

had given out an interview expressing the opinion that there should be an investigation. Governor Deneen also declared Lorimer's proposition to elect the governor to the senatorship had involved the use of democratic votes, and Mr. Deneen expressed doubts that election by such a course would have the effect of healing breaches in the republican party, as Mr. Lorimer had expressed confidence it would.

"Mr. Lorimer gave reasons why the democrats would support me. I failed to see any reason why they should support me," said the writer of the long telegram. "The truth is," he added, "that this bi-partisan combination was formed to defeat me," and went on to say that the combination had made corrupt alliances with interests that could not use him.

"Senator Owen criticised Mr. Lorimer for not appearing before the investigation committee. He declared the question was not so much one as to a seat in the senate as of whether the senate should stifle bribery and corruption or encourage such practices. He denounced the bi-partisan combination as 'thievish and knavish.' He was strongly of the opinion that the 'jackpot' combination should be still investigated. 'We should not rest until we have dug up the 'jackpot' by the roots.'

"By this time a number of senators had left the chamber and Mr. Owen stopped to comment on their absence. Saying he would like to have a photograph of the scene, he exclaimed: 'I appeal against the senate to the people. I am not speaking now to the senate. I am speaking to the master of the senate. A masterful hand will place itself on the senate and will purge it of its members who do not respect the will of the people.'

"As for himself, the senator said, he would not stultify himself by giving his vote to the doctrine laid down by the committee on privileges and elections. Believing that doctrine to be immoral, he would have none of it, not even if he should be the only man to oppose it.

"Apparently in the face of much opposition from his own state, Senator Simmons, of North Carolina, delivered a brief address, giving the reasons why he would support Mr. Lorimer. He said that on the evidence taken he could not justify himself in voting to displace him, notwithstanding he thought there were fraudulent schemes practiced in the Illinois legislature.

"I do not believe the senator from Illinois bribed anybody to cast a vote for him, and I do not believe the evidence is sufficient to warrant us in believing that anybody was bribed by anyone for that purpose," said the North Carolina senator.

"When Mr. Simmons yielded the floor, Mr. Lorimer, himself addressed the chair, evidently to the surprise of most of the senators. He rose only to speak of Governor Deneen's telegram to Senator Owen. Taking up that message in detail he said an examination of it would verify all of the statements that he (Mr. Lorimer) had made to the senate.

"Senator Smith of Michigan succeeded Mr. Lorimer in addressing the senate. The senator expressed a conviction that the committee had not gone far enough in its investigation, nor was the country satisfied with the extent of the investigation. Mr. Smith said he could not find it in his heart to condone the offense with which he believed the Illinois senator to be connected.

"Senator LaFollette also spoke briefly in opposition to Mr. Lorimer. Mr. LaFollette declared 'every line of the testimony convicts the senator not of obtaining his seat by bribery, but of being a participant in the bribery.'

"He turned toward the seat of Senator Lorimer at the left. People in the gallery arose to see what the object of all this denunciation would do. There was an instant of intense silence.

"The gentleman is not in his seat," Mr. LaFollette said, as he turned away from it to face the senate. He went on then to review the circumstances which he considered substantiating his position and declared it was impossible that Mr. Lorimer should not have known what was going on.

"We cannot say just where the money came from," he said, "but we know that a large amount of it was used."

"Senator Burrows, chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, which investigated the Lorimer case and made its report exonerating the accused senator, was on his feet trying to interrupt. He tried to read from the minority report which declared that the evidence did not prove complicity on Lorimer's part in the alleged bribery.

"Does the senator yield?" asked the presid-

ing officer. The hand of the clock hovered over the half-hour mark and the people held their breath. The chairman's gavel was in the air.

"Just a minute, just a minute," cried Mr. LaFollette. "I know what the senator wants to say. You never can prove a thing like that, but you can know it. I don't know where the money came from that was used in an effort to defeat my own re-election to the senate, but I do know that a part of it came from Wall street."

"Bang! The gavel fell and Senator LaFollette sank back with the phrase 'Wall Street' on his lips. A tremor of hysterical laughter ran through the galleries.

"The hour of one-thirty having arrived," said the vice president, "the secretary will report the resolution." It was read: "Resolved, That William Lorimer was not duly and legally elected to a seat in the senate of the United States by the legislature of the state of Illinois."

"The secretary will call the roll."

"Mr. Aldrich"—and the vote was on."

OPINIONS ON THE VERDICT

Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald: "The nation's disgrace is written in the vote of the United States senate confirming Lorimer's right to a seat in that body. The vote put the capstone on what Elihu Root described as a 'foul conspiracy against the integrity and purity of our government.'"

Philadelphia North American, republican: "A good man, murdered last month by an irresponsible assassin, was bitterly denounced a few years ago because he wrote a series of articles which he called 'The Treason of the Senate.' For the first time we feel impelled to add a word of criticism to the burden put unfairly upon David Graham Phillips while he lived. He had no right to pre-empt a title that never was completely deserved before today. For only now does a sickened nation observe an open, shameless union of the 'old guards' of both nominal parties sacrificing personal decency, political principle, party and public needs to save the official place of the beneficiary of the foulest corruption in the history of American politics."

Denver Times: "The downward revision of the tariff that did not revise downward; the Ballinger case; the Lorimer vindication; the existing effort to block reciprocity with Canada; they furnish the material for a ponderous indictment that cannot be easily answered."

