

## Another Great Victory for Popular Government

Following is a dispatch to the St. Louis Republic: Washington, D. C., April 8.—The death knell of the old method of electing United States senators by the legislatures was sounded today.

Word reached Washington this afternoon that the ratification of the direct election amendment has been completed by the legislature of Connecticut.

This makes the thirty-sixth legislature to ratify the amendment. It now becomes, after the necessary formalities as to proclamation by the president, a part of the constitution.

In states that have not already done so, it will be necessary for the legislatures to provide the necessary machinery for the senatorial election and particularly to make provision for putting the names of the senatorial candidates on the ballot. In some of the states this already has been done.

The situation that results throughout the country where many legislatures have adjourned until 1915, is such as to leave confusion in the minds of members of the senate as to how the early steps toward direct election of senators would be carried out.

While the proclamation of the secretary of state announcing final ratification of the amendment by thirty-six states is required by law, Senators Bristow and Borah, leaders in the direct elections fight in congress, expressed the opinion that the amendment is for all practical purposes now a part of the constitution.

"Any man who may be elected to the senate hereafter must be elected directly," said Borah. "The new amendment gives to the state legislatures, however, the right to prescribe the methods for electing senators.

"Many legislatures have adjourned and will not reconvene until early in 1915, a few weeks before the terms of more than thirty senators expire. It is expected that in many states the legislatures will adopt the plan authorized in the new amendment and direct the governor to appoint senators temporarily until the people can elect men at regularly called elections."

Special sessions of the legislatures will be urged in many states so the necessary laws can be passed before the general elections of 1914.

In some states action has already been taken or will be before the legislatures end their present sessions, authorizing the people to vote for senators at next year's elections.

The choice of a senator in Maryland in the place of Senator Jackson would have been made by the legislature next year under the old system. A special session of the Maryland legislature would be necessary to provide laws by which a popular election could occur next year.

In the opinion of members of the senate, no successor can be appointed by the governor under the new provisions, when Senator Jackson's term expires, unless the legislature shall have especially directed such action.

When told that Connecticut had ratified the constitutional amendment providing for the election of senators by direct vote, the president said:

"I am sincerely glad that the amendment has been ratified so promptly and a reform so long fought for at last accomplished."

Secretary of State Bryan said:

"The state department will take no action until it receives official notification from all the states which are reported to have ratified the amendment.

"We are writing to all the states that are reported to have ratified the amendment but which have not officially notified this department, and we hope to have their official notification at an early day.

"I am very much gratified to learn that the amendment has been ratified."

The new amendment to the constitution, for the popular election of United States senators, is the seventeenth to be adopted. It reads:

"The senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each state, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each senator shall have one vote. The electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any state in the senate the executive authority of such state shall issue writ of

election to fill such vacancies, provided that the legislature of any state may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct."

The amendment primarily transfers the power of electing senators from the state legislatures to the people at the polls. To effect this change it was necessary to alter the machinery for the filling of vacancies in the senate.

For more than sixty years proposals have been made to change the constitution so as to provide for the direct election of senators. It was not, however, until June 24, 1911, that the senate was induced for the first time in its history to give its consent to the change.

On that day it voted to submit to the states the proposed amendment. The resolution to submit had already passed the house in a somewhat different form. Before adjournment of the session, both houses agreed to the language to be employed and the resolution was deposited with the secretary of state May 16, 1912, for distribution among the states.

The original theory in establishing the choice of senators was that they represented the states, whereas the members of the house represented the people of their districts. It was because of this theory of the state as a unit that all states, large and small, were given equal representation in the senate, Rhode Island having the same number as New York or Pennsylvania.

In the theory of the constitution-framers this entity of the state was thus made more distinct under the federal system, and the state legislature was regarded as the suitable medium for expressing the same state entity.

Later it was contended that state entity would still be preserved if the people of the entire state, instead of the legislature, chose its senators, and this view has now been accepted as the basis of the new system.

In 1826 the first action was taken in congress looking to a change. In that year Representative Storrs of New York introduced a resolution making senators elective by the people.

Another resolution of similar import was introduced by Representative Wright of Ohio in 1829. In 1850 Senator Clemens of Alabama introduced the first senatorial direct election resolution in the senate. Nothing resulted from these movements.

It was Andrew Johnson who revived congressional agitation for the direct election of senators. As a member of the house of representatives he introduced two resolutions for the change, and in 1860 renewed the agitation as a member of the senate.

