

zens of De Graff, J. H. Basden and 5 other citizens of Alger, R. H. Valentine and 10 other citizens of Belle Center, J. S. Sherrick and 3 other citizens of Harrod, all in the State of Ohio, asking for the enactment of legislation to give the Interstate Commerce Commission further power in the regulation of express rates and express classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Don C. Bailey and 10 other citizens of West Liberty, E. L. Van Horn and 5 other citizens of Lake View, O. L. Rexer and 10 other citizens of De Graff, R. A. Graham and 12 other citizens of Belle Center, W. E. Heath and 3 other citizens of Harrod, C. E. Kennard and 5 other citizens of Alger, James W. Bowen and 2 other citizens of McGuffey, J. E. Hesser and 15 other citizens of Ada, B. C. Ballinger and 15 other citizens of West Mansfield, and J. D. Stevenson and 10 other citizens of Rushsylvania, all in the State of Ohio, against the enactment of any law for the extension of the parcel-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Men's Sunday Evening League and the Sunday School of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ashley, Ohio, in favor of the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill, for the further regulation of interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Memorial of the Manhattan (N. Y.) Camp, No. 1, Department of New York, United Spanish War Veterans, indorsing House bill 17470, providing a pension for widows and minor children of deceased Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Mitchell, Smith, and Phillips Counties, sixth district of Kansas, asking for the enactment of a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission further power to regulate express rates and express classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Norton, Kans., and of citizens of Mitchell, Smith, and Phillips Counties, sixth district of Kansas, protesting against the passage of a parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER and by unanimous consent the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2453) for the relief of Benjamin F. Martz, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1 and 2 to the bill (H. R. 13570) to amend an act entitled "An act granting employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; and had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 3 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4551) to extend the time for completion of a dam across the Savannah River, at or near the mouth of Stevens Creek, between the counties of Edgefield, S. C., and Columbia, Ga., authorized by an act approved August 5, 1909.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. RICHARDSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Milford, Del., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Milford, Felton, and Smyrna, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WETMORE. I present a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session, A. D. 1912.

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Rhode Island to urge the present Congress to secure the establishment of a lightship near Block Island:

Whereas a reef which extends about 1 mile in a northerly direction from the north end of Block Island is so far offshore that the strong tidal currents running across it make a very dangerous obstruction for any vessels entering Block Island; and

Whereas it is of the greatest importance to the people and the maritime interests of New England that a lightship be stationed off the north end of Block Island; and

Whereas a petition has been circulated and signed by the most important marine, shipping, and steamship men of New England requesting that such a lightship be established: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, That the Senators and Representatives of the State in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, requested to urge the present Congress to secure the establishment of a lightship with a first-class fog siren and lights, about 1 mile northerly from the north end of Block Island.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Providence, February 29, 1912.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true copy of the original resolution approved by his excellency the governor on the 28th day of February, A. D. 1912.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid the date first above written.

[SEAL.]

J. FRED PARKER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Scott, Kans., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Marion, Gretna, and Fairport, all in the State of Kansas, and a petition of sundry citizens of Hardy, Nebr., praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Oswego, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Post No. 71, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called dollar-a-day pension bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Burlington and Chanute, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented resolutions adopted by the Irish Nationalists of Ohio, in convention at Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Springfield, Olney, Sparta, Stewardson, and Browns, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the repeal of the oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Blue Island, Ill., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Retail Merchants' Association of Illinois, in convention at Belleville, Ill., praying for the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURTON. I present a large number of petitions from colleges of the country, favoring the ratification of the pending treaties with England and France without amendment. I ask that the petitions lie on the table and that the names of the colleges be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to lie on the table, and the names of the colleges were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio; James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.; Mills College, Mills College, Cal.; Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.; Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.; University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; University of Porto Rico, Rio Piedras, P. I.; Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.;

Franklin College, Franklin, Ind.; Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.; University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah; Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.; Park College, Parkville, Mo.; Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.; Stevens Institution of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.; Midland College, Atchison, Kans.; Purdue University, La Fayette, Ind.; and Teachers' College, Manhattan Borough, New York, N. Y.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Straitsville, Ohio, praying for the establishment of free mail delivery in towns, cities, and villages with a population of over 1,000, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Greencastle, Fayetteville, New Hope, and Lewisberry, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Meadville, New Brighton, and Bedford, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tunnelton and New Paris, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Grand Army Association of Allegheny County, Pa., remonstrating against the proposed abolishment of the United States pension agencies and their concentration in Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Uniontown, Pittsburgh, East Greene, Mount Pleasant, Millersville, and Big Run, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Valencia and Wilkesburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented the petition of Leon E. Hixson, of Portland, Mich., praying for the establishment of free mail delivery in towns, cities, and villages with a population of over 1,000, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of members of the Clio Club, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Benton Harbor, Lawrence, and Adrian, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Paw Paw and Belding, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the establishment of a parcel-post system, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Local Machine Co., of Ann Arbor, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of H. W. Rickel & Co., of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside liquor dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bellaire, Quincy, Jackson, Le Roy, Monroe, and Lincoln Township, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULBERSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brackettsville, Tex., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 2009, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Liberty, N. C., praying for the establishment of a parcel-post system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Groton and Poughkeepsie, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TILLMAN presented petitions of the congregations of the Beulah Baptist Church, of Congaree, and the Baptist Church of Pelion, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Utopia, all in the State of South Carolina, praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of McIntosh, Fla., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the Business Men's Association of Jeffersonville, Ind., remonstrating against the extension of the parcel-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Farmington, Del., and a petition of sundry citizens of Houston, Del., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of C. P. Kirkland Camp, No. 18, Department of Connecticut, United Spanish War Veterans, of Winsted, Conn., and a petition of A. W. Merriam Camp, No. 16, Department of Connecticut, United Spanish War Veterans, of Putnam, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or the Philippine Insurrection, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 151, Patrons of Husbandry, of Enfield, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics regarding tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on the Census.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Putnam, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the anticanteen law, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jamaica, Vt., praying for the enactment of an interstate liquor law to prevent the nullification of State liquor laws by outside dealers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 17681) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 434) thereon. I give notice that at the earliest opportunity I will ask that the bill be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1086) to amend sections 680 and 686 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 433) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5309) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved May 14, 1880 (21 Stat. L., p. 140), reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 435) thereon.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5076) to promote instruction in forestry in States and Territories which contain national forests, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 437) thereon.

Mr. STEPHENSON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 5355) to acquire a site and for the erection thereon of a public building at Beaver Dam, Wis., reported it without amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

S. 5077. A bill providing for the erection of a Federal building at Pocatello, Idaho (Rept. No. 438); and

S. 248. A bill providing for the erection of a Federal building at Cœur d'Alene, Idaho (Rept. No. 439).

NEW LAND DISTRICT IN MONTANA.

Mr. DIXON. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably with an amendment in the nature of a substitute the bill (S. 5075) for the establishment of a new land district in the State of Montana, and I submit a report (No. 436) thereon. I should like to ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill. The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Beginning in the mid-channel of the Missouri River at a point where the eastern boundary of the State of Montana intersects the same; thence south along said State boundary to its intersection with the township line between townships 9 and 10 north; thence west to the southwest corner of township 10 north, range 58 east; thence north to the northwest corner of said township; thence west to the southwest corner of township 11 north, range 56 east; thence north to the northwest corner of said township; thence west to the southwest corner of township 12 north, range 55 east; thence north to the northwest corner of said township; thence west along the third standard parallel north to its intersection with the eleventh guide meridian; thence north along said guide meridian between ranges 44 and 45 east, allowing for proper offsets, to its intersection with the mid-channel of the Missouri River; thence easterly, following the mid-channel of said river, to its intersection with the eastern boundary of Montana, the place of beginning.

