

only; one was selected by four votes and one by twelve votes. The man elected by three voted for himself, and he has three sons who voted for their father. Three democrats had pluralities of less than 100, the smallest being seventeen. In the senate the republicans have one member who was chosen by a plurality of fifty, while the smallest plurality for any democratic senator was 252. The democratic leaders declare that any election giving a plurality of 100 or less is anybody's fight when the next election comes around."

IN HIS ADDRESS at Yale college recently, Secretary of State Root said: "Doubtless there may have been abuses in raising and applying campaign funds, but in the main there is no more useful expenditure of money from the public point of view than this, which in the last presidential election, according to official statements, amounted to only about three and one-half cents per capita for the people of the United States on one side and probably somewhat less on the other, for the great bulk of it is applied to the political education of voters."

REFERRING TO Mr. Root's speech, the New York World says: "On notable occasions Secretary Root has appeared as spokesman for the president. Do his remarks at Yale reflect Mr. Roosevelt's views? Is Mr. Roosevelt satisfied to let the matter of campaign contributions rest as it is? He hesitated a long time after the 1904 election before urging congress to prohibit corporations from contributing to campaign funds. Does he favor secrecy in collecting and disbursing them? Do Secretary Root's remarks mean that in President Roosevelt's mind no more safeguards are needed against political corruption? Is this all the administration has to say? Is there to be only praise of the 'useful expenditure' of campaign money and no further practical steps to secure publicity of receipts and expenditures? Does Mr. Root, and does Mr. Roosevelt, think that 'turning at least 50,000 votes,' in E. H. Harriman's phrase, could be called a 'useful expenditure' of the money Harriman raised in 1904? Did Mr. Harriman mean by that phrase the 'political education' of those 50,000 voters? Where does Mr. Roosevelt stand?"

THE COURTSHIP of Mayor and Mrs. Isaacs of Chillicothe, Mo., who recently celebrated their fiftieth wedding anniversary, is told by the Kansas City Post in this way: "When the mayor was a young man he called at the Austin home one day as a peddler and exhibited his wares. While enjoying the huge comfortable fireplace the mayor's glance fell on Miss Amanda who was busy in the kitchen. Of course it was love at first sight with the mayor. While he stood rooted to the spot the playful fire took hold of the seat of his pants. Miss Amanda saw the danger and quickly enveloped him in a blanket. Needless to say the trousers were in a bad shape and Miss Amanda volunteered to mend them. Her services were accepted, and from that time to this she has been busy—keeping the mayor away from the fire."

A WASHINGTON dispatch to the New York World says: "Secretary Taft went into total eclipse today when a visitor weighing 349 pounds appeared at his office. It was Chairman Rush, of the Worth Bagley Monument association. Mr. Rush said that a massage expert told him that he had reduced the weight of Secretary Taft from 347 to 237 pounds. The masseur agreed to reduce the weight of Rush, and got \$20 for the first treatment. Instantly the appetite of Rush increased, and in forty days he gained twenty-seven pounds. He told the secretary of war that if he had continued the treatment it would have been impossible for him to get through the door. He said that although he had been buncoed, he would not demand the \$20 paid to the masseur if Secretary Taft would lend him some government flags for the unveiling of the Bagley statue. Secretary Taft agreed and expressed the hope that the shadow of Rush would never grow less."

THE UNITED STATES supreme court, speaking through Justice Holmes, has announced its decision in a number of cases involving the construction of the eight-hour law of 1902, by which the employment of laborers and mechanics on public works is limited to eight hours per day. The defendants were all prosecuted criminally and were all found guilty and fined by the trial court. The suits were instituted especially for the purpose of testing

the application of the law to laborers and mechanics employed on dredges in river and harbor improvements, but the other points were all necessarily involved. The court held the law to be constitutional, but held that it does not apply to laborers and mechanics on dredges, and that men so employed can not be held to be employed on public works.

ACCORDING TO THE Associated Press there are seven of the cases brought to the supreme court on writs of error from the United States court for the district of Massachusetts. Justice Holmes' opinion was based upon the cases of William H. Ellis and the Eastern Dredging company vs. the United States, and all the other six cases were decided along the same lines. Justice Moody delivered a dissenting opinion. The decision will have immediate bearing upon the letting of contracts for the \$87,000,000 worth of river and harbor work made by the last session of congress. Most of the contracts under that law were held up by the war department pending the settlement of the case. Justice Holmes' opinion that the men employed on dredges in river and harbor improvements are not laborers or mechanics was based on the ground that in effect such men are seamen, to whom the law is not applicable. He said that all other employment is incidental to the work of the men and to their service as seamen and that, therefore they must be classified as seamen. Justice Moody held a diametrically opposite view, declaring the duties of the men in handling the dredges are incidental to their work as laborers. Their principal duty was that of digging and removing dirt and the fact that they are employed on a vessel does not alter the case. The court, he said, had nothing to do with that policy of congress in enacting the law. Justices Harlan and Day concurred in the dissenting opinion.

ON MAY 16 Governor Gooding, of Idaho, escorted, so it is charged, a number of newspaper men to the cell of Harry Orchard, the self-confessed assassin of former Governor Steunenburg and whose alleged confession seeks to implicate officials of the Western Federation of Miners. Orchard submitted to an interview, saying that he had not been promised immunity and that if he had confessed the confession was not obtained by force. Governor Gooding supplemented Orchard's statement by saying that the assassin had not been promised immunity.

