

to believe it and that the president sent it to me because he did believe it and wanted me to believe it against this contention."

Mr. Pinchot here referred to the record concerning his letter of dismissal from President Taft.

"What have you to say to the charge that you were disrespectful to the president?" asked Mr. Pepper.

"I contend that the expression of an honest belief that the president had acted under a misapprehension is not disrespectful."

"What, now, as to showing a lack of confidence in the purpose of the president to take the defense of the people's rights in his hands?"

"If the president had signified his intention to take matters in his own hands I would have been happy to leave it there. But the president's letter showed he would continue to leave it in Ballinger's hands and that he had great confidence in Mr. Ballinger."

"What as to your being insubordinate?"

"I was not but I do not desire to lay stress on that point. I should have been insubordinate without a second thought if I should have considered it necessary to bring the facts before the public."

"Were you in fact insubordinate?"

"As a matter of fact I was not. But I have no desire for a personal vindication. I would rather not go into that question."

"Why not?" asked the witness' attorney.

"Because it is not important and I regard it unnecessary to bring out a difference of opinion between Secretary Wilson and myself. It would be a painful thing to get into a controversy with him and for that reason I have kept still."

Senator Nelson pressed his question as to whether or not Mr. Pinchot had consulted the secretary before sending the letter.

Mr. Pinchot said he would decline to answer the question unless it was put up by the whole committee. A motion to press the question was put and unanimously carried.

"Did you consult with the secretary before sending that letter?"

"I did."

The witness proceeded to explain his answer by saying he went to Secretary Wilson on January 3 and told him Senator Dolliver had requested information from the forest service and that the secretary made no objection.

"We discussed at length the right of Senator Dolliver to get the information from me as to the president's order forbidding subordinates to give information to congress. Secretary Wilson said: 'You and I will have no trouble about that order,' or words to that effect. I believed I had his consent. I described to him the situation as to the controversy before the interior department and the forest service; I told him of the intention of our opponents to magnify what had been done by Price and Shaw and myself. I thought the only wise thing for us to do was to lay our hand down on the table, admit what we had done and force the congressional inquiry to the points where it ought to develop itself.

"I was convinced that Secretary Wilson favored my effort to defend Price and Shaw although he did not favor my plan of getting publicity at the same time the other did. I felt I had, however, secured his permission to write to Senator Dolliver."

The cross-examination of Mr. Pinchot was delayed until Secretary Wilson, who desired to take the stand at once, could be heard. The grizzled old official, who holds the record for cabinet service, was plainly agitated when he took the oath as a witness and when he began to testify his voice was high pitched and strained. The secretary proved impatient at some of the questions put to him on cross-examination and became somewhat mixed as to just what letters were being referred to by his questioners and resentful of any inference other than his own that they wished to draw from his testimony.

Mr. Vertrees, counsel for Secretary Ballinger, took the direct examination.

"You have heard what Mr. Pinchot has said, have you any statement to make?" he asked.

"Some of the things Mr. Pinchot has said here—a good many of them," began Secretary Wilson, "are correct, but there are other things that are not correct."

The secretary brought his fist down on the table with a resounding whack. He then continued:

"He never got my consent to send that letter to the senate—there are two things in it that would have made it impossible for me to have given my consent. He attempted to review and judge the mental processes of the president.

He also assumed the authority that was mine to discipline."

Secretary Wilson said he had tried for two months or more to get a report from Mr. Pinchot concerning the alleged activity of the forest service in the Glavis matter. He said Mr. Pinchot kept delaying making a report to him.

"And what did he finally bring you?"

The witness stated Pinchot set Shaw and Price to work to prepare a report to him. For some reason or other this report was nothing more than their opinion of their own work.

"Now, gentlemen, I know comparatively nothing of what you are considering here. I have read something about it in the papers and know what the president said. Mr. Pinchot wants you to believe that because I reasoned no objection to his writing letters to Senator Dolliver regarding departmental matters that he had a right to write what he did. He had no such authority from me. I knew nothing of it. The question before this committee is: 'Did he have my consent to write that letter?' He did not. I never saw it. I never heard of it until I read it in the Congressional Record."

The cross-examination of Secretary Wilson was begun by Attorney Pepper, but it was soon taken out of his hands by the four democratic members of the committee who took turn about in plying the cabinet officer with questions. The republicans took practically no part in the examination. In reply to Attorney Pepper Secretary Wilson said he would forgive Mr. Pinchot for his assumption of authority over the disrespectful subordinates of the forest service, but that he could not forgive the part concerning the president.

MR. TAFT'S LETTER TO PINCHOT

In his testimony before the Ballinger investigating committee, Gifford Pinchot read into evidence the full text of a letter written to him by President Taft from Beverly, as follows:

Beverly, Mass., September 15, 1909.—My Dear Gifford: I inclose herewith a letter which I am about to send to Secretary Ballinger for such use as he sees fit, in reference to the charges made by Glavis against Secretary Ballinger, Pierce, Dennett and Schwartz. I have reached this conclusion only after a full consideration of Glavis' statement and their answers to it, but I never reached a conclusion based on a stronger conviction than this one is.