Sec. 2. That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint a register and receiver for such land district, who shall discharge like and similar duties and receive the same amount of compensation as other officers discharging like duties in the other land offices of said State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5006) to provide for repairs and improvements at the lighthouse depot and headquarters, San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5007) for the relief of Michael R. Morgan and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 5008) providing for the abandonment of the Vashon Island Military Reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for Mr. TAYLOR):

A bill (S. 5009) for the relief of the estate of John T. McClanahan; and

A bill (S. 5010) to pay the Southern Express Co. charges for carrying tents to Pulaski, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5011) granting an increase of pension to David P. Wilcox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5012) granting a pension to Robert Donson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 5013) granting a pension to Raymond R. Hammond (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5014) granting a pension to Mary J. Chick (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5015) to correct the naval record of Thomas Taylor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5016) for the relief of the heirs of John A. Winn, deceased; and

A bill (S. 5017) for the relief of Frank Schilling (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 5018) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Mines," approved May 16, 1910; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5019) granting an increase of pension to Michael Hilli; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 5020) to construct and place a lightship near the north end of Block Island, R. I. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 5021) to extend time of payment of balance due for lands sold under act of Congress approved June 17, 1910 (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 5022) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to subdivide and extend the deferred payments of settlers in the Kiowa-Comanche and Apache ceded lands in Oklahoma (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for conducting experiments in the breeding and raising of fur-bearing animals, the mink and marten, intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500 to reimburse Peter Mactelmy for damages sustained by him because of the sale by the United States to the State of Idaho of land for State park on a portion of which Peter Mactelmy made his home, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500 to reimburse the State board of regents of the University of Idaho for the premium paid on an indemnity bond on account of the loss of a United States draft for \$25,000 in transit between the United States Treasury and the State treasury of Idaho, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY BETWEEN PUGET SOUND AND COLUMBIA RIVER.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examination and survey to be made, and a report to be made thereon to Congress, of the intervening territory between Puget Sound and the Columbia River, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a canal connecting Puget Sound with Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

IMPROVEMENT OF COLUMBIA RIVER.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to submit, as early as practicable, an estimate of the cost of the improvement of the Columbia River from and including Grand Rapids to the international boundary line.

PACIFIC STATES TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO. V. STATE OF OREGON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask to have printed as a public document the record in the Oregon case where the Supreme Court held constitutional the initiative and referendum amendment to the Oregon constitution. I ask to have the request referred to the Committee on Printing before action is taken by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

PRINTING OF NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW ARTICLE.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have printed as a public document an article which appeared in the February number of the North American Review, by Leander T. Chamberlain, entitled "A chapter of national dishonor," the same being a historical and critical review of the proceedings which led up to and culminated in the creation of the Panama Republic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be entered.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to inquire whether the article is copyrighted or not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is copyrighted; but I have secured the permission of the North American Review to have it printed as a public document with the approval of the Senate, providing that proper credit is given.

Mr. HEYBURN. The North American Review may not be able to stop the train after they have started it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I object to the request until I know something more than the statement made as to what the article is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is an article which has been widely read. I am rather surprised that the Senator from Utah has not read it or heard of it. It is one of the leading articles of the month, and appearing as the leading article in the North American Review, it has secured a prominence and attracted an amount of attention which has commanded a great deal of comment.

Mr. HEYBURN. What is it about?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As I have stated, it is a historical and analytical article of the facts of which I spoke yesterday here in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator what is the reason for requesting that it be printed as a public document?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Because I think it tends very much to illuminate the history of that more or less obscure proceeding, and because I believe that it is a subject on which there is a great deal of public interest and on which the Senate may act. I believe it is written in a temperate vein by a man who is an experienced and recognized publicist, and it is a considerable addition to the literature of the day.

Mr. SMOOT. There are so many articles published in magazines that if we should undertake to publish them all as public documents we would have our mails full all the time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is quite true; I concede that; but I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I am not a great offender. I think I am one of few Senators in the Chamber who never before asked for the publication of anything as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is true.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I make this request only because I believe the article is worthy of publication as a document, and I think the Senator from Utah will concede it if he examines the article.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will allow it to be referred to the Committee on Printing, I will assure him that the committee will meet within the next few days and report it back.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator desires to examine it first, and will give us an assurance of an early report, that will be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather have it go to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter, with the request of the Senator from Nebraska, will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE LAWRENCE (MASS.) STRIKE.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate resolution 231, calling on the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to report to the Senate certain information in regard to the condition of the mill workers in Lawrence, Mass., through the Bureau of Labor.

The resolution has been objected to here principally on account of the last clause in the resolution, directing him to report as to "what action has been taken by the local authorities at Lawrence to forcibly interfere with the free passage of said aliens or others from the city of Lawrence and State of Massachusetts to other States." I believe the objections were based on that provision. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be amended by striking out the words which I have just read, and that as amended it be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate resolution 231, that the concluding paragraph thereof be eliminated, and that the resolution as thus amended be passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there can be no objection to the Senator amending the resolution by unanimous consent, but I shall object to its present consideration. The Senator can—

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can not very well be amended without being considered.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can give notice that he will offer that amendment when the resolution is up again. I object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood in reference to the purpose of my suggested amendment. I thought possibly it would secure the adoption of the resolution as amended. I do not care to offer the amendment unless—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not care to offer the amendment if the consideration of the resolution is objected to. I desire to give notice that, in view of the fact that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] is engaged in an address on the Stephenson case, I will not attempt to bring this matter up again to-day, but I will move the adoption of the resolution on Monday.

SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 299.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho requests that the following business be laid before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Order of Business 299: Senate resolution 136, directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate certain charges relative to the election of ISAAC STEPHENSON and the motion made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] that the report of the committee thereon be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned last evening I was reading from the testimony of Mr. Perrin, of Superior, Wis., who had received \$5,000 from the Stephenson fund, and who had disbursed a part of it. Perrin had disbursed, so he said, some \$350 of this fund to a Mr. Fridley, and also a part of it to Mr. Shields. Perrin received this \$5,000 in three installments. On the 30th of July he received \$1,000 from Mr. Edmonds, on the 4th of August another \$1,000, and on the 14th of August \$3,000 more.

The question was asked a number of times yesterday as to whether any of these men that received money were opposed to Mr. STEPHENSON before they received the money and afterwards supported him, so I desire to call to the attention of Senators the testimony of Perrin, which has a bearing upon this point. He was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee:

Do you know of any act or thing which he did because of the receipt of that money?

That question was asked of Perrin in interrogating him as to what Shields did with the money which Perrin had given Shields. His answer was:

Mr. PERRIN. I know that some people were active for the Senator after I gave him the money that were not before—that is, a certain class.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that class?

Mr. PERRIN. It would be mostly members of the Catholic Church.

The CHAIRMAN. Then that influence, you think, went in that direction?

Mr. PERRIN. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. On the same day, the 26th, we have items of cash, \$50, \$50, \$50, \$50. They are all on August 26. Who got that money?

Mr. PERRIN. They are all cash items?

The CHAIRMAN. They are cash items; but one of them is indorsed by "R. J. Agen, Sec'y."

Mr. PERRIN. He did not have the money. I think that was cash.

The CHAIRMAN. And C. R. Fridley. Did Mr. Fridley have the money?

Mr. PERRIN. He had the money where his name appears.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Mr. Fridley?

Mr. PERRIN. He is the attorney to whom I referred a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. * * * We will proceed to the 27th. We have three items on the 27th of \$10 each—one to J. W. Wilson, one to L. H. Mead, and one to Robert Inglis. Were those sums paid to those men for their use?

Mr. PERRIN. To be used by them in this campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they use those sums of money?

Mr. PERRIN. So far as I am advised.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know for what?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were they compensation to those men personally or to be expended by them?

Mr. PERRIN. To be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. All of them?

Mr. PERRIN. So far as I can recollect now.

The CHAIRMAN. On the 28th we have three items—two of cash, \$50 and \$50, and one of \$25 to D. M. Maxey, and indorsed by him. Can you account for the cash items?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you account for the Maxey item?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes. That is, it was sent to him to be paid to men to attend the polling places on primary day in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. To attend the polling places for what?

Mr. PERRIN. For the purpose of disseminating information in regard to Senator STEPHENSON'S qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever present when any of these men were disseminating information?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no idea as to the manner in which they disseminated it, or of the substance of the information?

Mr. PERRIN. Certainly not; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We come now to the 29th. There are three items on the 29th: \$150 cash—can you account for that or any part of it?

Mr. PERRIN. I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-five dollars to T. W. McManus. What was that for?

Mr. PERRIN. May I look at that item?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PERRIN. That was for advertisement of Senator STEPHENSON'S candidacy in some publication that he was in charge of, gotten out, I think, for use on Labor Day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a labor paper?

Mr. PERRIN. It was not a paper in that sense. It was, I think, simply a program with advertisements.

The CHAIRMAN. On the 31st there is an item of \$300 cash. Can you account for that or any part of it?

Mr. PERRIN. I do not remember.

The CHAIRMAN. That was received by you? All of these cash items were received by you, were they?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes. I do not know that I went to the bank and got them myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the fact that the checks were drawn payable to "cash"?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. R. J. Shields, \$250; That is without any date.

Mr. PERRIN. That \$250 to R. J. Shields was paid to him out of the first check that I received from Mr. Edmonds.

The CHAIRMAN. You say in regard to that item, on page 1922, that you have the checks for all except that item, and it does not show on its face. Is that the item that you refer to now?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes. When I got that check I indorsed it over to him; and he gave me back his check, as I remember it now, for \$750.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Shields did?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes. So that that payment to him was not covered by a check.

