ed, in a sensational speech, congressional investigation of the general land office.

Neither the anti-Ballingerites in private life nor any members of the minority, nor all of them together, have sufficient leverage to throw off the "lid" against the wishes of the president and Speaker Cannon. But at least they are oscillating it so persistently and industriously that refusal to consent to an investigation will place both the secretary and his friends in a rather uncomfortable position. There are many unquestionably who believe that the president has been misled to indorsement of his secretary's past and present record. Accusers of that official insist that their charges can be substantiated by the records. Where questfons of veracity are so directly opposed, and both disputants insist that the records justify their respective claims, it would seem that the quickest and most satisfactory way of ending the row is offered by the proposed congressional investigation which should result at least in bringing out the testimony of the "records," complete and ungarbled.

: : : :

New York Times: In its efforts to make Mr. Richard A. Ballinger's position in President Taft's cabinet untenable, Collier's Weekly has either overreached itself, or it has actually in its possession evidence seriously damaging, not only to Secretary Ballinger but to United States Senator Heyburn of Idaho, and to Commissioner Fred Dennett of the general land office at Washington. In its issue of December 18 Collier's brings fresh charges, to the effect that these three officials have acted as attorneys for persons interested in urging claims before the federal departments—offenses for which two United States senators have been tried criminally and convicted. The statute forbids officers of the government to practice before the departments not only during their incumbency, but "within two years next after" they shall have ceased to be officials. In March, 1908, Mr. Ballinger resigned his commissionership of the general land office. The charges lodged against him by Collier's are here subjoined:

"Under date of December 23, 1908, a little over two months before he took office of secretary of the interior, Ballinger wrote to the register and receiver of the United States land office at Juneau, Alaska, saying that he represented W. G. Whorf, whose entry was known as coal survey No. 315. On January 7, 1909, less than sixty days before Ballinger became secretary of the interior, M. A. Green, who represents another Alaska coal syndicate, wrote to John W. Dudley, register of the Juneau, Alaska, land office: 'I submitted this scrip to Judge Ballinger as my lawyer, and he has approved the same, saying it was regular in every way, so I bought it and paid for it, and am sending it forward to you at this time.' * * * Under date of April 19, 1909—six weeks after Ballinger took the oath of office as secretary of the interior—Walter M. French of the law firm of Allen & French of Seattle wrote John W. Dudley, register of the Juneau land office: 'Mr. Harriman, whom I represent, has on several occasions taken the matter of sale up with Judge Ballinger, whose firm represented the purchasers, and with Mr. Hartline, and the parties have at all times seemed to be in perfect accord.'"

In respect to the Cunningham claims, President Taft investigated and declared in his letter to Mr. Ballinger of September 19 last that the evidence concerning which the secretary of the interior had been consulted did not come within the inhibition of the law, since it was not secured "until after your resignation as commissioner," and Mr. Ballinger in advising his clients could not have acted upon official knowledge. But the fresh charges are more serious—very serious, indeed—as, also, the charge brought against the present commissioner, Mr. Dennett, that he has admitted having "worked for the legislation sought for these men (the Alaska coal claimants) and had interviewed several congressmen in their behalf." Senator Heyburn is accused of accepting 100 acres of coal land in consideration for his services as attorney for the Cunningham interests. Either these charges are true or they are gravely libelous. Mr. Heyburn, Mr. Dennett, and Mr. Ballinger must make answer to them.

It might be well if the public was furnished with the names of those upon whose recommendation judicial appointments are made—the verbal recommendations as well as the written ones. We could then tell what to expect in those cases where bias and personal opinion enter in.

Practical Tariff Talks

Perfumery is one of the so-called luxuries upon which the tariff tax has been increased. Under the Dingley law these preparations carried the high average tax of 77 per cent, or, as expressed in the law, 60 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem. Under the new law the specific duty remains the same, but the ad valorem has been increased to 50 per cent. Perfumery is only theoretically a luxury, its use being general and deemed necessary by the women, constituting, as it does, the base of most toilet preparations. The effect of the specific duty of the law is to bar out all of the cheaper perfumes, while those used by the wealthy constitute almost the whole of the importations. This gives complete control of the cheaper perfume market to the American manufacturers, who fix whatever prices they decide upon through their association, which aims to regulate competition. As a cheap perfume weighs as heavily as does a high-priced one, the specific duty of 60 cents a pound results in this: That on the cheaper grades used by the masses, the specific duty alone runs as high as 227 per cent, while on the dear stuff it is as low as 2 per cent. And the labor cost of perfumery making runs only about 10 per cent of the total.

It is something of a jump from perfumery to glue, but it can be excused on the ground that they are both in the chemical schedule, and both are good illustrations of the application of the principle that runs through so many of the tariff schedules, to bear down heavy on the cheaper grades of articles and light on the more costly ones. Under the Wilson and McKinley laws the tariff on glue was 25 per cent. This was changed in the Dingley law to 2½ cents a pound, which meant that on the 10 cent a pound glue the rate was 25 per cent, and on 4 cent glue it is equivalent to 60 or 70 per cent. At the tariff hearing before the house ways and means committee the charge was made that this change was made at the instance of the packers who manufacture the low-grade glues. The effect of this naturally was to greatly increase the price of the cheaper glues. Formerly the packers were glad to sell to the jobbers at 4½ to 5½ cents per pound. Today and for the greater part of eleven years past the cheapest glue sells for 7 to 8 cents a pound, and the packers won't take any less because the imported article can not pass the tariff barrier for less.

