

CURRENT TOPICS

JOHAN HAYES HAMMOND, the celebrated engineer, famous by his connection with the Boer war, recently paid a visit to Denver. At a luncheon given by the Denver chamber of commerce Mr. Hammond delivered an address in which he said: "I deem it a great pleasure to meet the members of the chamber of commerce today and I always deem it a pleasure to visit Colorado, for in the state the deep canons and pretty valleys offer rest and are inviting. I have spent many pleasant months in the state and always look forward with pleasure to my coming here. Your president has said that the mining industry is overshadowed by the agricultural interests. One of the things needed is that new areas should be discovered and I dare say that hardly anyone present now grubstakes the prospector as was formerly done. I am sorry that such a condition exists. I am acquainted with the wonderful resources of Colorado and its possibilities and not only have I advised my friends of the fact but have myself invested here, together with my friends. One of the things that will help Colorado and the entire Rocky mountain region is to restore bimetalism. The silver question that many have thought a dead issue for the last few years, is causing more serious discussion than ever. The great financiers want to restore bimetalism. James Hill is taking an interest in silver, as are other great men. There is now at work a committee endeavoring to bring around the condition whereby silver will be restored to its place. Because of the present gold standard and the rate of exchange, the United States and England are getting the worst of it in the Oriental trade and if we wish to continue our commercial supremacy we must restore bimetalism."

THE DENVER News referring to Mr. Hammond's address says: "Hammond's talk was the cause of considerable comment after the luncheon and many were there present who think that if he is not the real leader of the movement to restore bimetalism, he is at least cognizant of the fact that the great captains of industry are beginning to realize that something must be done to uphold American commercial supremacy in the far East and the solution is to restore silver to its proper place."

THE WASHINGTON correspondent for the Philadelphia North American (rep.) gives this important warning: "From every interested source statements are emanating intended to create the impression that in the next few weeks the Aldrich tariff bill is to be so greatly improved that not only can President Taft sign it with a clear conscience, but the American people may accept it without resentment. No clear explanation of just how this is to be done is given, but in a vague and general way the public is asked to believe that the bill will really be made in conference, and that before it is voted upon Aldrich will have added certain provisions, like that imposing a tax upon the earnings of corporations, which will go a long way toward counteracting some of the evils the bill contains at present. Unquestionably there is basis for hope that from now on the bill will be made better and not worse, and that Senator Aldrich has been forced to realize that he must make concessions to public opinion if his bill is to escape a presidential veto. But any great hopefulness that the bill will be anything like the measure the American people had a right to expect or that any of its conspicuous iniquities are even to be modified is not warranted."

IN THE GOULD divorce suit on trial in New York, Mrs. Gould gave some interesting testimony concerning the enormous expense of providing clothes for the women of her set. The following is taken from a newspaper dispatch: "The witness said she had to have at Castle Gould, morning, afternoon and evening gowns, with shoes and stockings that matched; tea gowns, coaching gowns, shopping gowns, which she used about the city, and with most of these hats, shoes, stockings and parasols to match.

Yachting costumes were distinctive from the others and had to have their expensive accessories, the witness said. She was accustomed to change her gowns five and six times a day sometimes. She had to dress at least three times a day at Palm beach and more than that during her various trips about Europe. Regarding the cost of her various dresses, etc., Mrs. Gould gave the following estimates: Dinner gowns, \$500 to \$600; morning gowns, \$100 to \$150; day gowns (worn shopping, etc.), \$500; tea gowns, \$300 to \$400; reception gowns, \$500. For motoring, coaching and yachting, the witness said she required particular gowns but did not say how much she paid for them. Mrs. Gould testified that her costuming cost her \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year. She said that Palm Beach was perhaps the most fashionable place in the world and that she dressed there merely as other women dressed. Mrs. Gould said she changed her gowns at least three times a day at Palm Beach and Ormond and wore her handsomest gowns at 'rolling chair' time and 'tea time.' She never wore the same gown twice, she said, and gave most of them away when she returned to New York, where her social position required an entirely new outfit. She said she only dressed at Ormond and Palm Beach as women of wealth and social distinction dressed, and that she was indulging in the 'mildest form of dress,' as there were other people there who dressed oftener and made more display. 'What would happen if you wore one of these gowns twice?' asked Nicoll. 'It would be considered very bad form—very bad,' Mrs. Gould replied. In New York, the witness said, her social position required her to change her entire costume at least three or four times a day. 'How much time is consumed in making these various changes?' asked Mr. Nicoll. 'Two or three hours for each one, usually,' said the witness. Mrs. Gould said a woman in her position in New York society required two maids to dress her. Counsel wanted to know if she could not dress quicker with four or five maids. 'Mercy, no; I couldn't dress at all with five maids,' said the witness."