(Page 687.)

The CHAIRMAN. For what did you pay that money to Mr. Shields?

Mr. PERRIN. For use in Mr. STEPHENSON'S campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have him account to you for it?

Mr. PERRIN. I do not think he ever did.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever ask him to account?

Mr. PERRIN. I did. He said he had expended it for Mr. STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ask for an itemized statement?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And he never rendered any?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not know what he expended it for?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know a little more about Shields. You must have been very well acquainted with him.

Mr. PERRIN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. In that you handed him over that check and gave him \$250 out of it.

Mr. PERRIN. I am very well acquainted with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have a conversation with him at the time you handed it over to him?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the conversation—what he said to you and what you said to him that resulted in the handing over of that check.

Mr. PERRIN. I can not remember the details.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us the substance.

Mr. PERRIN. The substance of it was that I went to him and asked him if he would put in some time in the Stephenson campaign. He said he would do what he could. I asked him how much money he thought he would need at that time, and he said that he ought to have \$250.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you tell him that you were disbursing Stephenson money at that time? You told him you had received this thousand dollars, did you?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And he told you he could be of some use to Senator STEPHENSON, did he?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How did he tell you he could be of use to Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. PERRIN. I guess I know as much about that as he did. I do not know that he expressed himself in specific terms as to what he could do or would do.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he do for STEPHENSON'S campaign?

Mr. PERRIN. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You say you knew what he could do?

Mr. PERRIN. I knew what he could do; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that to be taken as a criterion of what he did do?

Mr. PERRIN. It was by me.

The CHAIRMAN. What did he do?

Mr. PERRIN. Taking that as a criterion, he could, and I believe he did, get men interested for Senator STEPHENSON that neither Senator STEPHENSON, Mr. Edmonds, nor I could otherwise get.

The CHAIRMAN. Get men that you could not get?

Mr. PERRIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How would he get them interested? What would he do?

Mr. PERRIN. I think he would mostly talk.

The CHAIRMAN. What would he say to them?

Mr. PERRIN. I am sure I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be the nature of the conversation?

Mr. PERRIN. I would not undertake to say.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you know it is not just exactly the conversation you or Mr. Edmonds would have had with these people?

Mr. PERRIN. Because I know that I could not talk to some of those people the way Mr. Shields could.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not know what he said to them, how do you know that?

Mr. PERRIN. There are things, you know, that we know without being able to explain or express after long years of acquaintance with a man; that no man living can sit on the witness stand and detail.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Shields had something over \$300 as compensation—either he for talking or those to whom he talked for listening. How was it expended?

Mr. PERRIN. Or for those to whom he talked, to talk also.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you think they shared in the \$300—the listener and the speaker?

Mr. PERRIN. And the other listeners. I carry that further than the one step. I think these men to whom he talked talked to a great many other people.

The CHAIRMAN. It was a sort of endless chain—talking to one man, and he to somebody else, and that man in turn to somebody else?

Mr. PERRIN. I hoped it would be so.

The CHAIRMAN. "Sending it down the line?"

Mr. PERRIN. That expresses it thoroughly.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did the money stop? How far did the money follow that conversation down the line?

Mr. PERRIN. Oh, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not any idea?

Mr. PERRIN. It is impossible to trace that money to the ultimate consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of this money indicated by the cash items or the checks remained in your hands?

Mr. PERRIN. Not a cent.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet you can not account for a cent of it that you paid out?

Mr. PERRIN. I can not in detail; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a single item?

Mr. PERRIN. Not one.

The CHAIRMAN. That was rather a spectacular campaign in some respects, was it not, with money flowing out freely in those amounts?

Mr. PERRIN. To speak in the vernacular, I guess we got them "going some."

The CHAIRMAN. You can not remember a single instance that happened in that exciting time?

Mr. PERRIN. I do not remember the people to whom I paid the money.

The CHAIRMAN. Not one?

Mr. PERRIN. Not one.

Perrin was interrogated by Senator SUTHERLAND, as follows (p. 681):

Senator SUTHERLAND. Can you approximate in any way the number of people to whom you paid money, irrespective of the amount?

Mr. PERRIN. No, sir; no, sir.

Senator SUTHERLAND. Would it go up into the hundreds of people—less than 100 or more than 100?

Mr. PERRIN. I should think less than 100.

Senator SUTHERLAND. Less than 100?

Mr. PERRIN. I rather think so. I do not want to be understood as swearing positively to that.

Senator SUTHERLAND. You paid them amounts ranging from what to what?

Mr. PERRIN. Oh, from \$5 to sometimes as high as \$150, depending upon what I expected the man to do, where he could work, and what he could accomplish.

Thirty-one hundred and fifty-five dollars of this money was drawn by him out of the bank account in cash. Over \$2,500 of this cash was expended in the month of August, and yet the man who expended it states under oath that he can not remember a single individual to whom he paid a dollar of that cash.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it might be more accurate to say that this money was drawn in August.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, of course, I am taking the witness's statement, and he says he drew it in August and expended every cent of it. This witness has not told what he knows about this campaign. There is no complaint anywhere on the part of STEPHENSON'S friends that he did not account for this money to their satisfaction. It is intimated that he appropriated it to his own use. It was given, as I have said, in three items, running from the 30th of July to the 14th of August. To my mind, that money was used or was given for one of two purposes—to buy Perrin and secure his support for STEPHENSON, depending upon him to disburse it as he saw fit in securing the support that he could for this \$5,000, or it was given to him to be disbursed to different individuals, leaving it to his judgment as to whom it should be paid. It evidently was for one of those two reasons. Either one, in my judgment, is an improper use of money in a campaign.

I might continue to read pages of testimony similar to that which I have been reading, but it is unnecessary. The testimony of this confidential agent of STEPHENSON demonstrates the corrupt use of money, if such a thing is possible in an election.

I am not a lawyer, and therefore not skilled in construing and misconstruing the words and phrases of the English language, but the statutes of Wisconsin make bribery a penal offense, and, among other things, they declare:

Every person who shall, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, make any such gift, loan, offer, promise, procurement, or agreement as aforesaid, to or for any person in order to induce such person to procure or endeavor to procure the election of any person to a public office or the vote of any voter at any election—

to be guilty of bribery. The statutes also apply the laws relating to a general election to the primary election. If the employment of Wayland, Perrin, and others as indicated by the testimony that I have read is not in violation of this statute, then I must admit that I can not properly understand what this statute means.

The statutes of the State of Wisconsin also provide that—

Every person * * * who shall give or offer to give any valuable thing or bribe to any officer, inspector, or delegate * * * or who shall give or offer to give any valuable thing or bribe to any elector as a consideration for some act to be done in relation to such caucus or convention * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished in the manner hereinafter provided.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator kindly read again the section of the statute that refers to the improper use of money?

Mr. BRISTOW. The one I have just read?

Mr. REED. The one the Senator has just read.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is as follows:

Every person * * * who shall give or offer to give any valuable thing or bribe to any officer, inspector, or delegate * * * or who shall give or offer to give any valuable thing or bribe to any elector

as a consideration for some act to be done in relation to such caucus or convention * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished in the manner hereinafter provided.

Now, the law makes this applicable to a primary election as well as to a caucus or an election.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I make an inquiry of the Senator from Kansas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is whether STEPHENSON has been indicted or presented to the grand jury for anything in connection with this election or a violation of any statute.

Mr. BRISTOW. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will give the Senator the benefit of my knowledge.

Mr. OVERMAN. I can not hear the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have knowledge, obtained from inquiry of officials, that no prosecution has been instigated or proposed during all these years against any of the parties charged with violating this imaginary law.

Mr. BRISTOW. That these agents or scouts of STEPHENSON violated this statute I can not see how any reasonable man can doubt. But regardless of whether they violated the statute—indeed, if no such a statute had been in existence—it seems to me that the conduct of these men is indefensible and can not be excused or tolerated.

WILLIAM R. KNELL.

I now come to a very interesting agent of the Stephenson organization in the campaign, Mr. William R. Knell, who was the Stephenson manager for Milwaukee.

He testified that in organizing and conducting the campaign he expended \$11,886.61. He submitted to the legislative committee a statement of the purposes for which he expended this money; \$5,748 of this money was paid to ward organizers. There also appears to have been \$875.65 expended under the head of "expenses on account of organization." Of this amount there appears to be no statement either by Mr. Knell or anyone else as to what these expenditures were for.

The statutes of Wisconsin make it unlawful for anyone "to give or offer to give any valuable thing or bribe to any officer, inspector, or delegate," yet Knell seems to have paid money to three different election inspectors in Milwaukee.

