

WASHINGTON NEWS

Porto Rican sugar growers protest against reduction on the sugar duty. They say it will ruin the Porto Rican sugar industry.

The Associated Press said: The recall of federal judges by popular vote at presidential elections was proposed in the house today by Representative Taylor of Colorado, a democrat, who introduced a bill for that purpose.

The federal judge of any district, under the proposed bill, could be removed from office, "on account of lack of good behavior."

There would be no specification as to the bad behavior of a judge, but merely of good behavior. The voters at the same time could recommend to the president their choice of a successor for the judge sought to be removed.

An appropriation of \$250,000 for the aid of a negro exposition in 1913, to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Lincoln's emancipation proclamation was passed by the senate.

The following is an Associated Press dispatch: The democratic wool bill passed the house, 189 to 92, with twenty progressive republicans voting for it. Representative Rucker of Colorado, who opposed it in debate and answered "present" on the roll call, and Representative Francis of Ohio, who voted against it, were the only democrats who did not line up with the majority. Representative Payne moved to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to report the republican substitute, but that was lost, 169 to 108. The twenty republicans who voted for the bill were:

Anderson, Lindbergh, Miller, Nelson, Nye, Steenerson, Stevens, Volsted of Minnesota, Haugen, Hubbard, of Iowa, Akin of New York, Jackson, Murdock, Young, Kansas; La Follette, Warburton of Washington; Lafferty of Oregon; Hanna of North Dakota; Kent of California and Norris of Nebraska.

Supporters of the bill declared it would not cut the government's revenue, but would save more than \$50,000,000 a year to consumers because of the readjustment of rates. All of the attempts of the republicans to amend the bill to increase the rates were lost.

The tariff board came in for criticism in the speechmaking. Representative Kitchin considered that Senators Smoot and Warren had deliberately imposed on the tariff board to maintain the high duty on wool.

"How is it," he said, "that sheep-growers in Washington are able to raise wool at one-twentieth of a cent a pound, and in Wyoming, according to the board's report, a pound costs thirteen cents?"

"And yet," returned Mr. Kitchin, "this infallible board shaded that cost price just 2 cents. The gentleman's estimate discloses the beauty of the system."

An Associated Press dispatch says: A signal victory was won by the interstate commerce commission when the supreme court of the United States decided the commission had the power to compel water lines to report to it, as well as the interstate board. It was the first case from the commerce court to be considered by the supreme court and the commerce court was reversed. While the cases before the court concerned im-

mediately only water lines, the government declared in arguing the cases that the defeat of the commission in this case would mean that railroads also need not report regarding intrastate business and the commission's whole system of gathering reports relative to commerce would be worthless. The orders in question required reports regarding operating expenses and operating revenues of water lines and affected lines principally on the great lakes.

President Taft authorized the exportation from the United States to Mexico of five big shipments of munitions of war consigned to the forces of President Madero. These included two machine guns, other arms and ammunition, horses and blankets.

The Chicago Tribune's report of the Lorimer fight follows:

"Senator Lea offered the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That in the opinion of the committee this investigation has resulted in additional and new proof to that developed by the last investigation that corrupt methods and practices were employed in the election of William Lorimer, which warrants a reversal of the former action of the senate in declaring that the election of William Lorimer was valid, and that in the election of William Lorimer to the senate corrupt methods and practices were employed and that said election was invalid."

"Senator Lea's resolution failed to pass by a vote of five to three. Yeas—Kenyon, Kern and Lea. Nays—Senators Dillingham, Johnston, Gamble, Jones and Fletcher.

"Senator Johnston offered the following resolution:

"That the testimony failed to show that Senator Lorimer himself used any corrupt practices or means or had any knowledge if such were used."

"This resolution was adopted. Yeas—Dillingham, Gamble, Jones, Johnston, and Fletcher. Not voting—Kenyon, Kern, and Lea."

The vote taken by the committee shows that Dillingham, Gamble, Johnston, and Fletcher, who were members of the original Lorimer committee, adhered to the decisions they reached last winter, in spite of the overwhelming evidence in the record corroborative of the charges that Lorimer procured his seat by bribery and corruption. Kenyon, Kern, and Lea are new members of the senate, who were not handicapped by any official record against them. In a speech made last winter Senator Jones, after speaking of his warm personal admiration for Mr. Lorimer, made this statement:

"After a careful study of the evidence in this case and the briefs and documents of counsel, I am forced to the conclusion that members of the Illinois legislature voting for Mr. Lorimer were bribed, and that as a result of their bribery they cast their votes for him, and that a sufficient number of the members of the Illinois legislature were so bribed and so cast their votes as to insure his election, and that without them he could not have been elected on the 26th day of May, 1909."

The evidence upon which this statement was based was repeated by the same witnesses before the Dillingham committee, and was supplemented by additional facts having direct bearing upon the charges or corroborative of the White confession. An instance in point is the John Broderick letter to Holstlaw

and the latter's telegram in reply making the appointment in Broderick's saloon in Chicago, when the \$3,200 was given by Broderick to the Iuka man.