JUDGE WOOD, who is presiding at the trial of Haywood, promptly called the attention of the county attorney to the Orchard and Gooding interview and directed him to take such action as was deemed necessary if these interviews appeared to be in contempt of court. Judge Wood condemned the publication of these interviews and said that they were calculated to influence the jury. Attorneys Darrow and Richardson for the defense charged that the interviews were published for the purpose of preventing the defendant from obtaining a fair trial. After the attorneys had engaged in a heated argument Judge Wood interrupted to say that his course in the matter had been made clear. He said that some time ago a proposed juror had reported that he had been spoken to in reference to the case. "I directed the acting prosecuting attorney to take cognizance of the matter at that time, and I understand he did so. I will do the same thing in this case, and as the prosecuting attorney is present I call his attention to several articles in this morning's paper—one reporting the details of the visit of the newspaper men to the penitentiary, two others signed by two correspondents, and giving their opinion of Orchard, and another purporting to have been sent out by the Associated Press. If after careful examination, without fear or favor, he concludes that an attempt has been made in any way to influence jurors, he will take such action as the law seems to justify. I have every confidence in the prosecuting attorney."

HORACE WHITE, writing to the New York Evening Post, under date of the New York, April 22, says: "Sir—Dr. David J. Doherty, the representative of the Filipino Progress association in Manila, writes from Takloban, Leyte, under date of March 15, 1907, as follows: 'The use of thumb screws on some prisoners till the blood spurted from their finger ends was employed by a Filipino presidente, but an American officer stood by and did not stop it. Of course, the prisoner 'confessed.' In another letter from Manila he says of the same affair: "Thumb screws were used on some prisoners in Tolosa, under orders

of the presidente, Miguel Romeraldez, who is a violent 'Americanista.' An American officer of the army was present at the torture, but I could not determine his responsibility. In another case, an American detective beat a chained prisoner to force confession. The prisoners were tried in large batches. They had the legal right to demand separate trials, but they did not know it." Probably these are isolated instances of the barbarous method of obtaining worthless testimony by physical torture. Publication is recommended as the surest way to prevent the spread of the practice.

REFERRING TO recent railroad disasters, a writer in Colliers Weekly says: "The statistics of railroad 'accidents' for March contain nothing to dispel Mr. Hill's gloomy feeling that when he starts on a journey he is taking his life in his hand. In that month, as shown by an unofficial but fairly complete record, there were fifty-three serious wrecks in which ninety-two persons were killed and at least two hundred and fourteen injured. That is four more wrecks, with forty more killed, but by a curious chance eighty-eight fewer injured than in February, which, it is only fair to remember, was a shorter month than March by three days. The worst of the March disasters was the smash on the Southern Pacific near Colton, Cal., in which twenty-eight persons were killed and fifty-eight injured. In that month there were seventeen collisions, nine trains ran into open switches, five suffered from explosions, five were derailed by spreading and broken rails and broken trucks, and six were thrown from the tracks by wreckers, three of these crimes occurring on the Pennsylvania railroad, within a few days of each other. Negligence, disregard of orders, or faulty orders, are charged with four wrecks. Two were admitted by railroad officials to be due to overspeeding. Washouts caused two, and others were laid to slides and speeding on curves. In February, for which complete statistics have been collected by the Railroad Gazette, there were forty-nine serious wrecks, of which twenty-six were caused by collisions, twenty by derailments and three by boiler explosions. In these fifty-two persons were killed and three hundred and two injured."

THE New York Evening Post, a republican paper, does not appear to be greatly impressed with the efforts of Mr. Roosevelt to dismiss Mr. Harriman as a person unworthy of respectful consideration. The Post says: "It was not necessary for President Roosevelt to take notice of the publication of a letter, confessedly stolen and garbled. Yet if he had to do it, the pity is that he could not have done it in a more dignified manner, and made his rejoinder more effective and ingenuous, while quieter. Having chosen to disgust the public by laying before it the details of his correspondence with Mr. Harriman, the president invites a sifting of the case; and we are bound to say that a comparison of the documents does not leave Mr. Roosevelt in an altogether happy light. The president gloats over the fact that this new issue of veracity—and what a lamentably long list of such issues he now has!—has been raised between him and a man suffering the discredit which attaches to Mr. Harriman. But that gentleman was pretty well known in 1904, yet in that year Mr. Roosevelt found 'real pleasure' in seeing him, consulting with him about the campaign, and taking his \$50,000, with the \$150,000 more which he raised among his friends. All told, the new revelations confirm what has come out before about President Roosevelt being so anxious in 1904 to save the country that he did not scruple to use abhorrent means, and invite the aid of the men whom he now calls 'enemies of the republic,' in order to do it."

AN INTERESTING story is given under date of Northampton, Mass., in the New York World: "The will of John James, of the town of Goshen, made one hundred years ago, was presented in the probate court today. It stipulated that at the end of one hundred years \$100 with its accumulated interest should be paid to the town of Goshen and the parish of the Congregational church of that town. The \$100 with its accumulation now amounts to \$19,431.72. The court ordered a division of the fund according to the terms of the will. One portion of the money—\$10,556.72—was ordered to be paid the town for the benefit of the schools and the support of the poor of the town, and \$8,800 applied to the support of a gospel minister in that town and for the repairs of the house of worship, which has the same organization and the same meeting-house that existed in the life time of the testator."