

so glad, too. I may have my faults, dear James, and I may have good courage, but I could never have the courage or the heart to do such an awful thing to a woman. God alone knows my heart, and he knows that I did not commit this awful crime. The governor, who I think is very unjust has gone against me, and if nothing turns up to interfere I will have to die, and I assure you I will die brave and like a man. I have nothing to confess. I am entirely innocent. I have never spoken about this to you before. I have been asked, if guilty, to confess, but the people that have asked me that I have told them this: 'I have nothing to confess. Do you want me to tell a lie?' That is what I told them, James, and I really got real angry about it. It would be a lie through and through if I said anything of the kind. Now, dear James, after this terrible murder happens I want my folks to have my little body, so I can be near my dear parents. It will be a hard blow to them, but, dear James, it will be a comfort to them to live knowing that I died an innocent boy. I am so sorry for them, they are so good and faithful. I can not say any more, James, tears fall from my eyes so fast that I can hardly see to pen these words to you. Before I close, though, I want to thank everybody that tried to help me prove my innocence, and I also thank you again for being so kind and faithful. My last words to you are that I am innocent, and they will be the last words that I will have on my lips when I die."

THE ROOSEVELT administration was recently placed in a very embarrassing position by the secretary of the treasury. Mr. Shaw had been invited to deliver an address at the graduating exercises at Syracuse University. It will be remembered that James R. Day, who is chancellor of the Syracuse University, has on two occasions severely attacked Mr. Roosevelt. At the same time Secretary Shaw was invited to deliver an address in Davenport, Iowa, in behalf of George D. Perkins and against Governor Cummins, who seeks renomination. Mr. Shaw's Syracuse engagement was made several months ago before Chancellor Day attacked the president. The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald said it was doubtful if Mr. Shaw had any intention of breaking the engagement in spite of Chancellor Day's attack upon Mr. Roosevelt. But after Chancellor Day made his second attack Sunday, June 10, Mr. Shaw called upon the president, who made it very clear that he did not desire a member of his cabinet to fraternize with the chancellor of the Syracuse University.

IT HAPPENED THAT Secretary Shaw had just returned from Iowa where he had participated in the fight between Cummins and Perkins over the republican gubernatorial nomination. The Record-Herald correspondent says that when Mr. Shaw explained to the president that he was being pressed by friends at home to participate in an important event there, the president suggested that Mr. Shaw go home as "a pleasant way to abandon a disagreeable trip to Syracuse." Then Secretary Shaw sent to his friends at Davenport, a telegram saying that he had concluded to speak at Davenport after "having conferred with the president." This was accepted in Iowa to mean that the president was in favor of Mr. Perkins' nomination and the republican leaders in the Hawkeye state were greatly disturbed. The president caused a statement to be made to the effect that Secretary Shaw did not speak in Iowa as a representative of the administration and that the president was taking no part in the Iowa contest.

THE RECORD-HERALD correspondent says: "There are rumors in circulation to the effect that President Roosevelt was exceedingly vexed when the 'indiscreet language' used by Secretary Shaw in his telegram to Secretary Anthony of the Lincoln club of Davenport was brought to his attention. Gossip has it that on previous occasions the so-called political indiscretions of the holder of the treasury portfolio have called for reprimands, and there have been frequent reports that Mr. Shaw would leave the cabinet ahead of the time set for his retirement, which now is fixed at March 4 of next year. But the secretary has continued to sit at the cabinet table." Mr. Shaw's private secretary gave to the newspapers an interview, saying that Mr. Shaw did not avoid the Syracuse engagement on ac-

count of Chancellor Day's remarks, but that if these remarks had had any effect at all, they "would have made him all the more anxious to go," the secretary explaining, "he would, probably, be able to convince the people of Syracuse that Mr. Day had an erroneous idea of the situation." Mr. Shaw is a candidate for the republican nomination in 1908 and some of Mr. Roosevelt's friends say that he is not averse to taking his stand with elements that are not just now favorable to Mr. Roosevelt.

AN INTERESTING STORY is told by a writer in the Saturday Evening Post with reference to the efforts of Frank J. Heney of California, special United States district attorney, to convict the late Senator Mitchell and others indicted for complicity in Oregon land frauds. This writer says: "Part of Mitchell's defense was that he had made a written agreement with his law partners long prior to the date of the acts charged against him, which stated that, owing to his position as senator, he would in no way participate in either the work or the profits accruing from the land cases on which the indictment was finally based. The contention of the prosecution was that this agreement had been antedated and that it really was a subterfuge to let Mitchell out. Heney examined the agreement, which was typewritten. If the date was correct it would go a long way toward relieving Mitchell from the charge against him. Heney looked at the paper carefully. He found that the words 'legitimate,' 'salary' and 'constituent' were misspelled. The copyist, or original typewriter, had spelled them 'ligitimate,' 'salery' and 'constituant.' Mitchell's contention, of course, was that the paper had been drawn before he went to Washington. Heney knew better. He called before the grand jury a man associated with Mitchell in Washington, who had been with him only since he went to Washington. This man was a typewriter. Heney took him before the grand jury and dictated to him for fifteen minutes using the words 'legitimate,' 'salary' and 'constituent' half a dozen times. When the typewritten sheets were shown to the grand jury it was found that the words had been spelled 'ligitimate,' 'salery' and 'constituant' every time the typewriter had written them. Heney showed this to the typewriter who confessed to his part in the work, and the indictment followed. The paper had been written in Washington and forwarded to Oregon after the charges against Mitchell had come to a head."

