

WASHINGTON NEWS

Following is a special dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald: Norman E. Mack of Buffalo, chairman of the democratic national committee during the last campaign, who testified before Senator Clapp's committee, said in an interview subsequent thereto:

"Instead of 25,000 contributors to the fund of \$600,000 which the national committee had in 1908 there were more than 100,000 contributors. The average contribution was approximately \$6. A fund of \$1,000,000 gathered in small sums, ranging from \$1 to \$10 each, is far more valuable to the managers of a campaign than a fund twice as large would be if collected from a few corporations and wealthy individuals.

"The reason for this belief is that \$1,000,000 is an ample fund for all legitimate expenses of a national campaign."

When Mr. Mack was testifying before the senate committee investigating campaign funds of 1904 and 1908 Chairman Clapp asked him who were the largest contributors in the 1908 campaign.

"The largest was Mr. Murphy," replied Mr. Mack. "He contributed \$10,000. Senator Clark of Montana contributed \$2,000 to the Chicago headquarters, and I think about \$2,000 to the New York headquarters. Several people offered funds, but they were refused."

"Why were they refused?" asked Senator Jones.

"You probably suspect why," returned Mr. Mack. "Mr. Bryan had said he did not want contributions from corporations. Colonel Guffey offered \$5,000; he said it was the first time he had not contributed. It was reported he represented the Standard Oil."

Mr. Mack added that after Mr. Bryan had been defeated, he, as chairman, accepted the contribution of Colonel J. M. Guffey.

"That is the only instance where I accepted money from a source where Mr. Bryan did not want it," explained Mr. Mack. "I did not think I was betraying Mr. Bryan's confidence by getting money to pay bills."

The official report of expenditures which the committee filed at Albany in conformity with the New York state law, Mr. Mack said, was correct and covered every dollar contributed.

After Mr. Mack's testimony the committee adjourned indefinitely.

An Associated Press dispatch says: Senator La Follette had but five progressives behind him when he forced through the senate the compromise wool tariff bill, representing the agreement with the house between the rates of the La Follette and Underwood bills. They are Senators Bristow, Clapp, Crawford, Gronna and Works. The measure, which had passed the house, passed the senate by a vote of 35 to 28; and as soon as signed by the proper officers will follow the steel bill to the White house.

An Associated Press dispatch says: The absolute divorcement of the ownership of railroads and industrial organizations were declared by Representative Stanley of Kentucky in the house as the only preventive of such monopoly as he described the United States Steel corporation to be. Mr. Stanley spoke for an hour and a half, reviewing the work of the special committee which investigated the steel trust for several months. When he began, less than

a score of representatives were present. Representative Cline of Indiana presided.

The speech was a review of the report which was recently submitted for the majority of the committee. It was an elaborate exhortation of J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller and others who have figured in financing the steel industry. Mr. Stanley was frequently interrupted, and several of his assertions of facts were challenged by Representative Gardner of Massachusetts, republican, who prepared the minority report in opposition to the majority report.

The Kentucky representative reviewed the story of J. D. Rockefeller's acquisition of the Mesaba iron ore range. He told picturesquely of the manner in which Mr. Rockefeller's almoner, the Rev. Dr. Gates, conducted the negotiations with the Merritt brothers, discoverers of the range. He asserted that \$400,000 was the price which Rockefeller paid for property which he afterward sold for \$80,000,000 for stock of the steel corporation.

"Was not the statement of Leonidas Merritt on the transaction with Rockefeller retracted?" asked Mr. Gardner.

"It was," answered Mr. Stanley, explaining that Merritt signed a retraction when a settlement was made with his brother for \$400,000.

Representative Gardner asked Mr. Stanley if this portion of the story of steel was not struck from the report by the other majority members. Mr. Stanley said it was, and that he told it on the floor to get it to the house.

"The gentleman should not convey the impression that it was not made public," said Mr. Gardner. "Every newspaper in the country printed it when the testimony was given."

"Oh, the newspapers are printed today and lost tomorrow. I want to get it in the imperishable records," said Mr. Stanley.

The Kentucky representative traced the growth of the steel trust through its processes and described how Andrew Carnegie had forced it to buy him out by threats of competition. He said Carnegie was not afraid of Morgan or the Moore banking syndicate.

"Mr. Carnegie paid more attention to making steel billets than to issuing bogus bonds," he said. "He was an ironmaster, not a stock broker and a high class gambler."

The holding company and the protective tariff were pointed to as the bulwarks of the steel trust's strength. The holding company was described as a "pernicious device" and the formation of the steel trust was termed a "scheme that exceeded the dream of the most avaricious scheme-maker that ever lived."