In 1868, as president, he sent a special message to congress advocating the measure, and then repeated his recommendations in his annual message.

The subject was revived in 1873, 1876, 1886 and 1888, but without success. In 1893 the house agreed to the proposition, as it did in the succeeding congress, and still again in 1898, 1900 and 1902. The proposed change on none of these occasions won a favorable report from committees in the senate.

With the house thus arrayed year after year in favor of the change, the senate became the battleground. Senator Bristow of Kansas took the lead in advocacy of amending the constitution along this line. In December, 1909, he introduced his first resolution. A year later he obtained a report from the committee, but a feature had been tacked onto his proposal which brought on a fight in the senate, threatened to kill the entire proposition.

This interposed feature was to amend other provisions of the constitution so as to deprive the federal government of power to supervise the state regulations as to the time and manner of election. The votes of southern senators threatened to defeat the main proposition if the federal government was given this power.

Senator Root made a speech in which he criticized the method employed by southern states in depriving negroes of the right of suffrage. Senator Bacon replied that the federal government was being given the power once more to enact "force bills" and send armies and marshals into southern states to intimidate voters. On February 28, just before the end of the session, the resolution was defeated by four votes.

Senator Bristow reintroduced the resolution in the special session immediately following. The fight of the preceding session was refought, but this time the friends of the resolution won

by a vote of 64 to 24, or five more than the required two-thirds.

The house had passed a resolution which made it clear the federal government was not to interfere with senatorial elections in the states. For weeks the measure was in conference. Finally the house conferees receded and the house agreed to the senate measure by a vote of 237 to 39.

Previous to this time, the several states had taken the bit in their teeth by enacting laws which in effect did not wait for a constitutional amendment on the subject.

Probably the most successful of these was adopted in Oregon. It virtually directed the members of the legislature to elect the person who received the majority vote at the regular election, when the placing of the name of a candidate for United States senator upon the tickets was authorized.

The control of legislatures by great corporations was assigned by Senator Bristow as one of the main reasons for the demanded change. "With the development during recent times of the great corporate interests of the country," said he, "and the increased importance of legislation relating to their affairs, they have tenaciously sought to control the election of senators friendly to their interests.

"The power of these great financial and industrial institutions can be very effectively used in the election of senators by legislators, and they have many times during recent years used that power in a most reprehensible and scandalous manner. They have spent enormous amounts of money in corrupting legislatures to elect to the senate men of their own choosing."

One of the first speeches made in the senate during the twenty-year crusade for the change in favor of the direct election was by Senator Turpie of Indiana. In that speech he declared that the election of senators by legislatures was the one blemish on the democracy which was embodied in the American government.

One of the most notable speeches ever made in opposition to the change was that of Senator Hoar of Massachusetts in 1893. He stated the object of the election of senators by legislatures instead of by the people had been to remove one of the two bodies of legislation "from the operation of the fleeting passions of the hour, to lay its foundation below the frost and to remove the appointment of the men who are to compose it, as far as may be, from the temporary excitements which so often move the people to their own harm."

"I am not afraid to say to the American people that it is dangerous to trust any great power of government to their direct inconsiderate control," he added. "I am not afraid to tell them not only that their sober second thought is better than their hasty action, but that a government which is exposed to the hasty action of a people is the worst and not the best government on earth."

### A DEFINITE POLICY

The Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, in discussing the president's message, pays this high compliment to the president: "Even the opponents of the measure, or of the arguments advanced in its favor, will candidly admit, however, that the president and his party are endeavoring to redeem their pledges, to relieve the consumer, to open new channels to industry and commerce, and to promote national prosperity. There may be room for amendments and compromises; no rate is to be considered final; a full and searching discussion of the bill is assured. The administration will not wobble; it knows what it wants and will accept responsibility for the consequences of its policies; but it will welcome light and honest data from those who regard the proposed reductions as too radical."

### MR. UNDERWOOD'S EXPLANATION OF THE TARIFF BILL

(Continued from Page 5.)

protection of profits, the continued policy of hot-house growth for our industries—the stagnation of development that follows where competition ceases—or, on the other hand, the gradual reduction of our tariff to a basis where the American manufacturer must meet honest competition; where he must develop his business along the best and most economic lines; where, when he fights at home to control the market, he is forging the way in the economic development of his business to extend his trade in the markets of the world. The future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas."