

Senator Bailey's Farewell Speech

Following are Associated Press dispatches: Austin, Tex., Jan. 2.—Governor Colquitt announced tonight that he has been officially advised that the resignation of United States Senator Bailey will be presented within the next few days. He said he would appoint R. M. Johnson, editor of the Houston Post, to complete Senator Bailey's unexpired term.

Washington, Jan. 2.—Senator Joseph W. Bailey of Texas, long one of the picturesque figures and striking speakers of the United States senate, delivered today before crowded floor and galleries, his final speech as a member of that body. Within a day or two his resignation will be laid before the senate and communicated to Governor Colquitt of Texas, his expectation being that R. M. Johnson of Houston will be named to fill out his term, which would end March 4.

Senator Bailey's speech was an attack upon the principles of the initiative and referendum as institutions that would, if adopted, bring about the overthrow of the present system of American government. He declared they originated in the desire of politicians to escape the responsibility for action on such petty questions as the location of state capitals and the settlement of prohibition fights. As institutions of government he declared that the schemes for direct legislation by the people would convert the United States from a republic to a democracy and would give its control into the hands of "the unskilled, the idle and the vicious."

An attack upon William R. Hearst in the course of his speech in which he characterized Mr. Hearst as "a miserable dog," who had "hounded him," brought Senator Ashurst of Arizona to his feet. He attempted to answer this phase of Mr. Bailey's attack upon radical newspapers and magazines but was stopped by the Texas senator with the remark that "he could make that reply outside."

Later Mr. Ashurst took the floor in his own right and in the course of his defense of the system of direct government paid a tribute to Mr. Hearst as a loyal American citizen.

Galleries were crowded to their utmost capacity and long lines of people waited in the corridors for an opportunity to hear the Texan's farewell address to the senate. To the membership of the senate was added nearly seventy-five members of the house, who filled the benches and lined the walls along the floor of the chamber. Senator Bailey spoke for four hours. Throughout that time he received the closest attention from members and spectators. As he concluded a wave of applause swept through the galleries, bringing a sharp reprimand from Senator Gallinger, the presiding officer.

President-elect Wilson, although quoted liberally by Senator Bailey in defense of his declaration that direct legislation is not in accord with principles of American government, received only commendation from the Texas senator.

"If the man we have elected president of the United States gives the country a sane and satisfactory administration," he declared, "the republican party will never nominate another candidate for the presidency."

"Why should you?" he continued, advancing toward the republican side of the chamber. "You did not carry but two states this year and those two of the smallest. The contest four years from now will be between us and the Rooseveltians. He (Roosevelt) will take some more, but, thank God, they will be the kind we can afford to lose. Our conflict is with Roosevelt. If our president believes he can take the radical vote away from Roosevelt he is mistaken."

Senator Bailey declared that in states where constitutional amendments had been submitted to the people but a small proportion of the citizens voted upon them. In Wisconsin, he said, it ran as low as from 24 to 36 per cent. In Oregon, he declared, on a question involving the future of the state's university, in which the public had become keenly interested, but 80 per cent had voted upon the question.

"The only man who can do that, and he has not succeeded well, is Eugene V. Debs. He is the only man who can out-Roosevelt in attracting the radical vote. What the democratic party needs is not the radical, but the democratic."

Much of Senator Bailey's speech was devoted to excerpts and quotations from the writings of the men who organized and administered the early years of the American government and of

students who had in later years described the effect of direct legislation upon its principles. From the former he drew what he said was unquestionable proof that the United States began as a representative government and not a democracy of direct legislation. From the latter, among whom was Governor Wilson, he quoted to show that the opinion of students was that the people were not so well qualified to legislate as were seasoned men selected by them who framed their legislation in deliberative assembly.

At one point Senator Bailey produced a book of 208 pages which he said represented the thirty-two questions submitted to the direct vote of the people of Oregon in one year.

"Now, honor bright," he said, "how many citizens do you suppose there are who studied those questions? How many understood them when they did study them? I do not mean to reflect on the intelligence of the people when I say they could not understand them with the opportunity they were given to study them. I could not do it myself."

He declared that in Switzerland the people had become disgusted with the constant necessity of voting on questions of government and had gradually refused to go to the polls. A compulsory voting law, he said, had not succeeded and they had finally determined to pay voters.

"Make 'em vote, and if they won't pay 'em to vote, is the principle suggested," said Senator Bailey.

Senator Ashurst, answering Senator Bailey, declared that the percentage of people who voted on public questions in the states where direct legislation was attempted, was fully as great as the percentage of United States senators, "sworn and paid to vote on legislation," who voted on the majority of the subjects before the senate. Senator Ashurst in his defense of Mr. Hearst, declared that his name was associated with the name of many projects to promote happiness of the people and the perpetuity of American institutions and declared that he was a firm friend, a loving husband and a faithful father.

"More than that I need not say; less than that I could not say," he added.