One Arthur Wilcox was paid \$100, he being an election inspector. This was in violation of the statutes of the State.

Leo F. Kelpinski, an inspector of the fifth precinct of the fourteenth ward, was paid \$55. And Archie Hamilton, one of the inspectors in the second precinct of the seventeenth ward, was paid \$25.

Knell says he did not know at the time he paid these men that they were election inspectors. He was at that time the sheriff of Milwaukee County, and, of course, he can not plead ignorance as a justification of his unlawful acts. He was disbursing this money in such quantities to organizers in the various wards and precincts of the county in which he was serving as sheriff that, even if he was not sensitive as to its moral turpitude, he should at least not have openly violated the plain statutes of his State. Arthur Wilcox, one of the inspectors, had held that office for 10 years, yet the sheriff claims not to have known that he was an inspector. Hamilton claims to have done the work he did for STEPHENSON in a ward other than the one of which he was an inspector. Such a claim is in harmony with the whole spirit of the Stephenson organization—as though a judge of an election who was forbidden to accept any contribution of any kind from any candidate could violate that statute, provided he did his work in some other precinct than the one of which he was an inspector. Hamilton also had been an inspector for about 10 years.

The payment of \$55 to Kelpinski, of the fourteenth ward, brought out some interesting incidents. Knell, in commenting upon this payment, relates the following (p. 1773). I should like Senators to listen to this:

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. BROWN. Was the payment of this money to the inspectors by Knell questioned at all by anybody?

Mr. BRISTOW. I think not.

Mr. BROWN. Is it admitted by the sheriff?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is admitted by Knell himself.

Mr. OVERMAN. Knell, you say, was the agent of the organization?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; he was the organizer for Milwaukee County.

Mr. OVERMAN. Now, has the Senator in mind at this time the testimony—my recollection is that there is testimony in the record to show—that the Senator from Wisconsin knew of the agency of this man Knell?

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator from Kansas contend—I want to know his position; I am very much interested in his speech—that the payment by the Senator, or through his agent, to Knell of \$11,000, without the knowledge of the Senator himself of the employment of these inspectors in violation of the law, makes the Senator guilty of an offense—violating the law?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not think the Senator could be indicted for it, but my contention is that the accredited agents of Mr. STEPHENSON, in securing this nomination, violated the laws of Wisconsin in so doing and also expended money corruptly.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no question about that; but to what extent is the Senator from Wisconsin to be held? I want the opinion of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin could be indicted for a crime committed by somebody else, but I think his seat here can be questioned if it was obtained through corrupt means.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator from Kansas recollect that this man Kelpinski was not in the employment—

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Utah will pardon me, I will in one minute give the story of Kelpinski in full, and I will give just what he wants to know. But I prefer to do it in this way, because I have it fully covered here.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The only purpose of my inquiry was that Kelpinski was in the employ of Knell—

Mr. BRISTOW. I will tell the story the Senator has in his mind. I am not going to conceal anything. This is an absolutely frank presentation, so far as I have been able to place it before the Senate from the testimony.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very well.

Mr. BRISTOW. I was just going to call the attention of the Senate to Knell's story of his connection with Kelpinski, and I am giving it to you in his own words—Knell's words:

Leo F. Kelpinski was to receive \$110, one-half cash, the balance when the primary was over. He was to look after, I believe, two precincts in the fourteenth ward, two in the eighteenth ward, and one each in the thirteenth and twenty-first wards. A few days after paying him \$55 one of my deputies rang me up on an evening, and the following conversation ensued: "Is this the sheriff?" "Yes." "This is Matuszewski." "Well, what is it, Matt?" "I thought you said Leo Kelpinski was working for you." "So he agreed to." "Is he got the money?" "Part of it." "Well, you're done." "Why do you say so?" "I just saw a check for \$100 which he cashed in a saloon down here. It was Cook money." "You saw the check? Are you sure of that?" "I saw the check with my own eyes; I can swear to it." I then said, "Well, you know, Matt, that one is got to expect a certain amount of 'double crossing' in politics." That ended the conversation, and naturally I refused to pay the balance claimed to be due.

Kelpinski says that Richard White, one of Knell's lieutenants, told him that if he would carry the precinct for STEPHENSON he would pay him \$100. Kelpinski told him that that would be easy, and that he was going to a picnic the next day, and that it might be well for him to have some of the money, so White paid him \$50. But I will give it to you in Kelpinski's own language. He says (p. 1901):

I told him that was easy; if the precinct didn't go for STEPHENSON I didn't want the \$100. I says, "But I am going to a picnic to-morrow," as I said before, "and I can spend the money there, and so." I says, "\$50 would do." After he gave me the \$50 and I started to go out he called me back and he says, "I may be up there myself, but," he says, "if I ain't I will give you \$5 more, so you will have enough." And I spent about \$75 or \$80 that day.

So far the testimony of Kelpinski corroborates that of Knell. He says he received \$55 of STEPHENSON'S money; Knell says that he paid him \$55 and was to pay him some more, but he found out that he was being "double crossed." Kelpinski says that on the day of the picnic he spent \$75 or \$80. When asked how he spent it, he said:

I went from bar to bar and from ice-cream stand to ice-cream stand, and I told everybody to come on and have a drink on Senator STEPHENSON, and I distributed lots of cards and buttons at that picnic.

Now, there were about 36 of these organizers employed for Milwaukee County.

Apparently Knell did not care how Kelpinski used the money, but he did not want to be "double crossed." He was perfectly willing to pay the price, but he wanted to be certain to receive the goods he was paying for.

Knell's record also shows that he gave William O'Connor, of the fourth ward, \$500. Apparently the committee could not

find O'Connor; at least it did not take his testimony to find out what he did with the \$500 in the fourth ward. O'Connor seems to have had an assistant who received \$50. Knell, in testifying as to this expenditure, said (p. 1963):

I gave William O'Connor \$500.
 The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?
 Mr. KNELL. * * * to look after the fourth ward, in particular the colored vote and the railroad vote adjoining on the south of the fourth ward—that is, in the eighth ward.
 Senator POMERENE. \$500, you say.
 Mr. KNELL. \$500; yes.
 The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what they did with the money?
 Mr. KNELL. I think the greater part of it was spent for that purpose.
 The CHAIRMAN. For the same purpose you have indicated?
 Mr. KNELL. Yes. I suppose they had themselves paid out of it.
 The CHAIRMAN. Those men will not be called, they not being within the reach of the summons. I have no further questions of Mr. Knell.

O'Connor was the superintendent of the garbage hoist of the city of Milwaukee, and probably in his official capacity gave employment to a large number of negroes. He therefore was thought to be a very useful man to the Stephenson organization. So he was given \$500 as his part of the boodle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator, I suppose, has concluded what he has to say about Kelpinski?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has not discussed the point I had in mind. I understand the Senator to say that Kelpinski was an election inspector, and that Knell must have known of it. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Knell severed all relations with Kelpinski at least four or five weeks before the primaries were held at all, and Knell says he knew nothing about Kelpinski being an inspector.

Mr. BRISTOW. He says he did not know that any of these men were inspectors.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am speaking of Kelpinski. He did not know Kelpinski was an inspector. Does the Senator know whether Kelpinski was appointed more than four weeks prior to the primary election? I do not know about that myself.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is an office that lasts for two years. They are appointed every two years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They are appointed two years before?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I call the attention of the Senator to page 1786 of the record, where Knell expressly says his relationship had been severed.

Mr. BRISTOW. After Knell found he was being "double-crossed" he had nothing more to do with Kelpinski. He thought Kelpinski had sold out to the other fellows, and he did not want to buy a man who would not "stick."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He had nothing to do with him at the time of the primary election. That is the point of my suggestion.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think not. I think they had fallen out over some matters.

Morris Cleary and Alf. J. Klumb, a railroad conductor and locomotive engineer, were paid \$450 to look after the sixteenth ward. They were also furnished nine assistants, consisting of a yard man, a railroad man, a foreman, a locomotive engineer, a railroad man, a saloon and restaurant keeper, and three other railroad men, all being paid \$25 each, except the saloon and restaurant keeper, who received \$10, and one of the railroad men, who received \$15, making, all told, \$650 that was expended in that ward. Knell, in his testimony, page 1962, was asked:

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give them this money?
 Mr. KNELL. For the purpose of organizing the ward by hiring precinct men and primary day workers, distributing literature and cards, and in a general way enhancing the interests of Mr. STEPHENSON.
 The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any accounting from these men?
 Mr. KNELL. No. They estimated what it would take before I gave them the money.