Glavis seems to be a man who has acquired but one idea, and who has allowed his suspicions to grow to such a point as to be altogether disingenuous in the statement of evidence which he adduces to sustain his attack upon his superiors.

I have made no reference to you in this letter, which will probably be made public, because I do not wish to bring you into the controversy at all. I have advised Mr. Ballinger and his subordinates that I wish your name left out of the matter in their answers and references, should it become necessary, as is not unlikely, to send the whole record to congress. I am aware from the tone of your letter and from your conversation with me that you did not give to Mr. Ballinger the confidence and trust which I do; and in this respect I think you do Mr. Ballinger injustice.

I think you have allowed your enthusiastic interest in the cause of conservation, and your impatience at legal obstacles and difficulties to mislead you in this regard, and that Glavis himself has led you to regard as suspicious a number of things which, when weighed in the light of all the circumstances you now know, are lacking in evidential force to sustain such a previous charge as that of bad faith against officials who have heretofore shown themselves to be entirely trustworthy.

I write this to urge upon you that you do not make Glavis' cause yours. You had no access to the records which Glavis had access to, and you did not know the explanation for some of the things that he pointed out as suspicious which he ought to have made known to you and to me.

I can not for a minute permit him to remain as a subordinate in the interior department or in the public service. It would be fatal to proper discipline.

On the other hand, I wish you to know that I have the utmost confidence in your conscientious desire to serve the government and the public, in the intensity of your purpose to achieve success in the matter of conservation of national resources, and in the immense value of what you have done and propose to do with reference to forestry and kindred methods of conservation, and that I am thoroughly in sympathy with all of these policies and propose to

do everything that I can do to maintain them, insisting only that the action for which I become responsible, or for which my administration becomes responsible, shall be within the law.

I write this letter in order to prevent hasty action on your part in taking up Glavis' cause or in objecting to my sustaining Ballinger and his subordinates within the interior department as a reason for your withdrawing from the public service.

I should consider it one of the greatest losses that my administration could sustain if you were to leave it, and I sincerely hope that you will not think that my action in writing the inclosed letter to Secretary Ballinger is reason for your taking a step of this character. When a man has been unjustly treated, as Secretary Ballinger has been in the manner pointed out in the letter, a copy of which I send you, it is my duty as his chief, with the knowledge that I have of his official integrity and his lack of culpability, to declare it to the public and do him justice, however great inconvenience may arise in other respects.

I have been greatly disturbed by the public discussion carried on in the press, from which it is inferred that your bureau is arrayed against the interior department and that material is being furnished for both sides from official sources.

I was especially distressed by McHarg's reported interviews, though I believe he now repudiates any criticism or slurring remarks concerning President Roosevelt. He was an efficient officer, but he talked too much and wildly, and his withdrawal relieved me. I must bring public discussion between departments and bureaus to an end. It is most demoralizing and subversive of governmental discipline and efficiency. I want you to help me in this. I can enforce team work if I can keep public servants out of newspaper discussion.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. TAFT.

INTIMIDATED AND SILENCED

Washington, D. C., March 3.—"I am intimidated in my representative capacity as a member of the house," shouted Representative Steenerson of Minnesota, in the house today when charging that large sums of money had been raised by ship-owners to improperly influence members of congress in behalf of the ship subsidy legislation.

Mr. Steenerson, who is one of the house insurgents, demanded recognition from the speaker on a question of personal privilege to make reply to an attack made upon him in the "American flag," published at Cleveland, O., in the interest of ship subsidy. The speaker ruled that inasmuch as the attack had been caused by a private letter written by Mr. Steenerson it could not be brought out in the house.

Mr. Steenerson declared that the merchant marine league of the United States, with headquarters in Cleveland, "conspired and associated together for the purpose of unduly influencing congress and creating hostility against all persons opposed to such legislation."

He wanted a committee appointed to investigate these charges to determine whether a conspiracy did exist.

Representative Underwood of Alabama, upheld the contention of Mr. Steenerson.

"If a conspiracy of that kind has been formed," insisted Mr. Cooper of Wisconsin, "it is the subject for a criminal action and should be investigated by a federal grand jury."

Speaker Cannon cited precedents to show that the question raised was not one of personal privilege and on motion of Mr. Payne the entire matter was referred to the committee on the judiciary.—Associated Press report.

THAT PACIFIC MAIL CONTRACT

Washington dispatch to the Philadelphia North American (rep.): "Secretary of War Dickinson made no attempt to justify the existing contract made with the Pacific Mail Steamship company, except upon the ground of necessity, in his statement today before the senate committee on inter-oceanic canals. He admitted the contract was a bad one, that it had caused him embarrassment and that something should be done to improve the existing situation. But he contended that at the time the contract was made, it was necessary in order to maintain through transportation between Atlantic and Pacific coast ports by way of the Isthmus of Panama. The contract in question gives 70 per cent of the through rate on all shipments to the steamship company, leaving the government but 30 per cent for transport-