Senator Bailey's address dealt principally with the principle of the initiative and referendum, and he directed his words toward his resolution declaring that such a system of direct legislation as the initiative and referendum would establish is in conflict with the principle on which the government is founded.

"During my service of more than twenty years in the two houses of congress," said Senator Bailey, "I have never delivered an address in either of them intended more for the country at large than for the body itself, and I would not now depart from that rule, except for the extraordinary situation in which we find ourselves with respect to these questions."

Senator Bailey declared the advocates of this "extraordinary form of government" had conducted a systematic campaign for years in behalf of their views. He desired, he said, to present arguments against such a system of direct legislation.

"The wise and patriotic statesmen who dedicated this republic to liberty and independence," declared Senator Bailey, "rejected a direct democracy in which the people would rule without the intervention of representatives and adopted representative democracy."

The senator quoted from statesmen who participated in the formation of the constitution and the organization of the government to show that they had never intended that the republican form of government should give way to direct legislation by the people, such as the initiative and referendum would provide.

Senator Bailey's address included long extracts from the writings of Alexander Hamilton.

"This is a republic democracy," he said, and cited again opinions of men identified with history to prove that a "representative democracy" was better than a true democracy.

Senator Bailey said he would not quote from lawyers, because they "do not seem to be in high favor now with those who wish to work this change in the government."

"I never had a client who was my master in any manner," he declared at one point. Mr. Bailey quoted from the words of President-elect Wilson. "I am a democrat," said Senator Bailey, "and though I did not favor his selection, no man living hopes more for the success of his administration than I do."

He quoted from Governor Wilson's works to

the effect that the views men expressed on the stump were often tempered by the "common counsel" they enjoy when they finally come into control of the government."

Senator Bailey declared no more thorough presentation of the character of representative government had been made than that of Governor Wilson's book. Mr. Bailey said the advocates of the direct form of government declared they were not working for the overthrow of this government.

"They are mistaken," he said, "in the belief that they can establish a direct form of government without overthrowing the whole structure of representative government."

"It has come to a choice between the side led by the mighty spirits of another day and the side led by the noisy demonstrators of today."

Attacking journals and papers, Mr. Bailey picked up a magazine published by William R. Hearst.

"A moral pervert, a political degenerate, a physical coward," shouted the senator, referring to Mr. Hearst.

Mr. Ashurst of Arizona jumped to his feet.

"Mr. President, I would be false to friendship," he began.

"If you want to reply to that, you can do so outside," interrupted Mr. Bailey heatedly.

"Very well, I'll do so," retorted Mr. Ashurst, sitting down.

Mr. Bailey quoted one of the letters published by Mr. Hearst, purporting to have been written by Mr. Bailey from the senate, February 26, 1900.

"I did not even become a member of the senate until March 4, 1901," said Mr. Bailey. He declared Mr. Hearst had used "stolen letters" in an attempt to create the impression that the Standard Oil company controlled legislation, while many of the letters used, he said, were in fact unrelated to any matter of legislation.

Senator Bailey said the cry today of the new movement was, "Let the people rule." He denounced that as false.

"There are the southern states," he said. "There is not a southern state that has adopted woman suffrage, and I hope they will not. I can not understand how any woman wants to step down from the high pedestal upon which man has placed her to mingle in the broils and debaucheries of politics. No, the southern states believe in the rule of the men people. Not only in that, but in the white men people, and I agree with them."

THE BISMARCK ORDER

Several newspapers referred to the Bismarck order forbidding the marriage to "foreign" women of German diplomats as a "serious indictment against American women." But a Washington Herald editorial says: No such thing! If it were, Miss Langham never would have become Baroness Speck von Sternburg, nor Miss Luckmeyer Countess von Bernstorff, nor Miss Hoyt Baroness Stumm, etc. None of these unions could have been consummated without the kaiser's personal consent, obtained after a thorough investigation by his privy cabinet ("Geheim-Kabinet"). As a matter of fact, Bismarck's order had been a dead letter for years, as it was meant to be, for in military Germany, as a rule, orders are not given to be neglected, and was renewed for the sole purpose of tabooing the contemplated marriage of a rising diplomat with a girl considered socially undesirable, for a reason, for the sake of the highly estimable young lady (of western Europe), we will not name. Whenever, on rare occasions, such a dilemma presents itself, that notorious old rule of Prince Bismarck is brought forth from the "Rumpel Kammer," and, as an alternative placed before the astonished would-be benedict. Nor is there a scintilla of truth in the statement that such unions in German diplomatic circles are once more strictly to be prohibited because "foreign wives of German diplomats are unable to keep state secrets." It is true, Bismarck made use of that impression in the early '70's, when he issued his famous prohibitory rule. But he referred to one specific case only, and, in the light of his exceptional difficulties at the time with one of the German diplomats, he had a perfect right to say so.

Subscribers to The Commoner who commenced with the first issue of the paper should renew their subscriptions now to avoid the possibility of missing an issue of the paper.