# WASHINGTON NEWS

E. Livingston Cornelius has been appointed sergeant-at-arms of the United States senate, to succeed Colonel Daniel M. Ransdell, deceased. Mr. Cornelius is a democrat, and has been assistant sergeant-at-arms for the past year.

Former Senator Foraker says that William R. Hearst paid several thousand dollars to secure the Foraker-Archbald record.

Mr. Taft, accompanied by Mrs. Taft and a company, left for a visit to the Panama canal.

A dispatch to the New York Herald says: Great Britain has proposed arbitration of the dispute over the exemption of American coastwise shipping from Panama canal tolls. Those who counted on London's calmly accepting America's interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as meaning especial privileges for the United States find they are mistaken.

The British protest—courteously worded yet firm—was made public by the secretary of state, Mr. Knox. It is in the form of a note from Sir Edward Grey, secretary of state for foreign affairs, to Mr. James Bryce, British Asmassador to the United States, and which Mr. Bryce was instructed to read to the secretary of state.

The British argument begins with the assertion that if the canal had been constructed under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 tolls on American and British ships would have been identical. Since the United States, by the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the conclusion of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in its stead, recovered the independent right to construct the canal the point is made that England's compensation necessarily was the assurance of equal treatment in the matter of tolls.

Sir Edward Grey takes issue with President Taft's argument that the pledge of equal treatment of "all nations" does not apply to the United States, which under the Panama canal act receives special advantages through the exemption of coastwise shipping from tolls. So far as other features of the canal act are concerned the British note enters no protest, but it paves the way for one.

A dispatch to the New York World says: A bill to prevent the raising of enormous campaign funds to control elections was introduced in the senate by Mr. Clapp, chairman of the sub-committee that has for many months been investigating the matter of campaign contributions. The bill was referred to that committee.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person, firm, corporation, association or committee or their agents to send money or anything of value from any state or territory to any other state or territory, or to the insular possessions, to be used or expended for the nomination or election of a president, vice president, senator or representative.

The prohibition is not applicable to payments made by national committees in executing a speaking campaign, the transportation and hotel bills of speakers, or the distribution of literature when so designated.

A penalty of not less than six months nor more than one year's imprisonment is provided for any person violating the prohibition.

"This bill is aimed to meet the vice of gathering funds in large centers and sending them to distant states to influence presidential and congressional elections," said Senator Clapp. "It recognizes the continuance of national committees for handling all legitimate matters connected with campaigns."

Mr. Clapp believes that the subcommittee of which he is chairman will mould the bill into an effective measure for the prevention and punishment of campaign abuses.

A dispatch to the Cincinnati Enquirer says: Letters and telegrams by the thousands continue to pour in upon Washington urging legislators to vote for or against the Kenyon bill, which under a special rule will be called up before the senate and thus precipitate the bitterest liquor contest ever fought out in congress.

The appeals to the legislators come from persons in every walk of life and living in practically every section of the United States. They are coming in clouds from merchants, ministers, druggists, doctors, brewers, distillers and organizations, wet and dry. It is seldom that such a degree of interest in the fate of any measure has been so manifestly displayed by the country.

Washington people generally were interested in the following dispatch from Princeton, N. J.: The days of public receptions in the big east room of the White House are numbered, and in the next administration people will not be received at the executive mansion merely for the purpose of shaking hands or gazing in curiosity at the president. President-elect Wilson declared that he saw no use in spending time just to receive people who had no public business to transact.

Outside of the needless physical strain of receiving hundreds of persons when the president was endeavoring to use his energies for more important purposes, Wilson said he did not believe in incessant receptions to tourists and the numerous societies that come annually to Washington. He also indicated that he would not attend many of the banquets that national societies of various kinds hold in Washington and to which the president is invited.

Wilson said his open-door policy would be preserved at the White House, so far as it was physically possible, and that he intended to have the doors of the executive offices thrown wide open, so that the president would be accessible at all times, but only to those "who have business to transact."

President Taft has pardoned John H. Hall, formerly United States district attorney at Portland, Ore. Hall was convicted in June, 1909, of conspiracy in connection with the unlawful fencing of public land in Eastern Oregon. The pardon is based on the finding of Hall innocent.

President Taft has decided to accept the offer of the Kent professorship at Yale university. The position pays $5,000 a year.

An Associated Press dispatch says: The termination of the Russian treaty abrogated by congress because of Rususia's attitude upon the passport question, which becomes effective January 1, leaves the two nations for the first time in eighty years without an agreement to govern their trade relations, and presents a situation unprecedented.

Except in consequence of war, the United States has never before undertaken to continue on friendly terms with another nation in the absence of any treaty relations, after it has once enjoyed that connection. Naturally the great business interests of both countries have displayed the greatest anxiety to know upon what footing they may continue their operations after December 31, but as far as the Washington government is concerned, it has not been able to secure much enlightenment.

### ANOTHER MERGER "DISSOLVED"

The Harriman-Union-Pacific merger has been "dissolved!" Suppressing an inclination to mirth, we shall seriously consider what this promises.

The court says this dissolution follows along the same lines as in the case of the Northern Securities company. Good! The Northern Securities case was a dissolution which did not dissolve. The action never was intended to dissolve the merger between the Burlington, the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern. It was a fake from the beginning. It was a "moot" case.

The bill drawn by the attorney general, at that time Philander Knox, did not ask for a dissolution of that merger. It asked only that the court pass on the theoretical question whether a holding company was a lawful instrument for maintaining a perpetual combination.

The bill took direct notice of the fact that these railroads were held together in common interest by the issue of bonds covering both properties. These bonds were not attacked. The court was not asked for permission to sell or pay up these bonds or in any way to dissolve this ligament holding these properties as a unit. The attorney general's petition was satisfied by a recall of the stock certificates in their place to the original holders, marked with the names of the two principal properties.

That was over ten years ago, and the union between these great railroad properties has continued and they have been administered as a noncompeting unit.

Hurrah for the Northern Securities case!

The supreme court also announces that its mandate is to be carried out by the circuit court of the district of Utah. We remember how the supreme court turned over the chore of carrying out its mandate in the Tobacco and Standard Oil cases to the circuit court of the district of New York; and we remember what happened.—Cleveland (O.) Press.

### ALCOHOLISM IN FRANCE

Attempts to suppress absinthe drinking in France, however well intentioned, are rendered wholly fruitless by reason of the high proportion of drinking resorts to population. Deputy Joseph Reinner, writing in the Paris Revue, states there are in France one drinking place for every eighty-two inhabitants, while the proportion in England is one to 430, in Sweden one to 5,000, and Norway and Canada one to every 9,000 inhabitants. M. Reinach points out that France is a country in which alcohol is taxed the least. While America imposes a duty of $60 a hectoliter and England $98, the French excise claims only $44. He declares the most deadly enemy of the drunkard to be absinthe, of which France consumes more than all the rest of the world put together, and he recalls that in 1903 the Academy of Medicine unanimously voted for the total suppression of all drinks composed of alcohol and natural and artificial essences. But nothing came of it because the political power of the interest involved renders legislative action abortive. The French senate, however, has given tentative approval of a bill to prohibit the manufacture and sale of absinthe.—Omaha Bee.