One A. Rosenhein was the manager in the fourteenth ward. He was a saloon keeper, and he received \$325. In his testimony, when asked as to what he did with the money, he said (p. 1886):

I paid out \$105 to the workers, and the rest I spent in the saloons wherever I went.

There were about 35 of these ward managers, and the price paid them ranged from \$80 to \$500. Lee G. Merville, of West Allis, a precinct, was paid \$200, and given an assistant, one Pavelick, to whom was paid \$30. Mr. H. B. Daggett, of West Milwaukee, was paid \$175. He had no assistant. W. R. Jones, of the twenty-second ward, was paid \$100, and given two assistants, one of whom was paid \$50 and the other \$30.

Knell seemed to be a great organizer. He not only had these various ward managers but he had racial managers as well. His account shows that he paid his Greek manager \$110 for the campaign, while he paid his Hebrew manager only \$45—which seems to me an unwarranted discrimination against the Jew.

Knell's statement of expenditures is as follows.

I will not burden the Senate by reading it; but he goes through and gives quite an elaborate, detailed statement here as to the purposes for which he expended the money and comments on it very frankly. Something over \$500 of it was for these ward managers, and between eight and nine hundred dollars was for organization purposes, but what those organization purposes were is not disclosed at all.

Exhibit Knell 1, Oct. 25, 1911.
 BILLS PAID BY CHECK.

Check No.	Name, and for what expended.	Amount.
8	L. Breithaupt Printing Co., printing	\$36.25
8	John Calahan, rent	25.00
9	L. Breithaupt Printing Co.	159.29
10	Knell, Prengal & Steltz Co., cigars	29.50
11	Saxe Sign Co., signs	24.35
12	H. H. West Co., stationery	11.20
13	Streissguth-Petran Co., halftones and cuts	25.65
14	Laudon Electrotyping Co., electros	14.70
15	Remington Typewriter Co., rent	15.00
16	Siekert & Baum Stationery Co., stationery	37.50
17	Standard Paper Co., case of envelopes	26.24
18	Wm. C. Kreul Co., rent	46.00
21	Standard Paper Co., case of envelopes	26.24
22	David C. Owen, 25 M 2-cent stamps	500.00
26	F. L. Schneider, distributing	60.00
27	Keystone Printing Co., advertising	15.00
29	Edw. Pepper, distributing	60.00
30	Keystone Printing Co., 100 M sample ballots	125.00
32	H. Sperber, advertising	25.00
33	Cream City Bill Posting Co., fifty 20-sheet posters	130.00
35	Siekert & Baum Stationery Co., stationery	5.35
36	Standard Paper Co., case of envelopes	26.24
37	Knell, Prengal & Steltz Co., cigars	29.50
38	Rosberg Adv. Co., printing letters	25.00
39	S. E. Tate Printing Co., cards	15.00
40	Streissguth-Petran Co., cuts	.75
41	Waukesha-Roxo Co., water	3.68
42	Schwaab Stamp & Seal Co., rubber stamps	2.25
43	P. J. Sullivan, account distributing	50.00
44	L. Breithaupt Printing Co., printing	199.50
45	Juneau Press, Jewish cards	15.00
47	D. C. Owen, 50 M 1-cent stamps	500.00
48	D. C. Owen, 40 M 1-cent stamps	400.00
50	John Calahan, rent	10.00
51	Rosberg Advertising Co., printing letters	7.50
52	S. E. Tate Printing Co., Slavonic cards	6.50
53	Benoy Printing Co., advertising	12.00
54	Remington Typewriter Co., rent	12.00
55	Waukesha-Roxo Co., water and ice	7.10

PERSONAL CHECK.

612	Lee Merville, expenses West Allis meeting	\$27.50
615	Jones Island workers on primary day (2)	20.00
619	Rambler Garage Co., auto hire	43.50
620	S. E. Tate Printing Co., Slavonic cards (second lot)	6.50
629	Wm. C. Kreul Co., 1 chair claimed lost	2.25
633	Knell-Prengal & Steltz Co., cigars	13.00
638	Wisconsin Telephone Co., rental, etc.	32.10
Total		2,864.05

CASH DISBURSEMENTS.

Date.	For what expended.	Amount.
1908		
July 1	Expenses to Wausau and return, two persons	\$21.60
2	Expenses account of organization	7.65
3	Rent for headquarters, 2 months	150.00
4	Expenses on account of organization	9.15
9	do	3.75
10	do	15.20
11	do	9.65
12	do	14.90
13	Broom, etc.	1.00
	Expenses on account of organization	5.60
14	Window screens	1.75
	Expenses on account of organization	10.40
	Wages to help, week ending July 11	20.00
	Expenses on account of organization	5.80
15	Expenses, 1 man to attend colored picnic	5.00
	Expenses on account of organization	18.70
16	Hammer, screw driver, etc.	1.36
	Use, services	2.00
	Expenses on account of organization	7.55
	1,080 postage stamps	20.00
17	Expenses on account of organization	9.25
	do	17.85
18	do	12.05
19	do	18.35
20	do	6.55
21	do	4.60
	do	16.40
	Fowler Towel Supply Co.	1.00
22	Livery hire	2.00
	Expenses on account of organization	12.35
	Wages, week ending July 18	65.55
23	Livery hire	2.50
	Tacks, etc.	1.10
	Expenses on account of organization	13.55
24	do	11.70

Exhibit Knell 1, Oct. 25, 1911—Continued.
CASH DISBURSEMENTS—continued.

Date.	For what expended.	Amount.
1908.		
July 24	Boy, omitted from last pay roll.....	\$5.00
	Tickets for Catholic Forester picnic.....	1.00
	Tickets for West Allis firemen's tournament.....	1.00
25	1 man to Allis-Chalmers picnic at Waukesha.....	10.00
	Livery hire.....	5.00
	1 man to picnic of colored church.....	5.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	21.65
	Expenses on account of organization in towns.....	34.10
27	Roberts, expenses looking up Welsh voters.....	.75
	Car tickets.....	1.00
	Pay roll, week ending July 25.....	124.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	15.70
28	J. F. Haunty, distributing.....	6.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	15.10
29do.....	8.65
	Expenses obtaining signatures to nomination papers.....	184.20
	5,000 2-cent stamps.....	100.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	14.50
	Wauwatosa poll lists (typewritten).....	10.00
30	Livery hire (4 days).....	10.00
	Expenses checking poll lists of city of Milwaukee.....	130.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	13.75
31	1 man at Welsh picnic.....	5.00
	Street-car tickets.....	1.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	7.00
Aug. 1do.....	13.85
2do.....	7.10
3	Pay roll, week ending Aug. 1.....	143.50
	Expenses on account of organization.....	6.50
4	Expenses to McMahon.....	1.50
	Hammer, etc.....	3.00
	Expenses to Cohen.....	1.50
	Expenses on account of organization.....	9.40
5	Expenses billing and organizing town of Greenfield.....	43.95
	Expenses to Cohen and others.....	6.50
	Expenses on account of organization.....	11.40
6do.....	7.95
	Expenses to 1 "toucher".....	.50
7	Expenses on account of organization.....	11.45
8do.....	17.45
9do.....	32.10
	Expenses to McMahon.....	1.35
10	Pay roll, week ending Aug. 8.....	153.50
	Services by National Quartette.....	10.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	7.00
11	Copying eighteenth ward poll list.....	10.00
	Expenses to H. P. K., work in twenty-third ward.....	4.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	11.65
12	City Directory.....	5.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	17.30
13	Expenses to F. S., fifth ward.....	2.00
	Expenses to old soldier for frame.....	5.00
	Livery hire.....	7.50
	Expenses colored voters' meeting.....	4.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	11.30
14	Expenses to Roberts, looking up Welsh voters.....	2.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	16.20
	Touches by various lesser lights.....	3.50
15	Expressman taking mail to post office.....	.75
	Expenses on account of organization.....	17.40
16do.....	23.15
17	Telephone tolls.....	1.50
	Expenses on account of organization.....	19.10
	Pay roll, week ending Aug. 15.....	142.50
18	Auto hire.....	5.50
	Tickets to picnic of Railway Trainmen.....	2.00
	Expenses on account of organizing.....	14.65
19do.....	21.35
20	Tickets to picnic of Electrical Workers' Union.....	5.00
	Numerous and various touchers.....	17.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	8.45
21	Hall rent, West Allis meeting.....	15.00
	Expenses with delegation of railway employees.....	5.40
	Expenses on account of organization.....	22.10
22	Livery hire.....	5.00
	Expenses 2 men at Jewish picnic.....	6.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	14.70
23	Expenses trip through Ghetto (3 men).....	25.00
	Livery hire.....	2.00
	Tickets from Benevolent Society.....	2.00
	Expressman, hauling mail.....	2.50
	Expenses to McMahon.....	2.05
	Expenses on account of organization.....	9.30
24	Pay roll, week ending Aug. 22.....	174.85
	Expenses picnic at Waukesha, street railway employees.....	20.00
	Tickets, Company D, Wisconsin National Guard.....	10.00
	Additional pay roll, week ending Aug. 22.....	3.40
	Advertising, colored men's paper.....	5.00
	Services, National Quartette (various occasions).....	16.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	32.75
25	Touch by 2 old soldiers.....	2.00
	Touch by 2 heeters.....	2.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	17.40
26	Advertising, bartenders' program.....	4.00
	Expenses on account of organization.....	22.30
27do.....	18.70
29do.....	17.65
30do.....	31.15
	Tickets, game of Milwaukee baseball league.....	2.00
	Expenses with Phoenix and Liberty Clubs.....	10.00
	Three citizenship papers.....	3.00
	Expenses to McMahon.....	4.00
	Two teams, primary day, town of Greenfield.....	12.00
	One team, primary day, town of Wauwatosa.....	7.00
	Expenses to ward and town managers, including conveyances, primary-day workers, etc.....	5,833.00

Exhibit Knell 1, Oct. 25, 1911—Continued.
CASH DISBURSEMENTS—continued.

