

placed, although the legislature was strongly Republican in political complexion. Charges of bribery brought about an investigation through a special committee of the United States Senate (of which Senator Burrows of Michigan was chairman), and a majority of this committee, including its chairman, reported in favor of Lorimer's retaining his seat. A minority report took the ground that, irrespective of Mr. Lorimer's own connivance (of which there does not appear to have been any proof), the fact that there was corruption in connection with the election invalidated his election. In the Senate the majority report was sustained by 46 to 40, March 1, 1911. But two months later the Illinois Senate, by 39 to 10, charged that the election had been secured by bribery, and thereupon the United States Senate, June 1, 1911, voted unanimously for a new investigation. This investigation was conducted by the standing committee on privileges and elections, which decided, March 28, 1912, by 5 to 3, that in the absence of proof of his own culpability, Mr. Lorimer was entitled to the seat. But the minority report was adopted. It is as follows:

Resolved, That corrupt methods and practices were employed in the election of William Lorimer to the Senate of the United States from the State of Illinois and that his election was therefore invalid.



Mr. Lorimer had spoken two days in his own behalf on the floor of the Senate, and when the vote was taken on the 13th the resolution prepared by the minority of the committee, carried by 55 to 28. As eight Senators were paired and two were absent without pairing, the full record would be 59 for the resolution and 32 against it, Mr. Lorimer not voting. The majority against Lorimer included 26 Republicans and 33 Democrats; in favor of Lorimer there were 23 Republicans and 9 Democrats. Of the Senators who voted against him when the Senate had decided in his favor, Senator Jones (Republican) of Washington was the only one to vote in his favor on the 13th, and of those who had voted in his favor on the former occasion, the following voted against him on the latter: Senators Cullom (Illinois), Briggs (New Jersey), Curtis (Kansas), Simmons (North Carolina) and Watson (West Virginia), the first three being Republicans and the last two Democrats.



National Educational Association.

E. T. Fairchild of Kansas, the choice of the progressive element in the National Educational Association, was elected president of the association at the fiftieth annual convention which was held last week at Chicago. [See vol. xiv., pp. 659, 678, 948, and current volume, page 227.]

At this convention the progressives gained complete control of the affairs of the association, after three successive victories—that which resulted in the election as president of Ella Flagg Young at Boston two years ago, that in which Mr. Pearce, the retiring president, was elected at San Francisco last year, and that of the present year. Not only did the progressives win official control of the organization, but they secured also the adoption of amendments to its constitution, designed to make the association effective as an organization of teachers.



Proportional Representation.

A conference of members of the American Proportional Representation League was held at the summer home of C. G. Hoag, Tamworth, N. H., July 3 to 6, at which there were in attendance ex-Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, Robert Tyson of Toronto, William Hoag of Boston, Fiske Warren of Harvard (Mass.), Prof. Karl Schmidt of Tufts College and C. G. Hoag. The last was made secretary-treasurer for the United States, Mr. Tyson, however, remaining in that office for Canada. In describing the progress of the reform Mr. Hoag stated he had found that the proportional system gives satisfaction to the several cantons of Switzerland which use it for the election of their legislative assemblies, and that it is likely to be adopted for Federal elections in the near future. The Minister of Education for South Africa, Mr. F. S. Malan, was enthusiastic in praise of the Hare system as applied to the election of the South African Senate and the City Councils of Johannesburg and Pretoria. Count Goblet d'Alviella, a Senator and leading Liberal of Belgium, said that there was a strong movement in that country to extend proportional representation to elections in which it is not now used, and that, so far as already applied, the system gives general satisfaction. In France, proportional representation is the chief political issue, and the present Government has staked its existence upon its support of the reform. In Great Britain, such men as Lord Courtney of Penwith and Mr. J. H. Humphreys—who were most active in securing the adoption of a proportional system for South Africa—confidently expect that the same system will be adopted for the election of the Parliament of Ireland when home rule is established.

Regarding the application of proportional representation to the government of American cities, the Tamworth conference favored vesting the entire control of municipal government in a one-chamber council, to be elected at large by proportional representation, the vote of each elector to be effective for the election of only one member. The appointment and removal of all purely executive or administrative officers would be left to the council.



Two elephants is a crowd.—Baltimore Sun.