senate and to the speaker of the house of representatives.

Pennsylvania—While the application seems addressed in proper form, it is said that no application is on file in congress. Perhaps as this was made nine years ago, it has been lost or mislaid.

Tennessee—Like Nevada, ignored the senate and sent its application to the president of the United States, the speaker and to its representatives in congress.

Texas—Seems to have its resolution and application in proper form, but it is said that no application is on file in congress. After a lapse of nine years it is probably lost.

Utah—Ignored the senate and sent its application to the president of the United States and to the speaker of the house.

Washington—Failed, like Missouri, to make any provision in its resolution to bring it before congress, but merely urged other state legislatures to pass a similar resolution.

Wyoming—Did not apply to either senate or house in any form, but merely to its senators and representatives to bring it to the attention of congress.

LAFOLLETTE'S WARNING

Senator Robert M. LaFollette gives his views of the significance of the election results and incidentally provides the democrats with a warning in this way: "The result of the fall election is a declaration in plain terms that the people of this country will have no more senate and house committees in the American congress dictated in Morgan's private office, and no more bills drawn by his attorneys in New York, Philadelphia and Boston. It serves notice that laws shall be enacted and government administered in the public interest, or the men and the party responsible will be driven out of power. "It was not a democratic victory in the states where democracy won. It was a republican defeat. It condemns the Taft administration — Ballinger, Wickersham, Hitchcock and their like. It is a repudiation of Aldrichism in the senate and Cannonism in the house. It is a stern warning to the republican party to renounce, in executive and legislative departments of government the leadership of administrative officers, senators and representatives who are, in fact, the petty servants of the Morgan system. "The election was otherwise deeply significant. Where insurgency was strong, where there was real progressive leadership, loyal and unfaltering, it won loyal and unfaltering support. No progressive leader, however popular, was able to make the progressive vote subservient to any party. Wherever attempted, thousands of progressives withheld their votes in disgust or cast them for democrats as a rebuke and a warning against any attempts to compromise the progressive cause for a party advantage. "In the final analysis, the real significance of the November election is that the American people did their best to express their approval of progress and their disapproval of reaction and compromise."

A live, energetic young democratic attorney desires to locate in a new, growing town in the southwest, Oklahoma preferred. Kindly send information as to desirable opening to Department L, Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.