Date.	For what expended.	Amount.	
1908.			
Aug. 30	Expenses to Greek manager and primary-day workers.....	\$110.00	
	Expenses to Hebrew manager and primary-day workers.....	45.00	
	P. J. Sullivan, balance, distributing.....	70.00	
	Final pay roll.....	155.50	
	Advertising, Italian paper.....	10.00	
	Towell Bros., advertising.....	34.85	
	Patterson Typewriting Co., letters, etc.....	118.45	
	Advertising in colored men's paper.....	5.00	
	E. H. Daniels & Co., tacks, etc.....	1.20	
	Siekert & Baum Stationery Co.....	6.20	
	Fowler Towel Supply Co.....	1.00	
	Advertising, aldermanic ball-game program.....	15.00	
	Humphrey (Welsh), primary-day worker (not in total).....	20.00	
	Auto to West Allis meeting (Spehn).....	8.00	
	Wilson Detective Agency, watching mall.....	12.00	
	Chas. S. McGinn, distributing.....	75.00	
	Keystone Printing Co., printing, etc.....	60.75	
		9,239.16	
RECAPITULATION.			
	Amount disbursed in cash.....	\$9,239.16	
	Amount disbursed by check.....	2,864.05	
	Total disbursements.....	12,103.21	
Credits:			
	Stamps returned to postmaster.....	\$100.00	
	Stamps on hand.....	17.80	
	Envelopes on hand 20-1/2M.....	12.30	
	Cigars on hand.....	6.50	
	L. Breithaupt Printing Co.....	60.00	
	Other supplies and material on hand and usable (estimated).....	20.00	
	Total credits.....	216.60	
	Actual or net amount disbursed.....	11,886.61	
	Amount received.....	11,600.00	
	Disbursements in excess of receipts.....	286.61	
Names, addresses, and occupations of the persons and the amount of money paid to each of the persons participating in the distribution of the \$5,833.			
Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Amount.
FIRST WARD.			
Chester Roberts.....	711 Racine Street.....	Real estate and loans.....	\$100.00
R. Humphry.....	184 Knapp Street.....	Contractor.....	20.00
SECOND WARD.			
O. Janssen.....			80.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	20.00
THIRD WARD.			
Arthur Wilcox.....	342 Jackson Street.....	Gas fitter.....	100.00
Domonic Baroni.....	177 Michigan Street.....	Notary public.....	25.00
FOURTH WARD.			
Wm. O'Connor.....	822 Sycamore Street.....	Superintendent garbage hoist.....	500.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?) (about).....	50.00
FIFTH WARD.			
Fred Stark, jr.....	214 Greenbush Street.....	No regular occupation.....	100.00
SIXTH WARD.			
Emil C. Hammer.....	141 North Avenue.....	Barber.....	160.00
H. E. Ruggaber.....	640 Third Street.....	Clerk.....	15.00
SEVENTH WARD.			
Geo. B. McKinley.....	405 Van Buren Street.....	Salesman.....	150.00
EIGHTH WARD.			
Tom Novotny.....	Tenth Avenue and Scott Street.....	Saloon.....	150.00
NINTH WARD.			
			100.00
TENTH WARD.			
			100.00
ELEVENTH WARD.			
Martin E. Wilde.....	557 Seventh Avenue.....	Real estate and loans.....	100.00
TWELFTH WARD.			
Wm. Bark.....	411 Greenfield Ave.....	Barber.....	125.00
Archie Hamilton.....	224 Lenox Street.....	Clerk.....	25.00
THIRTEENTH WARD.			
John Sonnenburg.....	980 Richards Street.....	Union Monument Co.....	170.00

Names, addresses, and occupations of the persons, etc.—Continued.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Amount.
FOURTEENTH WARD.			
Leo F. Kelpinski.....	929 Tenth Avenue...	Assistant superintendent.	\$100.00 55.00
FIFTEENTH WARD.			
A. Rosenhein.....	1405 Vliet Street.....	Saloon.....	325.00
Do.....	do.....	do.....	20.00
SIXTEENTH WARD.			
T. L. Clary.....	656½ 35th Street.....	Railroad conductor.....	} 450.00
A. J. Klumb.....	3226 Park Hill Ave.....	Locomotive engineer.....	
W. G. Breekenridge.....	317 23d Avenue.....	Yardman.....	
(?) Mahoney.....	(?).....	Railroad man.....	
A. N. Lucas.....	3115 Sycamore Street.....	Foreman.....	
E. Edwards.....	3034 33d Street.....	Locomotive engineer.....	
(?) Fischer.....	do.....	Railroad man.....	
James O'Connor.....	3500 Canal Street.....	Saloon and restaurant.....	
(?) You-z.....	(?).....	Railroad man.....	
(?) Brady.....	(?).....	do.....	
(?) Fair.....	(?).....	do.....	25.00
Total.....			3,240.00
SEVENTEENTH WARD.			
J. Redfern.....	387 Beulah Avenue.....	Iron worker.....	} 145.00
W. Lawrie.....	392 Beulah Avenue.....	Molder.....	
G. Edmonds.....	349 Beulah Avenue.....	Iron worker.....	
C. E. Hickman.....	212 Woodward Ave.....	Bookkeeper.....	
J. M. Douglas.....	400 Superior Street.....	Pattern maker.....	
EIGHTEENTH WARD.			
Phil S. Farley.....	392 Oakland Ave.....	Foreman.....	} 180.00
H. P. Lochemes.....	630 Bartlett Street.....	Plumber.....	
J. Haunty.....	(?).....	Electrician.....	
Nacek.....	(?).....	(?).....	
Nolan.....	(?).....	(?).....	
NINETEENTH WARD.			
			100.00
TWENTIETH WARD.			
O. F. Krueger.....	1044 Teutonia Ave.....	Physician.....	145.00
TWENTY-FIRST WARD.			
H. S. Young.....	1318 Richards Street.....		125.00
TWENTY-SECOND WARD.			
W. R. Jones.....	850 27th Street.....	Salesman.....	100.00
H. J. Hanson.....	685 34th Street.....	Assistant paymaster.....	50.00
Geo. Luther.....	763 28th Street.....	Salesman.....	30.00
TWENTY-THIRD WARD.			
H. C. Kapanka.....	862 National Avenue.....	Barber.....	80.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	20.00
WEST ALLIS.			
Lee G. Merville.....	West Allis, Wis.....	Machinist.....	200.00
(?) Pavelick.....	do.....	(?).....	30.00
SOLDIERS' HOME.			
(?) Hart.....	National Home, Wis.....	Sergeant.....	50.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	20.00
SOUTH MILWAUKEE.			
Geo. Anderson.....	South Milwaukee, Wis.....	Molder (?).....	60.00
WEST MILWAUKEE.			
H. B. Daggett.....	449 43d Avenue.....	Real estate and loans.....	175.00
CITY OF WAUWATOSA.			
Geo. Lund.....	Wauwatosa, Wis.....	Saloon.....	40.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	10.00
TOWN OF WAUWATOSA.			
Christ Sommers.....	Wauwatosa, Wis.....	Farmer.....	15.00
John Barnekow.....	do.....	do.....	10.00
Gillett.....	do.....	do.....	10.00
(?).....	do.....	do.....	10.00
TOWNS OF GREENFIELD AND FRANKLIN.			
Schneider (?).....	(?).....	(?).....	50.00
VILLAGE OF NORTH MILWAUKEE.			
H. Brielmeire.....	North Milwaukee, Wis.....	Saloon.....	20.00
CITY OF CUDAHY.			
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	40.00

