homes, returning late, which precludes any real work until January.

The reasons for the adoption of the proposed amendment are these:

First. Congress should at the earliest practicable time enact the principles of the majority of the people, as expressed in the election of each Congress. That is why the Constitution requires the election of a new Congress every two years. If it is not to reflect the sentiment of the people these frequent elections have no meaning or purpose. Any evasion of this is subversive of the fundamental principle of our Government, that the majority shall rule. No other nation in the world has its legislative body convene so long after the expression of the people upon governmental questions.

During the campaign preceding a congressional election the great questions that divide the political parties are thoroughly discussed for the purpose of determining the policy of the Government and of having the sentiments of the majority crystalized into legislation. It seems trifling with the rights of the people when their mandates can not be obeyed within a reasonable time. It is unfair to an administration that the legislation which it thinks so essential to the prosperity of the country should be so long deferred. It is true an extraordinary session may be called early, but such sessions are limited generally to one or two subjects, which of necessity make enormous waste of the time of each House, waiting for the other to consider and pass the measures.

Second. As the law is at the present time, the second regular session does not convene until after the election of the succeeding Congress. As an election often changes the political complexion of a Congress, under the present law many times we have the injustice of a Congress that has been disapproved by the people enacting laws for the people opposed to their last expression. Such a condition does violence to the rights of the majority. A Member of the House of Representatives can barely get started in his work until the time arrives for the nominating convention of his district. He has accomplished nothing, and hence has made no record upon which to go before his party or his people. This is an injustice both to the Members and to the people. The record of a Representative should be completed before he asks an indorsement of his course.

Third. Under the present system a contest over a seat in the House of Representatives is seldom ever decided until more than half the term, and in many instances until a period of 22 months of the term has expired. For all that time the occupant of the seat draws the salary, and when his opponent is seated he also draws the salary for the full term; thus the Government pays for the representation from that district twice. But that is not the worst feature of the situation; during all of that time the district is being misrepresented, at least politically, in Congress.

By Congress meeting the first Monday in January succeeding the elections, contested-election cases can be disposed of at least during the first six months of the Congress.

Fourth. The President and Vice President should enter upon the performance of their duties as soon as the new Congress can count the electoral votes. The newly elected governors of our States are inducted into office as soon as the new legislatures of the States canvass the votes and declare their election. It is the old Congress which now counts the electoral votes. It is dangerous to permit the defeated party to retain control of the machinery by which such important officers are declared elected.

In the event that no candidate for President receives a majority of the electoral votes, the Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall elect the President, the representation from each State having one vote. At the present time it is the old Congress that elects the President under such contingency, and thereby it becomes possible for a political party repudiated by the people to elect a President who was defeated at the election. Under the present provision of the Constitution, in the event the House fails to choose a President before the 4th of March, then the Vice President then in office becomes President for four years. This affords a great temptation, by mere delay, to defeat the will of the people, and if it is ever exercised it will likely produce a revolution.

It is true that January weather would likely be inclement for an inaugural parade, but that is a reason too insignificant to constitute an argument against a constitutional amendment which promises so much for good government. Nearly all the governors of the States are inaugurated in January. The pomp and ceremony which usually attend the coronation of monarchs are at least not necessary to a republic.

For these reasons we favor the adoption of the resolution, amended as herein suggested.

Signed by Jno. K. Shields, Henry F. Ashurst, Knute Nelson, Albert B. Cummins, W. E. Chilton, Duncan U. Fletcher.

DISARMAMENT NECESSARY

Mr. Borah's plan for a "naval holiday" for the United States, Great Britain and Japan has not travelled very far as yet, but it may take on speed at any time. Conditions favor its growth in popularity. The people of this country have grown so accustomed to spending large sums for armament and they have been so impregnated with the preparedness argument, that it may take them some little time to grasp the significance of the enormous expenditures now contemplated. When they do realize what those expenditures must mean, however, they are apt to demand the immediate application of what seems on its face a promising remedy, and they are apt to press this demand very insistently and without taking due thought of what the consequences may be.

Mr. Borah's plan looks very attractive at first sight. If Japan and Britain stop building warships, why must we continue to build them? The average man, especially the man who has stopped to think of what those warships are going to cost him in taxes, cannot see why. Yet there are cogent reasons and some of them, at least, can be stated quite briefly.

Suppose all three nations stop building and simply maintain the naval status quo. That will leave Britain far superior to us in capital ships and Japan slightly inferior. In a naval war with Britain we should be hopelessly outclassed. In a naval war with Japan we might well be at a serious disadvantage because the principal theater of such a war would probably be the Philippines, where Japan could concentrate her whole strengh and we could concentrate only a part of ours.

