

# CURRENT TOPICS

SENATOR BULKELEY of Connecticut, who is also president of one or two insurance companies testified recently before a house committee. Senator Bulkeley said the insurance investigations instead of bettering conditions produced a contrary effect. He said that instead of having several great institutions as before controlled by a divided responsibility, they have put the entire business into the hands of one man. Representative De Armond asked "Who is that man?" Senator Bulkeley did not reply. Senator Bulkeley admitted that he had contributed \$5,000 of the funds of this company to the McKinley campaign of 1896. He added that it might as well have been \$20,000; that he would have been justified in giving this amount, which was not a "flea bite" to what he gave personally.

NOT SINCE ANTE-BELLUM days has excitement at the national capital gone so high as during the contest for railway rate legislation. It will be remembered that Senator Lodge, speaking for the president denounced as "a deliberate and unqualified falsehood" certain statements made on the floor by Senator Tillman for the authority of which the South Carolina senator quoted former Senator Chandler. The Commoner last week printed Senator Tillman's remarks, and also the formal reply made by President Roosevelt. It is generally admitted that the president's formal reply was not nearly so vigorous as the statement delivered on his authority by Senator Lodge. In another column of this issue will be found a letter written by former Senator Chandler and addressed to Senator Tillman. This is Mr. Chandler's reply to the president. It will be seen that Mr. Chandler fully corroborated every statement made by Senator Tillman, and took a vigorous issue with every material claim set forth by Mr. Roosevelt.

NOT EVEN THE strongest supporter of the administration undertakes to deny the seriousness of the situation, and it is admitted that the controversy has created a profound political sensation. The Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia North American says: "Men of all political factions hesitate to express opinions regarding it, and fear that the results may be disadvantageous to the policies the president had advocated. It is the first time since he entered the White House that Mr. Roosevelt has been shown to be clearly in the wrong, and that this fact may destroy public confidence in the sincerity of his convictions is feared by his friends and hoped for by his enemies. More important than any question that has arisen between the president and his accredited representatives in dealing with the democrats, is the positive proof that Mr. Roosevelt did enter into an agreement with the democrats, and then, for reasons that have not been satisfactorily explained threw his allies aside and made terms not only with the men who had been fighting him, but who had been marked by him as the chief obstacles in the way of the legislation he desired."

SENATOR LODGE of Massachusetts, although a firm friend of Mr. Roosevelt is being censured by friends of the administration for what is termed by one correspondent, "Mr. Lodge's buttinsky proclivities." The ground for this censure is described by the Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia North American in this way: "Every one in Washington is criticising Senator Lodge. It was Lodge who rushed to the telephone and informed the president that Tillman, upon the authority of former Senator Chandler, had accused him of criticising as enemies to rate regulation Senators Spooner, Knox and Foraker. That they are and have been such enemies no one in or out of the senate has questioned, and no one except Lodge thought the statement made by Tillman concerning the president's views respecting them reflected in the slightest degree upon the president himself. But Lodge, who had nothing to say respecting the more serious charge that the president had broken faith with the democratic supporters of his policy, rushed, in a very tumult of repressed emotion, to the telephone to ask immediate contradiction of the lesser accusation. Just what this telephonic conversation was no one knows; but Lodge, when he returned to the

senate chamber, had in his hand a sheet of paper, upon which he had written the statement from the president he said he was authorized to make. Lodge's action in the matter seems petty and unjustifiable. He has been known as a personal friend of both Chandler and the president, and to neither of them was his proceeding fair. The president, called upon to answer a charge without knowledge of the connection in which it was made, might easily have entered a denial without full realization of his effect. A single paragraph taken from Tillman's statement must necessarily place Chandler before the president in the light of one who had made public private conversations, and, therefore, aroused the indignation of the president to a point where his reply to Lodge's inquiries would not be well considered. It is, therefore, not unlikely that both the president and Chandler have been injured by Lodge's sycophantic efforts to shield Knox, Spooner and Foraker, and relieve the president from the charge of having criticised them."

WHILE THE PUBLIC interest in the Roosevelt-Chandler controversy was at its height, Senator Bailey of Texas rose to a question of privilege. The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, and the Washington correspondent for the New York Tribune, both papers being recognized as stalwart administration organs, charged that Senator Bailey had been the stumbling block to an agreement among the democrats on rate legislation, asserting that Senator Tillman had told former Senator Chandler that he was suspicious of Bailey and declaring that Mr. Chandler had informed the White House and vouched for the statement that Tillman believed Bailey was treacherous and did not want a rate bill passed.

