

such a word, because it is false. I knew his father. The son comes of fine stock. How would 'Chanler and Johnson' suit me? Good as any, if Mr. Bryan would be eliminated. He is a destroyer of plans and a breaker of images. I am sick and disgusted with the people of my state. How should I be expected to take any interest in the prospect of carrying New York with a man who has proved his popularity by obtaining office when the head of his own ticket was defeated? No, I am out of politics."

WITH THE expiration of the fifty-ninth congress the terms of thirty senators expired. Referring to this fact a writer in the New York American says: "Of these, seventeen were re-elected, leaving thirteen brand-new senators to be chosen. If it is conceded that George P. Wetmore, who is still making the political fight of his life in Rhode Island, will be elected; that the president will proclaim Oklahoma a state and its two democratic senators who were elected at the primaries are seated, the new senate will consist of sixty-one republicans and thirty-one democrats—the senate for the first time in its history comprising ninety-two members. Thus the new senate will be the largest yet, and will consist of two-thirds republicans, which gives them the power to ratify treaties without the aid of democratic votes. The democrats will have to elect a leader. Senators Daniel of Virginia and Culberson of Texas are the most promising candidates so far. Through the retirement, death or expired terms of such men as Clark, Alger, Dryden and Millard the new senate will not be as wealthy in the aggregate as was that of the Fifty-ninth congress, there being only two millionaires among the newcomers—Guggenheim of Colorado, and Richardson of Delaware. The age limit is greatly reduced, the newcomers nearly all being comparatively young men."

THE AMERICAN writer adds: "This will be the long session of the senate, but it will probably adjourn by June, 1908, as the convention of the two big parties will be held about that month or the first of July. From the infusion of new and young blood much is expected that will be picturesque, pyrotechnic and even pathetic, for one of the expected Oklahoma senators is totally blind. With the seating of Robert L. Owen and Charles Curtis, who are Indians, there come for the first time two members of this race. Guggenheim of Colorado, is the seventh Hebrew to enter the senate, and there will be two of this race—Ankeny and Rayner—to welcome him. 'Bob' Taylor of Kentucky, is a famous humorist, and has promised to make things lively in the austere end of the capitol. The noted platform speaker, Jeff Davis, of Arkansas, is expected to out-Tillman Tillman and furnish some of the pyrotechnics, and there may come 'Tom' Gore, the spell-binding orator from the new state, with the windows of his soul closed forever to the light of day and the silent appeal of his blind face. Those who may be classed as new senators for the approaching session, including two who have filled short unexpired terms and the probable new senators from Oklahoma, are as follows: John H. Bankhead, Fayette, Ala.; William E. Borah, Boise, Idaho; Jonathan Bourne, Jr., Portland, Ore.; Frank O. Briggs, Trenton, N. J.; Norris Brown, Kearney, Neb.; Charles Curtis, Topeka, Kan. (served out the unexpired term of Senator Burton in the Fifty-ninth congress—may be considered new); Jefferson Davis, Little Rock, Ark.; Joseph M. Dixon, Missoula, Mont.; Simon Guggenheim, Denver, Colo.; Joseph F. Johnson, Birmingham, Ala.; T. H. Paynter, Frankfort, Ky.; Harry H. Richardson, Dover, Del.; William Alden Smith, Grand Rapids, Mich. (served out the unexpired term of Senator Alger in the Fifty-ninth); Isaac Stephenson, Marinette, Wis.; Robert L. Taylor, Nashville, Tenn.; Thomas L. Gore, Oklahoma; Robert L. Owen, Oklahoma. Three of these members are promotions from the house—Bankhead, Dixon and Smith.

SOME VERY suspicious proceedings are going on just now in Oklahoma. The Houston (Texas) Post tells the story in this way: "It seems that the board appointed by the republican territorial government of Oklahoma to canvass the returns of the recent election has made up its mind to either steal the state or have the election declared void. They have without reason declared that the 'returns' within the mean-

ing of the enabling act are the poll book, tally sheets and certificates of the vote cast in the 1800 precincts of the state, instead of the abstracts of the vote prepared by the county clerks. Nowhere in the United States is such a rule observed in canvassing the returns of state elections and it was not the intention of the enabling act to have any such rule applied in Oklahoma. In none of the states formerly admitted under congressional acts was such a rule recognized. Of course, the democrats are protesting against the ruling and will resist it in the courts, but as the matter will have to be decided by republican authority, and because the republicans throughout the country are anxious to bar Oklahoma, it is not certain what the decision will be. It ought to be plain to the Oklahoma republican managers, however, that they are pursuing a course that will eternally damn the party in Oklahoma. Whether Oklahoma be admitted in an orderly and decent manner or barred for an indefinite time, it is a democratic state and the outrage now sought to be perpetrated upon its people will be remembered as long as this generation survives. Mr. Roosevelt has an opportunity to win the commendation of the people of Oklahoma by indicating to republican territorial satraps there that it is not his desire for them to steal the state or obstruct statehood. It is a disgrace already that Oklahoma has been kept out so long merely as a matter of political expediency and he should terminate the uncertainty with a quiet hint that further obstructions to statehood are not desired. There is no doubt the brood at Guthrie are bold enough to attempt the steal if the president should wish it, but they would have a fine time undertaking to maintain a government thus filched from the people."