Louisville (Kentucky) Courier-Journal: "It was logical that the senate, which on Tuesday voted to deny the people the right to elect its members, voted to sustain the title of William Lorimer to his seat, notwithstanding the fact that it had been clearly proved that the most flagrant fraud in his interest had corrupted the legislature which gave him that seat. There are too many United States senators who do not wish to have any more to do with the people than they can help. Any sort of legislature is good enough for them, and for some of them the rottener the legislature the better it suits their purposes. The senate by its action in retaining Lorimer demonstrated anew it has less respect for itself than the people have for it as an institution. There is no question that the people would have it spotless in the sight of the world. There is no question that among the senators themselves Lorimer is by no means alone in his consciousness that, in their credentials, it is far from spotless. It is natural that other 'spots,' as they say in the produce market, should have sympathized with Lorimer, and have stood by him. It is natural even that there should have been some sympathy for him as a human being, just as there is for other human beings who get 'in bad.' But the decisive factor in the vote was the influence of the committee which investigated Lorimer's case. The men who composed this committee had no idea, when they formulated their report, how profoundly the country was interested in this matter. They formulated it as lawyers, looking no further than the shell of the law, and taking the course of least resistance. When they realized how greatly they had shocked the moral sentiment of the people there was nothing for them to do but stand by their action and make the best of it. The Lorimer case became their own case. It was they, more than Lorimer, who were on the defensive and they fought desperately against the condemnation of themselves which an expulsion of Lorimer would have implied. Among them were some of the most conspicuous figures of the senate; several of them individually commanded a much greater influence than Lorimer himself could do, and collectively they made such a struggle that it

would have been almost a miracle if they had been turned down. As it was, they escaped condemnation by only 6 votes, an escape from which they and Lorimer will extract scant comfort."

ELECTION OF SENATORS DEFEATED

The election of senators by popular vote was defeated in the United States senate during the same week that William Lorimer was given authority to retain his seat. The vote stood:

Against the proposition..... 33

For direct election..... 54

Two-thirds majority necessary.

The story is told by the Associated Press in this way: "Washington, Feb. 20.—The senate defeated the resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution to provide that senators be elected by direct vote of the people. A fight had been made by the supporters of the measure, as was indicated by the vote. Fifty-four senators stood for the resolution and thirty-three against it. Though this division showed so large a majority to favor popular elections, the number was not sufficient by four to carry the measure, which required a two-thirds vote. Immediately after the reading of the journal the popular vote resolution was taken up. So long had the resolution been before the senate and so carefully had the membership been canvassed by its supporters and its opponents that it was recognized from the moment the question was brought up that it would go down in defeat.

"Though it had been understood that debate would shut off on the measure when called up Senator Bacon, who determinedly has opposed the resolution as altered under the Sutherland amendment placing the control of elections in the hands of congress, hoped to have an amendment adopted that might render the measure acceptable to some of the southern senators. The Georgia senator's effort was to provide that federal supervision of the elections should apply only in those states wherein the legislatures had failed to designate the manner and method of holding the elections.

"Vice President Sherman ruled the Bacon amendment out of order and the roll call was begun. It was followed with deepest interest. For a moment it was thought the calculations would be upset, for when Senator Gallinger's name was reached his answer was aye. Looks of surprise were exchanged by many senators, for the long debate on the question had developed no more inveterate enemy to the resolution than the New Hampshire senator. The clerk had received several more responses before it had occurred to Mr. Gallinger that something was wrong. He arose in some haste and had his name shifted to the nays.

"The roll call was: Yeas—Bailey, Beveridge, Borah, Bourne, Bradley, Briggs, Bristow, Brown, Burkett, Burton, Carter, Chamberlain, Clapp, Clark (Wyoming), Clarke (Arkansas), Culbertson, Cullom, Cummins, Curtis, Davis, Dixon, Dupont, Frye, Gamble, Gore, Gronna, Guggenheim, Jones, LaFollette, McCumber, Martin, Nelson, Newlands, Nixon, Overman, Owen, Paynter, Perkins, Piles, Raynor, Shively, Simmons, Smith (Md.), Smith (Mich.), Smith (S. C.), Stephenson, Stone, Sutherland, Swanson, Taylor, Thornton, Warner, Watson, Young—54.

"Nays—Bacon, Bankhead, Brandegee, Bulkley, Burnham, Burrows, Crane, Depew, Dick, Dillingham, Fletcher, Flint, Foster, Gallinger, Hale, Heyburn, Johnston, Kean, Lodge, Lorimer, Money, Oliver, Page, Penrose, Perry, Richardson, Root, Scott, Smoot, Tallaferro, Tillman, Warren, Wetmore—33.

"The absentees were Senators Aldrich, Crawford, Frazier and Terrell of Georgia. It was announced that, had they been present, Frazier would have voted aye, Terrell, nay. There was no announcement about Mr. Aldrich. Senator Crawford, entering after the roll call was complete, said he had been delayed by a stalled street car and would have voted aye.

"When the resolution was declared lost, there was no demonstration of any sort. From the democratic side of the floor, there were several modulated calls of 'good, good!' The Sutherland amendment had made the measure unpopular with some of the far southern senators.

"Senator Borah, who has been in charge of the resolution for the election of senators by direct vote, was gratified over the result, notwithstanding he lacked four votes of getting the requisite two-thirds.

"When it is demonstrated," he said, "that the senate stands within four of two-thirds it is certain that the real fight is over.

"The resolution will be again introduced at the first session of congress," he said, "regular or extraordinary, and urged unremittingly. The next congress, in my judgment, will pass favorably on the resolution."