

statement was couched in diplomatic though not reassuring language. At the very opening he said: "It is obvious that this Moroccan question has reached a point at which it will become increasingly difficult, embarrassing and anxious unless a solution is found." Later he said: "We thought it right from the beginning to make clear that, falling of a settlement such as I have indicated, we must become an active party in the discussion of the situation. That would be our right as a signatory to the treaty of Algeiras, as it might be our obligation under the terms of our agreement of 1904 with France. It might be our duty in defense of British interests directly affected by further developments."

A Seagirt, N. J., dispatch carried by the Associated Press, says: Taking cognizance of an alleged denunciation of Governor Woodrow Wilson by James R. Nugent, chairman of the democratic state committee, at a private dinner of politicians, nine of the twenty-one members of the committee drafted a formal demand for the resignation of Chairman Nugent. The bitterness of Nugent against Governor Wilson, it is stated, dates back to the recent senatorial fight. Nugent's remarks were meant only for the company present, he asserted, but they obtained publicity and created a stir among other members. Governor Wilson refused to be drawn into any discussion of the affair.

BRYAN'S DICTATORSHIP

Chairman Underwood's verbal assault upon Bryan as a dictator has an unfortunate tendency to confirm a conjecture that he may have fallen under the Bailey influence—an influence which in the last analysis is that of the protected interests. It may have been only the careless expression of a momentary irritability. Let us hope so. But charges of political dictatorship against Bryan have a suspicious significance, no matter who utters them; for this kind of warfare upon Bryan originated with the plutocratic elements in the democratic party.

It is an accusation that can not be made by any one in good faith. How can a man be a political dictator who holds no public office, who holds no party chairmanship, who belongs to no inside clique, who has no big business affiliations, who can not pull a single secret wire in politics, whose only political power is the confidence which a vast majority of the masses of his party repose in his fidelity? Bryan's political power has no other source nor support than that well-earned confidence. He hasn't any longer even dubious power of a possible candidate for the presidency, for he has distinctly declared his intentions on that score. That the power such a man as Bryan has is to be dreaded by some kind of political managers is true enough; but not by any of the kind with whom we still wish to identify Chairman Underwood. The test, however, of all such political managers is that they, as Mr. Underwood seems to have done, mistake the wholesome power of a trusted leader for the dangerous dictatorship of a boss.—The Public.

EXPLAINING IT

A man was recently fined for assaulting a policeman, and considering himself badly treated, made abusive remarks about the court as he was leaving the dock. An officer was sent to bring him back, and he was again fined, this time for contempt of court.

"My friend," said the magistrate, "if you had been more chaste and refined in your language you would not have been chased and re-fined."—The Pathfinder.

WASHINGTON NEWS

The interstate commerce commission handed down a decision in the Pacific coast freight cases, in which the right of railroads to meet water competition is recognized, and the way rates shall be made is outlined.

A special dispatch to the Louisville Courier-Journal says: "A roar echoed through the financial world when, drawing in his line of skirmishers, Representative A. O. Stanley, chairman of the steel investigating committee of the house, opened fire with his big guns on the 'steel trust.' He abandoned circumstantial evidence of violation of the Sherman anti-trust act and exploded a shell under the United States Steel corporation and its allies by putting in evidence a copy of an actual contract to pool prices and distribute business drawn by the Carnegie and ten other companies manufacturing steel plate, including so-called independents. Two highly important facts stood out prominently in the hearing and put to route the legal generals of the steel combine, who objected to the introduction of the agreement on the ground that it was made before the United States Steel corporation was formed, and it had never been signed. In the first place, witnesses were put on the stand who swore under oath that the agreement was kept generally in spirit and in many instances by the letter for several years after the documents had been returned unsigned. In the second place, the contract on its face shows that although it was drafted in November, 1900, it was to remain in full force and effect at least through 1902, a year after the organization of the United States Steel corporation."

Following is a dispatch to the Louisville Courier-Journal: That, through oral agreements, steel manufacturers now keep up prices and avoid "destructive competition" just as effectively as they did under the iron-clad contract of the American Steel Plate association, from 1900 to 1904, practically was admitted by A. F. Huston, president of the Lukens Iron and Steel company, before the house "steel trust" investigating committee.

Claus A. Spreckles told the congressional committee investigating the so-called "sugar trust" that H. O. Havemeyer and the American Sugar Refining company interest caused the break which existed between him and his father and brother for fifteen years.

After a conference on the joint resolution for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people the representatives of both houses of congress expressed confidence that ultimately there would be an agreement.

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington says: "Because he does not believe in the senate's method of taking testimony in investigations, Senator Bailey resigned from the committee on privileges and elections. He made no explanation to the senate and the resignation was accepted without comment."

To his friends Mr. Bailey said afterwards that he could not consent to enter on the work required in the investigation of the charges against Senator Stephenson.

"I have been appointed on the sub-committee to consider the Stephenson case," he said. "My conviction is that the strict rules of evidence

should control in all such inquiries. The senate does not observe such rules, but admits all kinds of matter. I can not see my way clear to decide a case of such magnitude on such a basis, and therefore have tendered my resignation as a member of the committee."