Names, addresses, and occupations of the persons, etc.—Continued.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Amount.
VILLAGE OF WHITEFISH BAY.			
John Singles.....	Whitefish Bay, Wis.	General store.....	\$20.00
TOWN OF MILWAUKEE.			
John Kuettemeyer.....	Green Tree, Milwaukee County.	Saloon.....	10.00
(?).....	(?).....	Truck gardener.....	5.00
Four primary day workers.....	(?).....	(?).....	20.00
TOWN OF GRANVILLE.			
Louis Tennesen.....	West Granville, Wis.	Saloon.....	10.00
Theo. Schweitzer.....	Brown Deer, Wis.....	do.....	10.00
TOWN OF OAK CREEK.			
Primary day workers and teams.....	(?).....	(?).....	20.00
Total.....			5,190.00
TOWN OF LAKE.			
M. Hurley.....	358 Scott Street.....	Teamster.....	40.00
(?).....	(?).....	(?).....	30.00
VILLAGE OF EAST MILWAUKEE.			
Primary day worker and team.....			10.00
<p>McMitten, lives near Hales Corners, furnished two teams on primary day..... \$15.00</p> <p>Two horses and buggy, town of Wauwatosa, on primary day..... 10.00</p> <p>One man, name and location unknown, primary day..... 3.00</p> <p>One assistant manager, having general supervision of the organization work, office help, and field work, for expenses during about eight weeks..... 350.00</p> <p>Primary night, bringing in returns from outlying districts..... 80.00-100.00</p> <p>Total..... 5,748.00</p> <p>Amount shown in report to Stephenson managers..... 5,833.00</p> <p>Amount received from Mr. Edmonds, by him reported..... 300.00</p> <p>Total disbursed..... 6,133.00</p> <p>Amount enumerated in foregoing statement..... 5,748.00</p> <p>Disbursed to men whose names are not remembered..... 385.00</p>			
<p>By way of explanation I wish to state, with reference to the wards in which the largest amounts have been placed, as follows:</p> <p>Fourth ward. This ward manager was to look after part of the so-called railroad vote and the colored vote. The colored population of Milwaukee is split into almost as many factions as is the Republican Party and Democratic Party combined. And then some.</p> <p>Fifteenth ward. This ward manager was to look after the vote of a thickly populated district immediately west of the ward and commonly called Center City. It is in the town of Wauwatosa and not incorporated.</p> <p>Sixteenth ward. These ward managers, and the others enumerated, were to look after the so-called railroad vote, the railroad shops, railroad yards, switch yards, and that part of the town of Wauwatosa adjoining these different yards and shops, as well as the railroad vote in general in the county.</p> <p>West Allis. This manager was to look after part of the so-called soldiers' home vote and part of the town of Greenfield.</p> <p>West Milwaukee. This manager was to look after part of the so-called soldiers' home vote and the northeast part (most thickly populated) of the town of Greenfield.</p> <p>Fourteenth ward. Leo F. Kelpinski was to receive \$110, one-half cash, the balance when the primary was over. He was to look after, I believe, two precincts in the fourteenth ward, two in the eighteenth ward, and one each in the thirteenth and twenty-first wards. A few days after paying him \$55 one of my deputies rang me up on an evening and the following conversation ensued: "Is this the sheriff?" "Yes." "This is Matuszewski." "Well, what is it, Matt?" "I thought you said Leo Kelpinski was working for you?" "So he agreed to." "Is he got the money?" "Part of it." "Well, you're done." "Why do say so?" "I just saw a check for \$100 which he cashed in a saloon down here. It was Cook money." "You saw the check? Are you sure of that?" "I saw the check with my own eyes, I can swear to it." I then said, "Well, you know, Matt, that one is got to expect a certain amount of 'double-crossing' in politics."</p> <p>That ended the conversation, and naturally I refused to pay the balance claimed to be due.</p> <p>Greek manager, Mr. Sarrass, given name and address unknown at this time. He lives in the northwestern part of the city and I meet him occasionally. Mr. Sarrass was to secure the services of, I believe, nine primary-day workers, aggregating \$45, and the balance was to be for his services and expenses. About two weeks' work.</p> <p>Hebrew workers. Mr. Abe Cohen received \$45 for which he was to secure eight primary-day workers, aggregating \$40, and for the other \$5 he was to busy himself on primary day looking after his men.</p> <p>First ward, 1; fifth ward, 1; sixth ward, 3; ninth ward, 2; tenth ward, 1.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the committee has not furnished the Senate with more testimony from these ward managers. From the meager information which the volumes furnished us contain,</p>			

it seems that the money was largely spent in the Milwaukee saloons by a lot of political scavengers who always had their hands out for boodle. Of course such men as these will always be found in the camp of the candidate who is most willing to put up the money, and in this case Senator STEPHENSON was that candidate.

The four Republican candidates for Senator, according to their statements, expended in this primary the following amounts: STEPHENSON, \$107,793.05; Cook, \$42,293.29; Hatton, \$26,413; and McGovern, \$11,063.88. And be it said to the honor of the city of Milwaukee, the candidate who expended the least money and who probably hired none of these political cormorants received more than twice as many votes as did Senator STEPHENSON, who spent \$27,000 more than all of the others combined. The vote in Milwaukee was: McGovern, 12,053; Cook, 5,420; STEPHENSON, 5,385; and Hatton, 2,764. Knell says he had employed about 400 workers, hired by him to "make sentiment" for STEPHENSON. Yet Knell, the sheriff of the county, with his 400 mercenaries, was able to secure for his chief only a little over 5,000 votes out of a total of 25,622. STEPHENSON expended more money in Milwaukee County than McGovern expended in the entire State.

LESTER S. DRESSER.

Lester S. Dresser was another one of Edmonds's upstate organizers. He was paid in all \$2,350—\$2,100 before the primary and \$250 immediately after. During the investigation he was asked by the chairman of the Senate subcommittee (p. 998):

What did you do with that money?

Mr. DRESSER. I drew the money and turned it over to different individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom did you turn it over?

Mr. DRESSER. I turned over money to Mr. Nesbit, in Barron County.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give Mr. Nesbit?

Mr. DRESSER. \$50.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give him \$50?

Mr. DRESSER. To go out and look over Barron County and see how the people felt on the senatorial situation.

The CHAIRMAN. In whose interest did you give him that money?

Mr. DRESSER. Senator STEPHENSON'S.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give him the money?

Mr. DRESSER. To pay his expenses in traveling over the county talking for Senator STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he render you an account of the money, as to the expenditure that he had made?

Mr. DRESSER. He did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you request him to do so?

Mr. DRESSER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know for what purpose he spent the money?

Mr. DRESSER. I do not. * * * I gave money to a man in Pierce County.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

Mr. DRESSER. Olof Halls.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his address?

Mr. DRESSER. Ellsworth, Wis.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give him?

Mr. DRESSER. \$50.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you give him instructions when you gave him the money?

Mr. DRESSER. I told him to look over the county and see what the senatorial situation was and report to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Name the next person to whom you paid any of that money.

Mr. DRESSER. A man by the name of Stevenson, of Menominee, I do not know his first name.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay him?

Mr. DRESSER. \$75.

The CHAIRMAN. For the same purpose?

Mr. DRESSER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that purpose?

Mr. DRESSER. To travel over Dunn County and see what the conditions were, and talk for Senator STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. Name the next man to whom you paid any money out of this fund; and just continue to name them until you have exhausted your memory, or the fund.

Mr. DRESSER. I paid Mr. Albert Anderson.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. DRESSER. When I testified before the other committee my recollection was that it was \$150. Afterwards I was talking with Mr. Anderson and he told me that I had made a mistake; that it was \$350.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you come to give him the \$350?

Mr. DRESSER. He was a bright young man, active in politics.

The CHAIRMAN. For whom was he active?

Mr. DRESSER. For Senator STEPHENSON.

There is always an expression in testimony like this that conveys the real purpose and motive of the man who is handling the fund. He gave this man \$350 because he was a bright fellow, an active fellow in politics. To other men he had given \$50 and \$75. He thought this man was worth more as a Stephenson promoter than the other, and so he paid him more money. The influence of this individual in that political campaign in the mind of Dresser, the agent of Edmonds, was worth more cash than that of these other fellows, and so he made the

figure higher. Now, if that is not the corrupt use of money in politics, what is? I should like to have somebody tell me.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you gave him the money?

Mr. DRESSER. He was supporting Senator STEPHENSON, but I do not know that he was active out through the district.

