

CURRENT TOPICS

AN INTERESTING study in elimination is given by the Cleveland (Ohio) Leader in this way: "Loeb—Gentleman to see you, sir. T. R.—Mollycoddle? Loeb—No, sir. T. R.—Undesirable citizen? Loeb—He doesn't look it. T. R.—Conspirator? Poltroon? Loeb—Not that I can see. T. R.—Deliberate and unqualified, etc.? Loeb—I think not, sir. T. R.—Well, why didn't you tell me it was Taft? Show him in."

THE DALLAS (Texas) Times-Herald and the Houston Post are in a hot dispute concerning the birthplace of Andrew Jackson. The editor of the Times-Herald, himself a native of South Carolina said: "Now comes the Houston Post with the claim that Andrew Jackson was born in North Carolina. All the world knows that Old Hickory was a Palmetto creation. Does the Post dispute this claim?"

RESPONDING TO THIS claim the Post says: "Old Hickory" was born in what is now known as Union county, North Carolina, but what in 1767 was known as the Waxhaw, Waxaw or Warsaw settlement, through which the then indefinite state boundary line passed. It is true that Jackson himself lived and died believing he was born in South Carolina, for in the nullification proclamation he addressed the people of South Carolina as 'Fellow Citizens of My Native State.' But he was mistaken, nevertheless, for when it later became necessary to designate exactly the boundary it was found that Jackson's birthplace was well within North Carolina territory. Mr. Parton, Jackson's most eminent biographer, not only went all over the ground in 1859, but he went to Ireland to investigate fully Jackson's ancestry. Parton was not a Carolinian and his mission to the Waxhaw settlement was for the purpose of getting facts and he talked not only with natives who remembered the Jackson traditions, but with relatives of the general who knew the facts. No biographer has ever questioned the accuracy of Parton's conclusions. Parton asserts positively that Jackson was born in North Carolina and not since his work appeared has any historian contradicted him."

COLONEL A. S. COLYAR of Nashville wrote in 1904 a biography of Andrew Jackson. From this work the Post quotes: "Curiosity with some and state pride with others forbid indifference as to the birthplace of a man so widely known as a soldier and statesman and, to settle the dispute between North and South Carolina, I shall give the facts as gathered up, showing that although General Jackson always believed he was born in South Carolina, yet he was undoubtedly born in North Carolina. There is doubt from the evidence whether the family left the Waxaw graveyard when the father was buried, on Twelve-Mile creek, in North Carolina, to return to the humble home where they had lived over two years in North Carolina, or started immediately to South Carolina; but either the night after the burial, or in a day or two, the mother and her two little boys, Robert and Hugh, started afoot to South Carolina, where Mrs. Jackson had a brother-in-law named Crawford, and was kindly taken in for the night by a man named McKamy (a branch of this identical McKamy lives in Dallas county) and Andrew Jackson was born there that night. Some papers written out after Jackson became famous, by a man called General S. E. Walkup, said to be a most estimable citizen, fell into the hands of Mr. Parton, which Parton verified by going over the ground, which established conclusively that General Jackson was born in North Carolina. He (Parton) also took the statements of James Massy, John Carnes, James Faulkner, Samuel Wharton, Jane Wilson and James D. Craig. These statements were taken in 1859. The witnesses were all old persons and had all seen and known persons who were at the house when he (Jackson) was born, or had talked with people who lived in the neighborhood where he was born and knew the facts."

JAMES FAULKNER, a second cousin of General Jackson, made this statement, which Parton quotes in his "Life of Jackson:" "Old Mr. Jackson died before the birth of his son,

General Jackson, and that his widow, Mrs. Jackson, was quite poor, and moved from her residence on Twelve-Mile creek, North Carolina, to live with her relations on Waxaw creek, and while on her way there she stopped with her sister, Mrs. McKamy, in North Carolina, and was there delivered of Andrew, afterward president of the United States; that he learned this from various old persons, and particularly heard his aunt, Sarah Lathen, often speak of it and assert she was present at his (Jackson's) birth; that she said her mother was sent for on that occasion and took her (Mrs. Lathen), then a small girl about seven years of age and that she recollected well of going the near way through the fields to get there; and that afterward, when Mrs. Jackson became able to travel, she continued her trip to Mrs. Crawford's and took her son Andrew with her and there remained."

CONCLUDING ITS defence of the North Carolina claim the Post says: "Not since the publication of Parton's 'Life of Jackson' and the mass of testimony presented by him has any biographer of note asserted that Jackson was born in South Carolina. Every modern encyclopaedia states that the general was born in North Carolina and the 'Biographical Congressional Directory,' published by the authority of congress in 1903, gives North Carolina as the general's birthplace. We deem it unnecessary to pursue the subject further as the proof in favor of North Carolina's contention is absolute, whereas South Carolina has never been able to produce any proof whatever other than General Jackson's address to 'Fellow Citizens of My Native State.' After a few years of boyhood in South Carolina the general returned to North Carolina, read law in Salisbury and then drifted over the mountains into what is now Tennessee and became famous."