It must be borne constantly in mind that the naval holiday plan provides no safeguard against war. It does not provide any method for the peaceful settlement of disputes. War is just as likely to come if there is a naval holiday as if there is none. That being the case, Americans must of necessity ask themselves whether, if we have a naval holiday, we shall be in position to take care of ourselves in case of war; and the answer to that question is No.

On the other hand, if there is no naval holiday, America, because of her greater resources, can outbuild both Britain and Japan and soon be in a position where she can feel safe if war comes.

It is necessary to consider this matter in a completely unsentimental way. We have no right to risk the safety of America. Terrible as is the prospect of resumption on a greater scale than ever of the competition in armaments, we cannot endorse the naval holiday plan. It is not the way to disarmament. It neglects the one all-important and absolutely necessary thing—the thing that must be accomplished before disarmament becomes feasible. That thing is the consummation of an agreement by the nations to settle their disputes peacefully, not by the use of force, and the setting up of machinery to that end. When that has been done, disarmament will be practicable; but not until then. May that time come soon, for the day is almost at hand when only disarmament can avert ruin. —Charleston, S. C., News and Courier

---

If the advice of Governor McKelvie of Nebraska is taken the party conventions will hereafter pick one of the various candidates for office in the primary or else the state will hold two primaries, the last limited to the two highest for each office at the first. If the legislature takes the advice of the people as expressed in the referendum last November, when they rejected the law restoring the convention system, it will keep its fingers off and unburned.

BENEFITS OF COOPERATION

On another page will be found an editorial from the Miami Herald which calls attention to the benefits of cooperation. It creates a bond of sympathy between employee and employer—the one thing to secure justice and, with justice, industrial peace. The editorial is worth reading.

Vetoes Suspending of Part of Clayton Act

President Wilson vetoed December 30 the joint resolution designed to suspend a section of the Clayton act prohibiting common carriers from dealing with any concern having interlocking directorates with the carrier except to a limited extent as to contracts. The president's veto message follows:

THE VETO MESSAGE

"I return herewith without my signature senate bill number 4526 amending section 501 of the transportation act by extending the effective date of section 10 of the Clayton act.

"The Clayton anti-trust act was responsive to recommendations which I made to congress on December 2, 1913, and January 20, 1914, on the subject of legislation regarding the very difficult and intricate matter of trusts and monopolies. In speaking of the changes which opinion deliberately sanctions and for which business waits, I observed:

"It waits with acquisence in the first place, for laws which will effectually prohibit and prevent such interlocking of the personnel of the directorates of great corporations, banks and railroads, industrial, commercial and public service bodies—as in effect result in making those who borrow and those who lend practically one and the same, those who sell and those who buy but the same persons trading with one another under different names and in different combinations, and those who affect to compete in fact partners and masters of some whole field of business. Sufficient time should be allowed, of course, in which to effect these changes of organization without interference or confusion. This particular recommendation is reflected in section 10 of the Clayton anti-trust act. That act became law on October 15, 1914, and it was provided that section 10 should not become effective until two years after that date, in order that the carriers and others affected might be able to adjust their affairs so that no inconvenience or confusion might result from the enforcement of its provisions. Further extension of time, amounting in all to more than four years and two months have since been made. These were in part due to the intervention of federal control, but ten months have elapsed since the resumption of private operation. In all over six years have elapsed since this enactment was put upon the statute books, so that all interests concerned have had long and ample notice of the obligations it imposes.

"The interstate commerce commission has adopted rules responsive to the requirements of section 10. In deferring the effective date of section 10, the congress has expected corporations organized after January 12, 1918, and as to such corporations the commission's rules are now in effect. Therefore it appears that the necessary preliminary steps have long since been taken to put section 10 into effect and the practical question now to be decided is whether the partial application of these rules shall be continued until January 1, 1922, or whether their application shall now become general, thus bringing under them all common carriers engaged in commerce, and at last giving full effect to this important feature of the act of October 15, 1914.

"The grounds upon which further extension of time is asked, in addition to the six years and more that have already elapsed, have been stated as follows:

"That the carrying into effect of the existing provisions of section 10 will result in needless expenditures on the part of carriers in many instances; that some of its provisions are unworkable, and that the changed status of the carriers and the enactment of the transportation act require a revision of section 10 in order to make it consistent with provisions of the transportation act.

"When it is considered that the congress is now in session and can readily adopt suitable amendments if they shall be found to be necessary such reasons for further delay appear to me to be inadequate. The soundness of the principle embodied in section 10 appears to be generally admitted. The wholesome effects which its application was intended to produce should no longer be withheld from the public and from the common carriers immediately concerned for whose protection it was particularly designed.

"WOODROW WILSON."