The sub-committee of the senate committee on privileges and elections appointed to consider the charges against Senator Stephenson of Wisconsin, held a preliminary meeting but did no business beyond mapping out the first stage of the work to be done.

By a combination of democrats and insurgent republicans the senate passed by a vote of 43 to 32 a compromise wool revision bill offered by La Follette. This was passed after the senate had defeated the original La Follette bill and the house bill. Concerning this measure the Associated Press says:

The bill as passed by the senate was drawn by Senator La Follette and was a compromise between the Underwood bill which passed the democratic house and the original La Follette bill, both of which were forced out of the way by decisive votes before the new measure was adopted.

Some idea of the compromise may be had from the proposed rates on raw wool. The house bill proposed a rate of 25 per cent ad valorem. The original La Follette bill proposed 40 per cent. The compromise fixes the rate at 35. It is predicted that the conferences will put it at 30.

The progressive program is to remain in session until action may be had on the several schedules named. In view of the action on wool and the contemplated action on cotton some of the progressive senators have urged the importance of an immediate reduction on machinery and chemicals because of the bearing of these schedules on the manufacture of cotton and woolsens.

The agreement under which the wool bill was put through extends to the farmers' free list, now on the senate calendar and the passage of that measure in modified form seemed assured.

The plan is either to place the various measures on the free list bill as amendments or have the house take up the schedules as independent bills. The progressive republicans are willing to proceed in either way, but they prefer the separate system. The democratic senators are neither so unanimous nor so enthusiastic as the insurgent republicans for a continued revision. They say that much will depend upon the president's attitude, and some of them predict early adjournment in case the president vetoes the wool bill. Others will contend for the right of the house to originate all tariff bills and will oppose the indirect method of organization through the amendment of a house bill covering other schedules, as does the free list bill.

It has been suggested that after the disposition in conference of the wool, cotton and free list bills, there should be a recess of a month or six weeks to permit the ways and means committee to proceed with its work.

The important features of the new La Follette bill compared with the present law and the Underwood house bill are shown in the following:

Raw wool, first class: Wool on skins, present law, 57.71 per cent ad valorem; Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 30 per cent. Wool not on skins, present law, 47.24 per cent;

Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 35 per cent.

Raw wool, second class: Present law, 44.98 per cent; Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 10 per cent.

Top waste, etc.: Present, 98.93 per cent; Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 25 per cent.

Shoddy, nolls, etc.: Present, 41 per cent; Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 25 per cent.

Woolen rags, mungo, etc.: Present 34 per cent; Underwood, 20 per cent; La Follette, 25 per cent.

Combed tops, present, 111 per cent; Underwood, 25 per cent; La Follette, 40 per cent.

Yarns: Present, 76.63 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent; La Follette, 45 per cent.

Yarns: Present, 76.63 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent; La Follette, 45 per cent.

Blankets and flannels: Present, 95.42 per cent; Underwood, 30 per cent; La Follette, 55 per cent.

Clothes, dress goods, fabrics and woolen cloth: Present, 96.74 per cent; Underwood, 45 per cent; La Follette, 55 per cent.

Carpets: Present 50 per cent; Underwood, 25 per cent; La Follette, 35 per cent.

Mats and rugs: Present, 62.95 per cent; Underwood, 50 per cent; La Follette, 35 per cent.

"The situation is entirely to our liking," said Chairman Penrose of the finance committee. We are satisfied the president would veto any bill that can be sent to him within a range prescribed and we shall proceed next winter with whatever tariff revision may be necessary. Then we shall have the tariff board's report and can work intelligently."

The passage of the bill came after a defeat of the Underwood house bill, 44 to 36, on almost a party vote, and after the original La Follette house bill had been voted down with only the republican insurgents in its favor. Having secured a vote on the Underwood bill, as provided by the house, democrats then supported a motion made by Senator La Follette to reconsider the vote by which their bill was defeated.

As soon as the motion to reconsider had been carried, Mr. La Follette offered his compromise. He said he represented a reduction of the duties in his previous amendment. The democrats accepted it as the best that had been obtained. All insurgents but Borah, Idaho; Dixon, Montana, and Jones, Washington, voted for the compromise bill, while the democrats were unanimous in their support of it.

The senate has passed the Warren bill, allowing homestead claimants in drouth-stricken districts of Wyoming, the Dakotas and Nebraska to leave their lands until April 15, 1912, without loss of any of their rights.

An Associated Press dispatch says: The sensational charge was made before the house committee investigating the postoffice department that Leonard Goodwin, a Chicago lawyer and brother of Russell P. Goodwin, assistant attorney-general for the postoffice department was exploiting mail order houses throughout the country telling them he could arrange any trouble they might have through a denial of mail privileges, etc. The charge was made by E. G. Lewis, president of a publishing company in St. Louis, recently denied the second class mail privileges. Lewis also declared that postoffice inspectors had been told to use whatever methods they pleased, "to put Lewis out of business" and "to shut Lewis up before the next campaign." This was the campaign of 1908.

Following is an Associated Press dispatch: President Taft sent a special message to the senate should-