It was not the intention of the majority of the committee to vote upon any other question than that of res adjudicata. The resolution was prepared with that end in view and offered by the Washington senator. But the plan to close the proceedings in this fashion failed, because of the determination of Senators Kenyon, Kern, and Lea to put the committee on record on the issues involved and especially those named in the resolution directing the investigation.

The committee was not ordered to discuss the plea of res adjudicata. The resolution adopted authorized, empowered and directed the committee "to investigate whether in the election of William Lorimer as a senator of the United States from the state of Illinois, there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices."

The committee was further and specially instructed to inquire fully into and report upon the services and use of the "alleged 'jackpot'" fund in its relation to and effect, if any, upon the election of Mr. Lorimer.

Through the amendments offered by Senators Kern and Lea, the committee was forced to respond directly to the provisions of the senate's resolution, with reference to the question of whether or not corrupt practices had been employed.

Senator Jones then put his resolution declaring there was no proof of the existence of "a jackpot" or other fund in connection with the election of Senator Lorimer, other than the statements of White, Beckemeyer, Link, and Holstlaw that they were paid money after the election and none of them except White claimed to have received such money for voting for Lorimer.

In his speech last winter Senator Jones said in discussing the "jackpot":

"There seems to have been a general system of taking of money for use to further or throttle legislation. The committee finds that there was a jackpot fund that was used for or against legislation. * * * When Link and Beckemeyer and Holstlaw were asked to forsake their party and party principles and cast their votes for one of opposite faith they knew what to expect without asking why or making any promises."

Senators Gamble, Fletcher, and Johnston also believed there was a "jackpot," but held it had no relation to the senatorship.

It will be noted that the committee adopted the Lea resolution declaring there was a fund distributed in the city of St. Louis on June 21, 1909, by Lee O'Neil Browne, and on July 15, 1909, by Robert E. Wilson to certain members of the Illinois legislature.

All the men who received money from these two legislators voted for Lorimer. The majority of the committee did not vote upon this resolution, so that they are free to explain their individual attitude upon the floor of the senate.

The resolution respecting Hines offered by Jones holds that it is not proved that the lumberman received \$100,000 or any other sum, or that he contributed any sum to aid the election of Lorimer. The Jones resolution further said that "the evidence is that he did not raise, contribute to, or expend" any sum to assist "improperly" in the election of Lorimer. It was the testimony of Clarence S. Funk that Hines solicited \$10,000, so that the Jones resolution does not touch the question at issue in this matter.

The majority of the committee says it will be ten days or more be-

fore it is able to present its report to the senate. The minority report will be ready within a shorter period. It will be the effort of Lorimer's defenders to secure a vote upon the plea of res adjudicata, and this will be discussed as strongly as possible in the majority report.

Eminent lawyers in the senate hold that this plea is fallacious and can not stand. They believe the country will regard it as an effort to evade a vote by an appeal to a technicality.

Commenting upon the doctrine the Lorimer advocates propose to expound, a member of the minority of the committee said:

"It is now apparent that the Lorimer adherents will try to crawl out through the technical loophole of res adjudicata, which, translated means former adjudication, or in other words, that Lorimer having been once tried and acquitted can not be tried again.

"The senate passed upon that question when it ordered the second investigation. The senate resolution ordered the committee to go into the general question as to whether corrupt methods or practices had been employed in the election of Lorimer as fully as if there had been no previous investigation.

"The committee spent the first month in examining the new evidence to which the attention of the senate had been called. If it proved nothing then why did the committee proceed for months going over all the old evidence and investigating all the circumstances surrounding the election? If res adjudicata was to be relied on, why did the committee proceed for months at an expense of \$40,000 or \$50,000 to thrash out all the old evidence and the circumstances of the original case?"

"The fact is, the new investigation was ordered largely because the former committee had not made a full investigation—had not explored all the sources of evidence—and the country demanded all the facts.

"Laying aside the Funk-Hines episode, the fact remains that this new investigation has developed scores of facts pertinent to the election of Lorimer which the old committee failed to discover. The doubts as to the correctness of Holstlaw's confession were dispelled. Prosecuting Attorney Wayman clearly refuted the claim that coercion was used to extort confessions. White's story was corroborated in many particulars and the case against Lorimer strengthened all along the line. This res adjudicata plea is the veriest subterfuge—a studied effort to befog the real issue.

"Its fallacy and ridiculousness will be fully uncovered by the minority report."

A vigorous investigation of the "money trust" and its ramifications were forecasted when the house adopted a resolution empowering the judiciary committee to employ every means in going into the situation. The resolution gives to the committee the powers of a court, authorizing it to subpoena witnesses and to compel the production of papers and records. Phases of the subject will be investigated, under authority already given by the committee on banking and currency.

An adverse report on the house steel revision bill, signed by all the republican members of the finance committee except Senator La Follette, has been submitted to the senate.

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated April 3, says: President Taft, in an address to the American cotton-makers' association, renewed his pledge for revision of the tariff only by a tariff board that