Mr. Stanley declared that the steel trust levied a tax on every man, woman and child in the United States.

"Every one of the 80,000,000 of people in this country pays to the steel trust to live, labor and finally when they die," said the speaker.

The house of representatives passed Sulzer's bill for a national department of labor with a secretary having a seat in the cabinet.

An effort will be made in the senate to appropriate \$25,000 to reimburse former Senator Lorimer for his expenses in defending himself.

The United States senate has issued a warning to the nations of the world against encroaching upon the

The Range With a Reputation

The Economy of A New Range

It is a mistaken idea of economy to try to get along—to attempt to get results with an old worn out range or cook stove merely to save the price of a new one. You can probably stick a knife blade anywhere in the seams of your worn out range where the bolts are loose and the stove putty has crumbled away and you're burning twice the fuel necessary. You can save the price of a Great Majestic in the saving of fuel alone—and that would be good management and real economy. Don't trust wholly to a printed description in buying a range, because a very glowing description can be given of a very ordinary range. If you are considering a new range, it will pay you, before investing your money in any range to go to some dealer who handles them and carefully compare, point for point, with any other—the

Great Majestic Malleable and Charcoal Iron Range

A Perfect Baker—Fuel Saver—Outwears Three Ordinary Ranges
ONLY range made of malleable iron and charcoal iron. Charcoal iron won't rust like steel—malleable iron can't break. Put together with rivets—joints and seams absolutely air-tight always. Oven lined with guaranteed pure asbestos board, covered with an iron grate—you can see it—insuring a dependable baking heat with half the fuel required in ordinary ranges.

All Copper Movable Reservoir—Other Exclusive Features
 Reservoir is in direct contact with fire, heats through pocket stamped from one piece of copper—patented feature only in Majestic. Oven Thermometer—open end ash pan—ventilated ash pit—ash cup. Sold by dealers in nearly every county in 40 states. Write for our booklet, "Range Comparison."

Majestic Mfg. Co.,
 Dept. 145, St. Louis, Mo.

It Should Be In Your Kitchen

continents of North and South America. The United States will not see, "without grave concern," said the senate, any suitable naval or military site pass into control of a foreign corporation, when such possession "might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States." So vital were the issues discussed in the Lodge resolution, which set forth the policy of the United States as to points situated like Magdalena bay, in Lower California, that the doors of the senate were closed for three hours, while the resolution was debated in secret session. It finally passed with only four votes against it. Notwithstanding the comparative unanimity of the senate upon the note of warning, it is understood the measure did not have the official indorsement of the administration. It was framed entirely outside the state department, and it is understood the executive branch of the government was not consulted with regard to the senate's pronouncement.

Democrats in the house have effected a compromise by agreeing to make appropriations for one new battleship instead of two.

An Associated Press dispatch says: The Panama canal administration bill, providing free passage to American ships; prohibiting railroad-owned vessels from using the waterway, and authorizing the establishment of a one-man government when the canal is completed, was passed by the senate by a vote of forty-seven to fifteen.

The provision for free tolls which was fought in the senate was indorsed again just before the passage of the measure. Attached to the bill as it passed the senate were two important amendments directed at trust or railroad control of steam-

ship lines. The first, by Senator Reed, would prohibit ships owned by an illegal industrial combination from using the canal, and the second, by Senator Bourne, would force railroads to give up water lines that might otherwise be their competitors, if it were proved that they were stifling competition.

President Taft is surely a stand-patter. An Associated Press dispatch says: For the second time within a year President Taft vetoed a bill to revise the wool tariff—Schedule K of the Payne-Aldrich law. With a message of disapproval the president returned to congress the bill evolved as a compromise between the house and senate, holding that its low rates would bring disaster to home industries. He appealed to congress, however, not to adjourn until it had enacted a measure to "substantially reduce unnecessary existing duties" without destroying protection for the wool industry in the United States.

The president's disapproval of the wool bill is to be followed with similar vetoes of the steel bill and the cotton bill. The sugar bill is likely to be vetoed, as is the excise tax bill, the latter probably on the ground that the president believes it unconstitutional.

"I shall stand by my pledges to maintain a degree of protection necessary to offset the differences in cost of production here and abroad and will heartily approve of any bill reducing duties to this level," wrote Mr. Taft.

While the bill vetoed and the one disapproved last year were identical in terms, the president's reasons differed. He vetoed the former bill because it had been framed before the tariff board's report—the latter because he said it had been framed with disregard for the board's findings.