

by 43 to 29. The Insurgent Republicans who voted for the amendment, 12 in number, were Beveridge, Borah, Bourne, Bristow, Burkett, Clapp, Crawford, Cummins, Dixon, Dolliver, Gamble, La Follette. But two Senators who are sometimes insurgent, Brown and Nelson, voted with the Standpat Republicans against the amendment as did the following Democrats: Bailey, McEnery, Smith of Maryland and Taylor. Four Democrats stayed away without pairing, namely Hughes, Bankhead, Percy and Money. Senator Aldrich got the Democratic votes against the Cummins amendment by agreeing to accept two amendments opposed by the Standpatters, which were thereupon adopted unanimously. One of them provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission may suspend increases in rates for a period of ten months; the other that after increases in rates are placed in force the railroads shall in waybills and bills of lading, pending the adjudication of increases before the Commission and in the courts, state what the charges would have been if the rates had not been increased, and in case the rate is finally found unreasonable shall refund the difference. The bill came near being voted on in the Senate on the 27th. But in the midst of a wrangle a Democratic motion to adjourn was carried. It had been understood that when an amendment by Senator Dolliver regulating stock and bond issues had been acted on, one by Senator La Follette on physical values of railway property, and then one by Senator Newlands on national incorporation would be disposed of, after which vote on the bill as a whole was to be taken. But when the Dolliver amendment had been defeated by 47 to 19—15 Insurgent Republicans and 4 Democrats constituting the minority—Senator Dixon (Insurgent) offered an amendment placing inter-State telegraph and telephone lines under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This amendment as altered and simplified by Senator La Follette, was adopted, whereupon Senator Brown (Insurgent) moved an amendment prohibiting common carriers from acquiring any interest whatever in the capital stock or any leasehold interest in competitive lines. Protests against immediate action were made, and Senator Bacon's (Democrat) motion to adjourn was carried by 31 to 27. Senator Aldrich was not present, having gone home under the impression that the bill as arranged by him would pass.

+ +

The Ballinger Investigation.

Closing speeches before the Congressional committee investigating the charges against Secretary Ballinger of the Department of the Interior, one of President Taft's cabinet (pp. 481, 487), were made on the 27th by George W. Pepper and Louis D. Brandeis. Mr. Pepper spoke as attorney for

Gifford Pinchot, and Mr. Brandeis for Louis R. Glavis. The summing up closed on the 28th, when Mr. Vertrees finished in behalf of Secretary Ballinger, and Mr. Pepper and Mr. Brandeis replied for Mr. Pinchot and Mr. Glavis respectively.

+ +

Roosevelt and the Insurgents.

Washington dispatches of the 28th report that Theodore Roosevelt (pp. 468, 490) has written a letter which has practically indorsed the fight made by the Insurgents of the House of Representatives against Cannon and the regular organization. He is said also to have invited one of the most influential of the Eastern Insurgents to meet him in New York for a conference immediately after his arrival from Europe. The announcement of a definite position by Mr. Roosevelt in regard to Insurgency has impressed itself deeply, the dispatches say, on the Insurgents and the Regulars at the Capitol. The Insurgents are described as taking on an air of triumph, the Regulars as depressed, but saying, "There must be a mistake somewhere." Col. Roosevelt's letter appears to have been written from Dorchester House, England. In effect he said as reported: "You know my views on the Insurgent situation. They have not changed since I last talked with you. I wish to see you in New York immediately after my arrival." There were, says the dispatch, but five lines in the Roosevelt letter, which was in answer to a nine page summary of the battle of the Insurgents against Cannon and Cannonism in which the recipient of the Roosevelt letter took an active part. Although permission to make a verbatim report of the missive was denied publication it was shown to several of the newspaper men under pledge not to reproduce it. By inference Roosevelt told his correspondent that he had much to say which would be better if transmitted from lip to ear. Speaking of the attitude of the ex-President, the Insurgent leader said: "Whereas, I know that Mr. Roosevelt admires Speaker Cannon for the fighting blood that is in him, I know and have known for a long time that Roosevelt was with the Insurgents in spirit in the fight they made against the cast-iron rule of the organization which, through its tyrannies, precipitated the legislative battle of last March. I know that Mr. Roosevelt approves of the contest we made and rejoices in the victory we won. I know that he approves of the course taken by the Insurgents in fighting tooth and nail for the passage of the good features of the Taft program."