THE QUESTION of independence of the Filipinos received some attention in the senate. An Associated Press dispatch says: "Senator Borah started the ball rolling. Saying he proposed to cast his vote for 'loosening the bands which tie the Philippine people to the United States government,' he declared himself in favor of giving the Filipinos an independent government. The declaration aroused immediate attention, being apparently unexpected. 'When I speak that sentiment,' continued Mr. Borah, 'I am aware that I express a view contrary to that of the president, for whose opinion and services to that people I have profound regard. Nevertheless I have a conviction that the duty of the people of the United States is to prepare this people for supporting an independent government.'"

MRS. CLEVELAND, widow of the late Grover Cleveland, appeared as a witness against Broughton Brandenburg, who is charged with selling to the New York Times a letter said to have been written by Mr. Cleveland and denouncing Bryan and endorsing Taft. Following are extracts from the Associated Press report: "Counsel for the defendant asked the talesmen if the fact that the article on which the charge is based was political, written during the last campaign and unfavorable to one of the candidates, (Mr. Bryan) would influence their opinion or prejudice their minds. The work of selecting jurors progressed rapidly and the jury box was filled before the close of the morning session of court. Mrs. Cleveland was called as a witness at the opening of the afternoon session. After she had identified Mr. Cleveland's signature to several checks, Mr. Nott showed the witness a steel plate, on which was engraved the name of Grover Cleveland, and asked her if it was her husband's signature. Mrs. Cleveland said it was not, and that it was a false signature. Mr. Nott completed his direct examination at 8:30. Lawyer Samuel Bell Thomas cross-examined Mrs. Cleveland for the

defense. On cross-examination, Mrs. Cleveland told about meeting John G. Carlisle and F. S. Hastings, an executor of her husband's estate, in this city, and discussing the article which appeared in the New York Times, August 30, 1908, over Mr. Cleveland's signature. 'Did you hear Mr. Hastings say that the signature was genuine,' asked Mr. Thomas. 'No,' answered Mrs. Cleveland; 'I did not hear him say one way or the other at that time.' 'Did you authorize him to say it was genuine?' asked the lawyer.

'No, I did not,' said the witness emphatically. 'Did you send a telegram to the New York Times in regard to this article?' asked Mr. Thomas. The witness said she did, and she produced the telegram."

WRITING TO the Canton (Ohio) Morning News, Clyde H. Tavenner, its Washington correspondent, says: "Is Alexander Hamilton responsible for the tariff system, or is he not? The position of Senator Depew of New York in the affirmative, has been called by Minority Leader Champ Clark of Missouri. Mr. Clark would have answered the New York senator in a speech on the floor of the house, but is unable to do so because of the rule which prevents speech-making for the present. 'Anyone that never read history or studied the tariff,' said Mr. Clark today, in an exclusive interview with the writer, 'would conclude inevitably but erroneously from reading the last speech of Senator Chauncey Mitchell Depew in the senate that Alexander Hamilton originated the tariff system—evolved it out of his own inner consciousness. Why, bless his soul, he is old enough and has read enough to know that the tariff system was hoary with age before Christopher Columbus turned his prow westward in search of a new world. If Senator Depew has any doubts on this subject let him refresh his memory by reading Gibbon's account of the tariff system they had as to the city of Rome—a system which Senator Aldrich has studied with much advantage to the tariff barons and much disadvantage to the mass of consumers. Senator Depew predicts that Great Britain will be captured by Hamilton's system, when the truth is that Hamilton borrowed his system from Great Britain, a system which Great Britain repudiated in 1846 under the lead of Sir Robert Peel. Justin McCarthy, in his 'History of Our Own Time,' says that there is no more chance of Great Britain's return to the old tariff system than there is for a repeal of the Rule of Three, and it's dollars to doughnuts that McCarthy knew more about British politics than Depew knows or ever will know. If Hamilton originated the tariff system as Senator Depew seems to think, will the senator please inform us just how and why it is called a 'tariff' system? Every school boy knows that our word 'tariff' comes from a small Moorish town on the south coast of Spain, Tarifa, the abiding place of a lot of cut-throats and pirates who levied tariffs, or toll, on ships passing through the Straits of Gibraltar. That town was founded some six or seven hundred years before Hamilton was born. In his tariff speech Senator Depew said that 'the ideas of Hamilton have crossed the oceans; they have captured every country in the world except Great Britain. The fight to the death is now going on in the last citadel of Adam Smith, Richard Cobden and Robert J. Walker—the British Isles. It is a contest which I believe must result there, as everywhere else, in the triumph of the ideas of Alexander Hamilton.'"

MR. BRYAN NOT A CANDIDATE

A newspaper dispatch sent out from Omaha stated that Mr. Bryan had caused it to be announced that he is a candidate for United States senator. There was no truth in the dispatch. Mr. Bryan wired to the Omaha World-Herald this statement:

"I reiterate what I have said several times before, namely, that I do not desire to be a candidate for the senate and do not expect to be. While I will not say I will not be under any circumstances, it will require some emergency now unforeseen to bring me into the race, and I hope no such emergency will arise."