

dinner is to be fixed by Chief Justice White, and its purposes are said to be two-fold: 'First, it is proposed to honor the first graduate of a Jesuit college who has reached the high office of justice of the supreme court of the United States. Second, it is intended to form a sort of national organization of the alumni societies of the Jesuit universities with headquarters in this city (Washington), with a New Yorker as president. A committee has been named to wait upon Justice White and inform him of the plans of the alumni societies and have him fix the date of the banquet and reception at the Metropolitan club.'

FORMER GOVERNOR Frank S. Black of New York delivered a speech at a banker's banquet in New York City. A United Press report says: "The Black speech included enthusiastic praise of Speaker Cannon and bitter criticism of 'muck rakers and demagogues,' and the ensuing applause was led by J. P. Morgan. The fact that Black, after assailing the initiative and referendum, the recall, popular election of United States senators, and of the other doctrines advocated by progressives in the two old parties, was applauded at length and the speaker afterward warmly congratulated by Morgan and the other big financiers is thought to indicate that the moneyed interests of the country will oppose any extension of these policies wherever possible, most especially in the east. 'It is up to the business men of sense,' said Black, 'to quit whispering in private when demagogues and disturbers are busy and to come out and reason with the people. Demagogues always start with an advantage no fair disputant ever has. Men like you believe, but you do not speak and consequently demagoguery and muckraking go on unrebutted. I believe that generations from now, when the names of sporadic and valuable reformers are preserved only because they fought him, the name of Speaker Cannon will be remembered with increasing respect. The muckraker and the demagogue have done harm enough and ought to be sent to the rear. Their message of distrust and turbulence is neither sincere nor true. The vast majority of American business is honestly done and the vast majority of American fortunes honestly acquired.'

NO ONE CAN TELL just now the scope of the Progressive Republican League recently organized. A special writer in the Philadelphia North American says: "It means the banding together of the progressive forces within the republican party to fight for control of that party, and it suggests with unmistakable clearness the possible formation of a third party in case that effort fails. The declaration put forth today, signed by nine progressive republican senators, a score of republican members of the house and a long list of public-spirited men not heretofore identified with political movements, is a summons to the people of the country to assume control of their own affairs, and especially a summons to the republicans to wrest control of the party from the gang politicians and the special privilege combinations. While no announcement is made of the immediate political purposes of those in the movement, no one can doubt that it will develop into a fight against the renomination of President Taft, and no one can doubt that it will provide a rallying point not only for the opponents of Taft's renomination, but the opponents as well of the special privilege legislation which President Taft has favored. This being true, the question naturally arises as to whether the movement, if it succeeds at all, will not succeed beyond the power of its promoters to control its action, and develop into a third party."

REFERRING TO the punishment visited upon its editor, Fred Warren, the Appeal to Reason, socialist paper, says: "Warren's 'crime' apparently consisted in this, that he tried to do, or to cause others to do, that which the supreme court of the United States pronounced to be perfectly legal when it was done. The actual kidnapping, in the dead of night, of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone from the state of Colorado to the state of Idaho was declared by the United States supreme court to have been a perfectly proper and legal act. But the attempt, or the offer of a reward for the attempt, to kidnap ex-Governor Taylor of Kentucky and to deliver him to the judicial authorities in his own state, has been adjudged a crime punishable by heavy fine and imprisonment. Whence

this difference? Why is a mere attempt a crime, and the accomplished act no crime whatever? Can it be that the accomplished act was right and proper for the reason that the sufferers and victims were labor leaders, while the unsuccessful attempt was a crime for the reason that the person against whom the attempt was aimed was a prominent capitalist politician? Perish the thought! The equality of all citizens before the law is a sacred principle of American jurisprudence, which it were almost blasphemy to doubt. Particularly when we consider that the offer of a reward for the arrest of fugitives from 'justice' is quite an ordinary practice resorted to by constituted authorities everywhere. Warren's 'crime' must be deeper and blacker than any overt act or attempt for which he was compelled to appear in court. And if this 'crime' does not consist in being a socialist, we do not know what it does consist in. In Warren's case, moreover this crime assumed a particularly offensive and flagrant aspect, for Warren is the editor of a socialist paper with a large circulation. A crime so unusual certainly merits exemplary punishment. And yet this revolting crime was not mentioned in course of either trial of the case."

THE NEW SENATOR from Tennessee is described in a Nashville dispatch to the Chicago Record Herald as follows: "Luke Lea, independent democrat, practical owner of the Nashville Tennessean-American, and youngest politician in Tennessee with any degree of success, was named by the general assembly today to succeed to the seat in the United States senate held by James B. Frazier. His nomination is the last echo of the tragedy in which ex-United States Senator Carmack was killed. At the time Carmack was shot he was editor in chief of the Tennessean. Lea is generally spoken of as 'the man who made Governor Patterson' in the first place, and the one who contributed more subsequently than any other in defeating him, after he pardoned Colonel Cooper, imprisoned for the Carmack killing. Lea is thirty-two years of age, a graduate of the University of the South at Sewanee, and is the second Luke Lea to attain prominence in the politics of Tennessee. He is the son of Overton Lea, a descendant of Andrew Jackson, and the son-in-law of Percy Warner, president of the Nashville Railway and Light company. He came into prominence locally in 1905 when he took charge of the Home Telephone company's fight against the Cumberland Telephone company for a franchise in Nashville. In 1907, when the county unit primary plan was adopted, Lea supported Senator Carmack."