SENATOR LAFOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, is finding it very difficult to maintain intimate relations with the republican party. The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald (rep.) says: "There is a chance—not so extremely remote—that Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin, an avowed candidate for the presidential nomination, may have to fight for admission to the republican national convention next summer. Confronted by the same conditions he went up against in 1904, there is again the possibility that he may have to carry on his individual battle outside the national party breastworks." The Record-Herald's correspondent adds: "Incident to the gathering of republican leaders here this week for the purpose of arranging the preliminaries for the national committee meeting in December, some significant facts relating to the calls for national conventions have been unearthed. Unless the executive committee of the national committee, which will issue the call for the 1908 convention after the time and place have been set for the full committee, breaks all precedents the call will provide specifically for the election of delegates at large from all the states and territories by conventions, taking no cognizance of the direct primary system prevailing in Wisconsin under which LaFollette's friends would expect him to be elected a delegate at large from the Badger state and to head the Wisconsin delegation."

JUST HOW to keep LaFollette out of the national convention is a question, the difficulties of which are intimated by the Record-Herald's correspondent when he says: "Political conventions are a thing of the past with Wisconsin republicans under the direct primary scheme which LaFollette forced through during his term as governor. Delegates to national conventions are to be chosen as candidates for state offices are nominated—by direct vote of the people. The state law and political organization regulations, however, have no influence upon the national committee. This committee is all powerful in prescribing how the membership of the party conventions shall be selected. In 1904 and the time before that and the time still previous, and as far back as there is any record at hand, the republican national convention call has provided that 'delegates at large shall be elected by popular state and territorial conventions, to be held at least thirty days before the meeting of the national convention and of which at least thirty days' notice shall have been published in some newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the respective states and territories. Sometimes there has been a change in the number of days' notice that must be given, or the time ahead of the national gath-

ering at which the state convention must be held, but there has been no deviation from the 'popular state and territorial convention' feature. There is a feeling that while LaFollette might be certain to pull down one of the four delegations-at-large at a direct primary, he might fall by the wayside through the holding of a party convention, which might choose a complete delegation favorable to some other person as a candidate for president and instruct the members accordingly. It will be recalled that three years ago the factional split in Wisconsin resulted in dual state conventions and the election of rival delegations to the national convention at Chicago. The republican national committee in making up the temporary roll of the national convention threw out the LaFollette delegation and unanimously seated the stalwart delegation, headed by Senator Spooner. The national committee of today is no more inclined to idolize LaFollette than was the case in 1904, when he practically was without a friend in the whole outfit."

THE RECORD-HERALD'S story concludes thus: "The contingencies that may arise in view of the fact that certain members of the national committee are known to favor strict adherence to the old form of call for the national convention are manifold. LaFollette and his friends might go ahead with their primary, believing the result would be accepted by the national convention as the will of the republican organization in Wisconsin. The other republican element in the state might call a convention and elect delegates in strict conformity with the call for the national convention. Then it would be up to the national committee to pass upon the credentials of the two sets of delegates, and it is more than probable—practically certain—that the decision would seat the set chosen as prescribed by the committee. If both elements accepted the literal construction of a call made as indicated there would be the merriest kind of a fight for control between those wanting LaFollette for president and those believing that Wisconsin would do better to support some candidate outside the state who stands a better show of getting the nomination. A state convention might lead to the same situation as was presented in 1904, with a bolt or something of the kind and the election of two sets of delegates, the same as preceded the national convention at Chicago. If prejudices cut any figure with such a contest launched, the LaFollette side would get the smallest consideration. The exacting possibilities of the prospective situation are increased by the fact that Lieutenant Governor Connor, who is chairman of the Wisconsin republican state central committee, has broken with LaFollette, and the senator's old strength around the state capitol at Madison is likewise shattered to a considerable extent. Chairman Connor might fall in readily with an anti-LaFollette program, call a state convention under the direction of the national committee and prescribe the manner in which delegates thereto should be elected. In Washington LaFollette has been playing a lone hand ever since he entered the senate, and his indiscriminate attacks on his colleagues have arrayed nearly ever national leader against him. The leaders would drive LaFollette out of the party if they could, many of them declaring that his attacks already have put him outside the ranks in everything except name."

CONSIDERABLE interest is just now attracted in an incident that took place at St. Louis, according to the newspaper dispatches. These dispatches say: "The toast to the president proposed by President Smith, of the Business Men's League, was drunk standing, while the president remained seated. When the others had resumed their seats the president arose. He grasped his well-filled glass of champagne, he lifted it, he crooked his elbow, he brought the glass close to his lips, then, smiling quizzically, he sat the glass back on the table and quietly sat down. There was a murmur of applause around the table. 'He isn't going to drink it,' said several of the guests, who had left their glassed turned down. In an instant the president was on his feet again. He lifted the glass a second, it approached his lips, but this time it did not stop. He took a sip of the wine and held the glass poised. There was a burst of applause much louder than the first. This time his face broke into a broad grin; and, bowing to President Smith, with one gulp he drained his glass."