THE REPRESENTATIVES of the Standard Oil Trust are denying that that concern is interested in defeating the bill removing the tax on alcohol for use in manufactures and the arts. In this connection, a writer in the Springfield, Mass., Republican draws attention to the following extract from the report of the house ways and means committee: "The bulk of free denatured alcohol in Germany is used for the purpose of light, fuel and heat. A lamp is now made with a Welsbach mantle which produces a very strong, steady and high-grade light by the use of alcohol. Experiments have been made testing this lamp with the most improved pattern kerosene lamps with round wicks and of equal candle-power; it was found that a gallon of alcohol would keep the alcohol lamp burning twice as many hours as would a gallon of kerosene burning in the most approved pattern of kerosene lamp which is in general use. In other words, one gallon of alcohol is equal to two gallons of kerosene for lighting purposes. Hence it follows if the price of alcohol methylated is less than double the price of kerosene, its use, especially on the farms and in the villages of the country, would become enormous."

REFERRING TO THE Standard Oil interests in defeating the free alcohol bill, the writer in the Springfield Republican, says: "There now comes from the 'electrical testing laboratories' of New York a report on the test of a French incandescent mantle alcohol lamp side by side with a round wick center-draft Miller kerosene lamp. The candle-power in each case was substantially the same, but in the case of the alcohol lamp one gallon of fuel lasted fifty-seven hours and five minutes while the gallon of kerosene lasted only twenty-eight hours and forty-one minutes. The gallon in the alcohol lamp produced 1,732 candle-power hours, and that in the kerosene lamp 883 candle-power hours, or a trifle more than one-half as much light. Pictures of the two lamps are given in the report—the alcohol lamp resembling in shape and otherwise the ordinary round-wick kerosene lamp. If

denatured grain or fruit alcohol free of tax can be produced to sell at no more than 20 cents a gallon—and the claim is made that this is possible—the petroleum monopoly must be seriously affected by the proposed legislation. It would be practically impossible to monopolize the production and sale of alcohol substitute, since the material from which it is derived is universally available."

THE WASHINGTON POST, a publication that can not be said to be unfriendly to the administration, says: "Congress has provided laws, money and machinery. Yet the greatest trust in the country has not been prosecuted, and there is no indication that the attorney general is preparing to tackle it. It is this great fact which is disappointing to friends of the administration. The message and the report tend to confirm the general impression that the Standard Oil company is violating the law. While waiting upon congress to perfect a law correcting railroad rate evils, it will be difficult to convince the public that the department of justice could not wisely employ its time and resources in prosecuting the big trust under the laws already in existence. If the Standard is a lawbreaker, it should be prosecuted, and if it is not it should not be prosecuted."

THE STANDARD OIL TRUST is not, after all, so anxious to face its record. The story is told in a Cleveland, Ohio, dispatch as follows: "The Standard Oil company will make no defense before the interstate commerce commission against the charge of commercial banditism which has been hurled at the company publicly and repeatedly by scores of witnesses. After demanding a 'day in court,' after publicly stating that the company could not permit the testimony adduced before the commission to go unchallenged, and after asserting that the company would refute every charge made, it has been decided to permit the long array of accusations to go unchallenged so far as rebuttal testimony is concerned. The interstate commerce commission is in receipt of a letter from Virgil P. Kline, attorney for the company, to the effect that he will not produce any witnesses at the hearing which the commission is to conduct here beginning tomorrow. This letter was sent to the commission immediately after a conference of Standard Oil magnates and attorneys which was held in New York shortly after the former Cleveland inquiry into Standard methods. The letter coming as it did after repeated demands by Attorney Kline, made during the hearing, for an opportunity to be heard in defense of the accusations, caused great surprise in the commission. So far as the hearing goes the silence of the company leaves a clear record against it, and members of the commission declare that they can do naught save report all the charges to congress as unrefuted."

A REPUBLICAN MEMBER of congress—Haugen of Iowa—is opposed to the parcels post. As an argument against the plan, Mr. Haugen compiled statistics relating to the amount paid for mail transportation by the government to the railroads. According to the New York World Mr. Haugen's investigation discloses that: "Over one-quarter of the cost of the post-office department is paid to the railroads. For the mere transportation the railroads charge \$1.25 per ton mile. This is over 100 times the average freight charge, although in their freight business the railroads provide stations, cars and all employes. In the mail business the government pays additionally the rental for cars and furnishes the clerks who handle the mail. For the 1,015 postal cars the government pays \$5,500,044 annually, an average of \$5,427. The cars cost only \$6,000 to build. The express companies carry parcels at a 100-pound rate for less than a quarter of the railroad mail charge. Yet the express companies out of this pay for their offices, clerks, delivery wagons and big dividends on inflated capital." The World reminds Mr. Haugen that his figures provide "conclusive indictment against the postoffice administration which pays railroads ten times as much for the mail as for the express matter in the next car." Now will Mr. Haugen undertake to bring about a reform in the matter of expenditures for mail transportation? If not, why not?

After carefully noting the associations he would have to endure on the republican side of the senate chamber, Professor Coburn decided that he would continue to teach the gentle art of farming to the Kansas youth.