SENATOR BAILEY intimated that the newspaper articles referred to were inspired in the White House. Senator Tillman had the secretary of the senate read these newspaper articles and then the Texas senator said: "I had taken no part in the question of veracity which had been raised by the president between him and ex-Senator Chandler; I had not even given any public expression of my opinion as to the question of good faith which the senator from South Carolina (Mr. Tillman) raised with the president because personally I knew nothing about either transaction. I had never conferred with the president directly nor had I conferred with him through ex-Senator Chandler. It was, therefore, a matter of surprise this morning when a senator called my attention to the communication in the Chicago Tribune of yesterday. That communication, it is understood, was sent by a correspondent who is close to the White House and who is presumed to speak with some degree of authority concerning transactions there. I do not know this to be true; but, sir, I denounce that statement as an unqualified, deliberate and malicious lie; I denounce that correspondent as an unqualified, deliberate and malicious liar; I denounce the man who furnished him that information and who inspired its publication as an unqualified and deliberate and malicious liar, whoever he may be, and however high the office which he holds."

SENATOR TILLMAN, referring to the same newspaper articles to which Senator Bailey directed attention, said: "The points to which I wish to address myself in this remarkable article are only two: Coleridge tells us:

I counted two-and-seventy stenches.  
I counted two-and-seventy stenches."

This correspondent is undoubtedly a muck-rake. Into what house the handle goes or what hand holds the handle I shall not say, but in the brief time I have had to examine the article I counted eight distinct and absolute falsehoods in regard to myself. But the one more particularly that is necessary to mention is that I ever lost faith in the integrity and honor and fair dealing and purpose of the senator from Texas (Mr. Bailey). There never has been the slightest disagreement between us from the beginning of the railroad rate debate in the senate, and I have never at anytime or anywhere indicated a suspicion. I have never said that there were conferences between the

senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Aldrich) and the senator from Texas (Mr. Bailey) and myself, also, looking to an agreement between the democrats and the railroad senators on the other side, which we declined to have anything to do with. But there has never been the slightest suspicion on my part of the good faith of the senator from Texas. Therefore, this story which is concocted now, and is being sent abroad by the cuckoos and hirelings of the republican machine, to endeavor to muddy the waters and cloud the situation, is only indicative of the desperate straits to which some people have brought themselves."

THE NEWSPAPER correspondents who were criticised by Senator Bailey replied to the senator's remarks re-affirming in effect their charges. Senator Bailey, again speaking on a question of privilege, caused to be read a letter written by former Senator Chandler and addressed to the Texas senator. The letter was as follows: "I have your letter of today, and I enclose to you a copy of a memorandum sent by me to the White House on the morning of Wednesday, April 11. I think the memorandum was not dated, by my retained copy is dated April 11. I did not therein give the president any assurances as to your attitude relative to the so-called game, because I had not seen you and did not feel authorized by anything Mr. Tillman had said to give any assurance in your name. At 9:15 p. m. I saw Mr. Tillman and talked with him fully, and he told me that neither he nor yourself were entering into games with the railroad senators, and at 9:30 I saw the president and told him what Mr. Tillman had said and that he need have no apprehension on the subject. I enclose to you copies from my diary. April 13 I saw Mr. Moody, and again on the 14th and arranged with him to see Mr. Tillman and yourself on the next day, Sunday, the 15th."

POINTING OUT HOW the Chandler memorandum had been misquoted and misconstrued by these administration newspapers, Senator Bailey said: "The president did not consider this memoranda an impeachment of my good faith. The proof of that is that with the memoranda before him within three days he asked me to confer with his attorney general on this vital question. It is inconceivable that the president, with a suspicion of my integrity in his mind, would permit his attorney general to transmit to me an amendment intended to be incorporated in this great measure. I have no words to express my opinion of those who would treat with those whom they suspect of treachery, and only traitors would do it. My statement does not seem to have disturbed the correspondent of that paper, because he says he was overlooked in my attack on the president. Perhaps he regards it as being overlooked to be called an unqualified, malicious liar. He says he has not the Chandler memoranda before him, but he attempts to quote from it. Now, where did he see it? I did not show it to him. Ex-Senator Chandler did not show it to him. It is addressed to Mr. Loeb the president's secretary. I will leave it to the country and to the senate to say who furnished him his information concerning it." The Texas senator spoke of his own faults, admitting that he has at times justly been called arbitrary, dictatorial, intemperate in speech and rash, but he declared that he had never intentionally done a man an injustice, and that he had never done a wrong without making reparation when the fault was called to his notice. He said that no man ever before had imputed to him a lack of candor; no man had ever charged him with double dealing and could not do so now and escape his denunciation. "Across the brow of such a man," he said, "he would put the brand of liar so that all men may know him and shun him."

MANY PEOPLE are wondering how ex-Senator Chandler came to be mixed up in the present interesting situation concerning the rate bill. A little explanation will suffice to make it clear. It will be remembered that when Prince Henry was entertained at the White House by President Roosevelt, the invitation sent to Senator Tillman was recalled, because of a personal altercation on the floor of the senate. Senator