Never heard of cutch, did you? Maybe it won't interest you to learn that cutch has been taken off the free list and put under a duty of seven-eighths of a cent a pound, about 25 per cent of its value? But a little later you will be paying the tax on every pair of shoes bought. It won't be much, but it will be a good excuse for tacking some more on. Cutch is a tanning extract, containing a strong brown coloring principle, and is the liquor secured from boiling the chips of acacia trees , which grow only in southern Asia. Cutch was originally used in the dyeing of cotton and woolen cloths, but as its value became known it was used for dyeing silks, piece goods and various textile fabrics. Later it became widely used in the tanning of leather, as the discovery of aniline dyes destroyed much of its usefulness for textiles. The demand for it has caused the substitution of mangrove bark extract, and the importation of the latter under the name of cutch.

The extract makers in this country desired this tax put upon cutch because its importation interferes with the sale of what they make. Cutch can not be made in this country, and if a stiff tax be put on it the importation will cease, becoming prohibitive. One of the men who protested against the increase said that the government could well afford, in order to save the oak and hemlock of our forests, to pay a royalty on every pound of mangrove cutch imported. Fifteen years ago, he said, practically no tanning extracts were used in leather making. With the failure of the bark supply in the immediate vicinity of the tanneries, the owners had to go farther away, and the cost rapidly increased. Chestnut-wood extract began to be mixed with the oak-bark extract largely used, but as the tanning business increased it became necessary to export various extracts made from foreign woods and barks. Not many years ago, so careless were the tanners, hemlock trees were felled for their bark alone and left on the ground to decay, and now hemlock bark forms but a small part of the tanning extract trade. Oak, however, is still used, along with chestnut. The effect of putting a heavy duty on cutch will be to either increase its price, or if it is shut out, to cause a further raid on the forests, where the American extract makers secure their chief supplies. C. Q. D.

A MONEY DICTATORSHIP

Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's Equitable Life Assurance Society refuses to buy any of the four per cent bonds issued by Dallas county, Texas, because the Texas legislature has had the audacity to enact an insurance law that is displeasing to Mr. Morgan's company.

Here follows the letter of the Equitable's vice president to the county judge of Dallas county:

"The Hon. John L. Young, County Judge of Dallas County, Dallas, Texas.—My Dear Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter in which, on behalf of Dallas county, you offer for sale county bonds. I have read with great interest what you say respecting the bonds as well as the financial statement of Dallas county. I have no doubt of the soundness of these securities and their desirability as an investment. We should be very glad to buy the bonds, but as under the extraordinary laws of Texas, enacted and approved by the present administration of your state, this society, together with nearly all other strong and reputable life insurance companies which had been doing business in Texas, was compelled to retire from the state, we can not invest in Texas securities nor can we loan money in that state without jeopardy. For this reason we can not become bidders for the attractive bonds you submitted to us. Respectfully yours,

"W. A. DAY, Vice President."

It is stated in a Dallas dispatch that "as no eastern financiers have offered to buy any of the bonds it would seem that all have taken a stand similar to that noted by Mr. Day."

Let it be observed that there is "no doubt of the soundness of these securities," no doubt of "their desirability as an investment," no doubt of the excellence of Dallas county's credit. The bonds are boycotted by the New York money trust solely because the Texas legislature in the exercise of a sovereign power has enacted laws that are offensive to Mr. Morgan's life insurance company and the other insurance companies allied with the money trust.

The World is not defending the Texas insurance code. It may be a very harsh and objectionable statute. We are merely calling attention to this latest method of Wall Street finance to coerce states and to punish states that do not govern themselves in accordance with Wall Street's wishes. Today it is Texas that is disciplined for its insurance code. Tomorrow county bonds in some other state may be boycotted because of railroad legislation that is offensive to the money trust. The next day the United States government may feel the weight of money trust displeasure because congress has not been sufficiently considerate of "vested rights."

Among the great insurance companies, banks and trust companies there is now a community of interest the like of which the country has never before known. After Mr. Morgan bought the Equitable from Thomas F. Ryan, a Wall Street operator was quoted in a financial newspaper as saying that any man might experience much difficulty in borrowing a million dollars in New York, regardless of his security, if Mr. Morgan was unwilling that he should have the money. The Dallas county case may now be cited in evidence.

This community of interest is not confined to New York. The great Wall Street banks and the great insurance companies, through their financial relations and alliances with outside banks, reach to nearly every part of the country. More and more they are coming to dictate the terms on which the American people are permitted to do business. Not satisfied with this power, they have begun, as the Dallas case shows, to dictate the terms on which states may govern themselves.

Whether Dallas county can dispose of $875,000 in four per cent bonds is of no great public importance except for the extraordinary circumstances of this financial boycott. Money has publicly offered no more insolent challenge to free institutions since the World, during the second Cleveland administration, smashed the Morgan-Belmont bond syndicate which had taken the government of the United States itself by the throat.—New York World.