+

Mr. Roosevelt is to make a series of political speeches throughout the United States, according to dispatches from Washington dated the 30th. This speaking tour will give him opportunity to inform himself on the political changes which

have taken place during his absence in Africa, especially in regard to the development of the Insurgent movement, and will also enable him to give such political advice as he deems appropriate. His itinerary is announced as proceeding through the following twenty-four States: New York, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware and New Jersey.

+

The University of Cambridge, England, on the 26th, conferred the degree of Doctor of Laws upon Mr. Roosevelt, who received the honor in person.

+ +

Senator Lorimer's Defense.

Replying to the charges of having bought his seat in the United States Senate by bribing members of the Illinois legislature (p. 469), which were first published by the Chicago Tribune, Senator Lorimer made reply on the 28th from his place on the Senate floor. He asserted that the charges were false; that they had been formulated by the Tribune principally for the purpose of carrying out the Tribune editor's threat to crush the new banking institution Lorimer was starting in Chicago, coincident with the opening of which the charges were published; that there were political motives also, Lorimer having refused to take orders from the Tribune as other Republicans had done; that Gov. Deneen, who had yielded to the Tribune's power, was a party with the Tribune to the conspiracy against Lorimer; and that the Tribune had a further motive, of its own because it "is in politics for revenue only," and does not want interference with its tax-dodging, its rent-gathering and its ground-rent stealing. Of the Tribune's relation to the Board of Education on two of these counts Mr. Lorimer said:

There is one board in Chicago which the Tribune watches as a cat does a mouse, and that is the Board of Education. It seems to take a special delight in plundering its funds. For many years the Board occupied quarters in the Schiller building, which were first class and commodious, where annual rental was less than \$15,000 per year. The Tribune was more successful in compelling this Board to move than it was with the Sanitary Board, and it now has the Board of Education housed in the Tribune building, for which the Board pays \$32,500 a year for quarters no better adapted to its needs and not as convenient—for the Board—as the former quarters in the Schiller building. This is a case of looting the school fund to the extent of \$17,500 per year.

But of all the plundering of sacred funds of trust there is nothing in the history of Chicago to equal the lease of the school ground to the Tribune company, on which its building stands. The School

Board gave to the Tribune control for a period of eighty-nine years. The lease was drawn without a revaluation clause, which is included in every long term-lease of property owned by private parties, and under which the steadily increasing value of the ground would be saved to the Board. The tenants occupying the grounds just across the street from the Tribune building pay an annual rental of 5 per cent on a valuation of \$91.35 per square foot, plus the taxes, as against 6 per cent on a valuation of \$45.88, with no taxes paid by the Tribune company, occupying a corner which is at least as valuable as the one referred to.

The total number of square feet in the Tribune plot is 17,280, which yields \$47,000 approximately, at a rate of 6 per cent. If the Tribune's owners were compelled to pay on an honest valuation, such as that on the corner across the street, they would pay approximately \$94,000 a year into the school fund, but through coercion and intimidation and in the dead of night, to escape a threatened injunction, this corrupt lease was authorized, under which the Tribune robs the school funds of \$47,000 each year.

Mr. Lorimer then grouped his charges of greed:

To summarize the annual plunder of the school fund and public treasury by the Chicago Tribune:	
Taxes dodged.....	\$ 45,000
Rent plunder.....	17,000
Ground rent steal.....	47,000
Total	\$109,500

In round figures the Tribune robs the school fund and public treasury of Chicago of \$100,000 every year. It is to protect this plunder that prompts the Tribune to force men into subjection or drive them out of public life. It was because the Tribune could not control Judge Nathaniel Sears, the Hon. Zina R. Carter or Judge Elbridge Haney that it opposed them and aided in their defeat when they were candidates for Mayor, and who, had they been elected, would have had the appointment of the members of the Board of Education. It is the fear that such men in public office will end its theft of public funds that impels it to secure complete control of the party organization through which candidates are selected for public office.

In closing, Senator Lorimer asked for a full Senatorial investigation and introduced a resolution for the purpose. The resolution was referred under the rules.

+

By a dramatic conjunction of circumstances, on the very day on which Senator Lorimer was assuring the Senate of the United States that no man had been bribed to vote for him as senator, D. W. Holstlaw of Iuka, a Democratic member of the Illinois Senate, was confessing to the grand jury of Sangamon county that he had received \$2,500 for voting for Lorimer for senator. He was promised the money, he stated, by State Senator John Broderick of Chicago, and he later received the money from Broderick, who also gave him \$700 as his share of the legislative "jackpot" for voting as the graft ring wished him to vote. As a result of the confession the grand jury in-