REFERRING TO THE Lorimer case the Indianapolis News prints this editorial: "It is clear that Senator Bailey of Texas is going to be a rather puzzling problem to the democratic party. At the present time he is—or seems to be—very greatly interested in the Lorimer case, and on the Lorimer side thereof. It is known that he favors the majority report of the committee, which favored Lorimer. Only the other day Bailey made a technical point against the reception of Senator Beveridge's minority report, holding that it really was not a minority report at all. He did not press the point, as, so he said, his only purpose was to make a 'precedent.' And now Bailey is greatly concerned over the 'attack' of the president on the independence of the senate. As all that Mr. Taft did was to ask that senators make a careful study of the evidence in the case, there is no reason to think that the senate will 'resent' an insult that was never given. The question, of course, is whether the democratic party will allow itself to be put in a false position by Bailey. The case is simple. It is charged that Lorimer's election is so tainted with corruption that he ought not to be allowed to retain his seat. The president evidently holds that opinion, as he has a right to do. He is a distinguished lawyer, and accustomed to weighing evidence. Further than that, he is the leader of his party, and as such has a perfect right to counsel with other republicans, even though they happen to be members of the senate, on matters affecting the welfare of the party. This is all he has done. Are the democratic senators, under the leadership of Bailey, going to raise this false issue, and co-operate with certain of the republicans to support Lorimer as against other republicans? It is to be noted that the great effort has been to prevent any real consideration of the case. This was made clear in a dispatch to the New York Times,

quoted in the News of yesterday, containing this: "In the discussion of the case here the point already has been reached where every man who declares himself in favor of a full and exhaustive examination of the matter before a vote is taken is at once set down by Lorimer's friends as against Lorimer. \* \* \* The line upon which the friends of Lorimer are proceeding just now ignores entirely the question of whether the election which gave him his seat was honest or corrupt.' This is the nature of the campaign which is now on. It is a campaign of suppression and secrecy. And Bailey is one of its leaders. Another interesting phase of the question is suggested by the statement of the Times that representatives of the lumber trusts are active in Lorimer's behalf. The most vigorous Lorimer lobbyist is, according to the Times, the man 'who made himself conspicuous about the capitol during the tariff fight, especially when the president was endeavoring to have lumber put on the free list.' Bailey, it will be recalled, voted against free lumber. If the president and the republican senators make up their minds that Lorimer ought not to have his seat, and if he is saved by a combination of Burrows republicans and Bailey democrats, the democratic party will suffer a severe blow. This question is one that concerns the whole country, and it also touches the honor of the senate. As for the influence of the president, it is nothing compared with that which the lobbyists attempt to wield when they impudently threaten senators who declare that they are going to vote against Lorimer."

THE VOTE BUYING scandal in Uncle Joe Cannon's home county continues to grow. An Associated Press dispatch from Danville, Illinois, says: "The Vermillion county grand jury today heard Danville's city attorney accused of having admitted buying votes and was given a list of fifty possible witnesses by the accusers. The city attorney's alleged trafficking, it was testified, was in the interest of the present sheriff at the last general election. The jury heard eleven witnesses, and twelve, including Speaker Cannon's son-in-law, are subpoenaed for tomorrow. The fact that an investigation may disclose irregularities in the elections of the state's attorney and even the court itself has not stood in the way of their orders to have the search complete, and all the officials concerned have openly announced they want the inquiry to go to the bottom of affairs, regardless of the result. One of the newspaper men who was a witness today told the inquisitors he had been approached by persons offering him a vacation and several 'good things' if he would not go before the grand jury with his story. It had not been expected the alleged vote traffic would be investigated so soon, as there were many routine matters to be looked into by the grand jury, but the climax of the situation was precipitated when the two newspaper reporters who last week sent broadcast a story purporting to contain a 'confession' from City Attorney Frank W. Jones that he had purchased votes, which story was denied by Jones, demanded to be allowed to go before the grand jury and tell their story. When it became known they would insist on being heard, several forthwith subpoenas were issued and nine other persons appeared later and were heard."

AN INTERESTING story comes from Nashville, Tennessee, in the following United Press dispatch: "That 'heavenly securities' constitute the major part of the estate of the Rev. Lundy H. Harris, is the substance of an inventory of his wife, Mrs. Cora Harris, author of 'A Circuit Rider's Wife.' Harris, who recently committed suicide, is said to have been the real 'Circuit Rider' of the story. Mrs. Harris' inventory declares Harris' temporal possessions were '\$2.35 in his purse, \$116 in the Union Trust company of Nashville, about 400 books and coffin in which he was buried.' 'But' she continues, 'the major part of his estate was invested in heavenly securities, the values of which have been variously declared in this world and highly taxed by the various churches, but never realized. He invested every year not less—usually more—than \$1,200 in charity so secretly, so inoffensively and so honestly that he was never suspected of being a philanthropist and never praised for his generosity. He contributed anonymously to every charity in Nashville; every old maid interested in a 'benevolent object' received his aid; every child he knew exacted and received penny tolls from his tenderness. He was ever recognized as one of the largest bondholders in heaven.'"