ACCORDING TO a Washington dispatch to the Houston (Texas) Post, a Massachusetts millionaire called on President Roosevelt after the regular cabinet meeting and during the chat a leading politician from a western state remarked to the president that his state would surely send a delegation in favor of Mr. Roosevelt to the next republican national convention. A member of the cabinet expressed the confident opinion that his state would do the same. The Massachusetts millionaire said: "I tell you, Mr. President, Massachusetts and other New England states are disposed to insist on your renomination." "Nonsense! If I were to accept a renomination after what I have said on the subject I would be historically disgraced," replied Mr. Roosevelt.

ACCORDING TO THE final statements of the clerks of the senate and house committees on appropriations, the Fifty-ninth congress at its last session appropriated \$920,798,143 for 1908, or over \$41,000,000 more than at the preceding session. At its first session the Fifty-ninth congress appropriated \$879,589,185, or about \$60,000,000 more than the Fifty-eighth congress at the preceding session. In two years the Fifty-ninth congress appropriated over \$1,800,000,000, or an average increase of \$50,000,000 a year.

REFERRING TO THESE figures the New York World says: "At this rate President Roosevelt, if he accepts a 'second elective term,' by 1911 will be able to celebrate, with the help of the Sixty-first congress, the passing of the \$2,000,000,000 mark. He still has ship subsidies and other wasteful schemes in mind which should serve to advance the date. For the four years 1893-96, under the second Cleveland administration, the total appropriations amounted to \$2,016,345,753. The total expenditure of the four full years of McKinley was only \$2,430,316,390, although he conducted the Spanish war. In the four-year period ending June 30, 1906, under Roosevelt, the aggregate of appropriations reached \$3,153,334,292, an increase of \$1,396,990,539 over that of Cleveland's second term. Exclusive of the Panama appropriations the increase of expenditures in 1904 over 1903 was \$35,496,995; in 1905 over 1904, \$40,336,233; in 1906 over 1905, \$17,903,836. The rate of increase has been much heavier during the last two years. A 'second

elective term' for President Roosevelt would probably show expenditures double those of President Cleveland's second term. President Roosevelt has great influence over congress and writes lengthy messages, but no subject occupies less space in them or receives less emphasis than the studied policy of public economy in national expenditures."

IT SEEMS THAT after all there is not to be a severe fight in Ohio between the Taft and the Foraker forces. George B. Cox of Cincinnati, whom Mr. Taft once denounced as a political boss, seems to have been the peacemaker. Cox insisted that there was nothing to fight about, but the republicans of Ohio ought to endorse Taft for president and Foraker for senator. Charles P. Taft, the secretary's brother, and Senator Foraker both expressed satisfaction with the suggestion. Some criticism of the "tie-up" is heard among Ohio republicans. Some declaring that it indicates that the Taft forces are more interested in the success of their presidential candidate than they are in the defeat of a corporation candidate for senator; and that in order to win for Taft Ohio's vote in the republican national convention the Roosevelt-Taft element is willing to consent to the re-election to the senate of the man who fought every reform measure advocated by the president and who, next to Senator Aldrich, is recognized as the chief representative of the corporations on the floor of the United States senate.

MANY REPUBLICANS disapprove of the Taft-Foraker tie-up in Ohio. The Lincoln (Ieb.) News, republican, says: "According to the Roosevelt program, as understood by the friends of the president throughout the country, there can be no compromise in the Ohio situation and should Mr. Taft accede to the Cox proposition it will be a distinct disappointment to those who have been ready to accept him as a worthy successor to President Roosevelt. A tie-up between the Taft and Foraker forces in Ohio would be so manifestly a playing of the game of practical politics to the sacrifice of principle as to discredit the secretary in the eyes of his friends and brand him as one who is more anxious for his own political preferment than for the success of the policies for which he is supposed to stand. The Roosevelt policy, represented by Taft, and the Foraker policy are as wide apart as the poles. They are diametrically opposed to each other and can no more sincerely meet on common ground than oil and water can mix. To assist in returning Foraker to the senate would be to indorse the fight which has been waged against the things for which Mr. Taft stands and on which he bases his claims for preferment. It would be to invite the charge of insincerity and make it extremely difficult to disprove that charge."

EDMUND G. ROSS, at one time United States senator from Kansas, and whose vote prevented the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson, died recently at Albuquerque, N. M. Referring to this incident a writer in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "In this most dramatic incident of American political history the president of the United States was defendant, prosecuted by the house of representatives before the chief justice of the supreme court, sitting as trial judge, and a jury composed of the cabinet and senate. At the close of the trial seven republican senators voted with the democratic minority against impeachment, the seventh and deciding ballot being that of Senator Ross. For this simple act of justice in the face of threats of political annihilation, social ostracism, financial ruin and assassination, all but the latter became Ross' portion. There was no doubt how Fessenden, Fowler, Grimes, Henderson, Trumbull and Van Winkle intended to vote; but Ross, whose name came low on the list, represented a passionately radical state and had been subjected to unlimited political pressure, abuse and threats. When Kansas heard Ross had voted 'not guilty' the storm broke. D. W. Wilder, then editor of the Leavenworth Conservative, in his issue of May 17, 1868, said: 'Johnson is acquitted because Kansas is corrupt. The fate of the nation depended upon the vote. It was found and came from Kansas. Ross has betrayed the people, betrayed the cause, stabbed