He needed a little more "pepper," as the baseball boys say.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you give him this money to be paid out or to be retained by him?

Mr. DRESSER. It was given him to use as he thought best.

The CHAIRMAN. To pay out as he saw fit or to retain so much?

Mr. DRESSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how much he retained for his own services?

Mr. DRESSER. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Dresser, will you proceed to give the name of another person or persons to whom you paid money?

Mr. DRESSER. Mr. Henry Hetting.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay him?

Mr. DRESSER. He worked throughout the campaign—two months—practically throughout the campaign.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. How much money did he have?

Mr. DRESSER. He had, altogether, in the neighborhood of—well, he spent the rest of the money—seventeen or eighteen or nineteen hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. When you paid Mr. Hetting this money you did not pay it to him all at one time, did you?

Mr. DRESSER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice you enumerate several payments here, running from \$150 up to \$300 or \$350.

Mr. DRESSER. Something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true?

Mr. DRESSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You paid it to him as he called for it, did you?

Mr. DRESSER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you instruct him as to the manner in which that money was to be expended?

Mr. DRESSER. Why, we talked it over in a general way.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he to distribute any money? You have already stated that he was to travel over the district and distribute literature.

Was he to distribute any money?

Mr. DRESSER. He was to get some workers.

The CHAIRMAN. He was to get workers to do the same class of work that he was doing?

Mr. DRESSER. Not the same class of work that he was doing, because he covered the entire district. He was to get some workers for local towns.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Hetting spend portions of this money for liquor or cigars?

Mr. DRESSER. I presume he did do some treating.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any idea as to the extent of such expenditures?

Mr. DRESSER. No; I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever talk to him about it?

Mr. DRESSER. Yes. He said he usually treated where he went.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he give you any information as to how much money was expended for such purposes?

Mr. DRESSER. If he did, I have forgotten it.

Dresser was a member of the board of control of the State of Wisconsin, a board which has supervision of the asylums and penal institutions of the State, and as such member he travels over the State inspecting such institutions for the public expense. He says he did not charge Mr. STEPHENSON for any expenses in traveling about and supervising the expenditure of his money in the various counties that were assigned to him. He seemed to work directly under the supervision of Senator STEPHENSON, as is shown (p. 1009).

Questions have been asked as to what knowledge Senator STEPHENSON had in regard to a number of these expenditures. A large amount of this money was expended by his agents, and of course he did not know the details. Some of the details he did know. He was familiar with this money which Hetting disbursed, as shown by the following letter:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Marinette, Wis., July 14, 1908.

Hon. L. B. DRESSER, St. Croix Falls.

DEAR SIR: Your letter received and contents fully noted. In regard to the work of Mr. Hetting, I have no one in the counties named by you unless it is Mr. T. S. Whitten, of Hayward, of Sawyer County. Whether the management in Milwaukee has anyone I do not know. It may be well to write Mr. Puelicher, of the Marshall & Isley Bank, if he has and who they may be.

If you think it necessary to have anyone to help Mr. Hetting in the counties named, you may employ such help as may be necessary and some one that can be relied upon; will take care of the expense, and have them do the work promptly.

I hope some one will be looking after Douglas. Let me hear from (sic.) when you think best and with all the possible information.

Very truly, yours,

ISAAC STEPHENSON.

Send nomination papers direct to J. H. Puelicher, care of Marshall & Isley Bank, Milwaukee. Send by registered mail.

L. S.

It appears from this testimony that not only were the saloons of Milwaukee subsidized in Mr. STEPHENSON'S behalf, but also a part of the State government.

D. E. RIORDAN.

Mr. D. E. Riordan was another one of the Stephenson scouts. He received \$3,200 of the Stephenson money, and expended all but about \$500, which he retained for his own compensation. He accounted for about \$1,200, paid to other individuals, leaving a balance of about \$1,500 that he did not account for. In regard to this sum he was asked by Senator POMERENE (p. 787):

Of this \$1,500, did you give part to other men to be expended in behalf of Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. RIORDAN. Not very much of it. If I did it was in small amounts. Senator POMERENE. Then, if I understand you correctly, the most of this \$1,500 would go to the "ultimate consumer," as he has been termed here?

Mr. RIORDAN. A great deal of it went for what I regarded as legitimate traveling and incidental expenses, incident to organizing and going through that vast territory.

Senator POMERENE. That is, your own traveling expenses?

Mr. RIORDAN. And those that I asked to accompany me and to come to meet me.

Senator POMERENE. How much of it went to pay your own traveling expenses?

Mr. RIORDAN. I did not keep any itemized account.

Senator POMERENE. Approximately?

Mr. RIORDAN. I am not able to say.

Senator POMERENE. A couple of hundred dollars?

Mr. RIORDAN. Oh, yes; more than that.

Of the \$1,200 that he accounted for, Riordan said that he gave \$75 to a man named Frank Marteau, who ran an Italian newspaper. He also gave the same man \$25 for printing sample ballots. He paid a man named Matt Connor \$40 for blank ballots, and a man named Lowell, at Rhinelander, \$25 for printing sample ballots. Barney Moran, of the town of Pelican, was paid \$50 for attending the polling place and securing workers to instruct the voters how to vote for STEPHENSON. Riordan paid a man named Frank Trimble, of Rhinelander, \$60 or \$75 for the same purpose. He paid a Mr. Stewart, of Langlade County, \$185 to go through the county, handle sample ballots, and create sentiment for STEPHENSON. He also paid Mr. E. A. Everett, of Eagle River, who was then a candidate for the legislature, \$250. In regard to this expenditure, the chairman asked him (p. 781):

When you paid it to him did you know that he was a candidate for the assembly?

Mr. RIORDAN. I think I did; certainly. I surely talked with him about it.

(Page 780.)

The CHAIRMAN. For what did you pay him that sum?

Mr. RIORDAN. For traveling through the counties of Vilas, Iron, and Oneida and ascertaining as far as he was able the sentiment of the people as he went along; that is, those who were for and against each of the several candidates.

Mr. RIORDAN. * * * And if the chairman will permit, I would like to say that this trip, that was made in the first instance by Mr. Everett, in pursuance with this agreement I made with him, was made early. That was the first thing I did after I agreed with Mr. Edmonds to support Senator STEPHENSON and to do some work for him there—to make this arrangement with Mr. Everett and start him out.

That was one of the first services he was employed for. He was hired to go out and work for STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. You paid him that out of the first \$1,000?

Mr. RIORDAN. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you pay it to him?

Mr. RIORDAN. I paid that by check, and I gave it to him along late in August.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed. To whom other than Mr. Everett did you give money?

Mr. RIORDAN. To Mr. George E. O'Connor.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give him?

Mr. RIORDAN. \$75.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give him that money?

Mr. RIORDAN. For the same purpose and with the same understanding I had with Mr. Everett, excepting that he was to take a different course in the more rural parts of the district—what we call the mill towns.

That is, Everett was paid \$250 to do the same work, practically, covering the same period that O'Connor was paid \$75 to do, but in a different part of the country. Now, why Everett \$250 and O'Connor \$75? That Everett was a candidate for the legislature and his influence was more desirable than O'Connor's is the only conclusion I can draw.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand the Senator to say that Everett was a candidate for the legislature?

Mr. BRISTOW. He was.

Mr. BORAH. I presume he was one who was not elected.

Mr. BRISTOW. He was one who was not elected.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay anybody any money, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of inducing them to support Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. RIORDAN. I did directly, and in a manner that I thought was proper and which was customary.

That is his answer. You will note the qualification that follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Just describe how you did it.

Mr. RIORDAN. The manner in which I provided for the employment of men to handle those sample ballots that I caused to be printed, and to use them on election day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the only way? I asked you if you paid any money to any person to secure their influence for Senator STEPHENSON.

Mr. RIORDAN. I misunderstood the question. I thought you said support.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you did not pay any person any money, directly or indirectly, to secure the support of such person for Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. RIORDAN. No; I did not.

I wondered when I read that what he paid it to him for.

The CHAIRMAN. You may now proceed with any other person to whom you remember having paid portions of this money that you received.

Mr. RIORDAN. B. F. Jillson.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

Mr. RIORDAN. He keeps a hotel at Monico Junction.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give him?

Mr. RIORDAN. \$50.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. RIORDAN. For use in getting out the vote to the polls and to influence them with the use of the ballots, as I have suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. Make that plain, because that might mean many things. You say "to influence" them with the use of the ballot. Do you mean this sample ballot?

Mr. RIORDAN. Yes; I mean this sample ballot.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything else? Just recall the question: Did you pay them, or was any money paid them, for anything else than merely to handle sample ballots in the manner that you have described?

Mr. RIORDAN. And to talk to the elector within a proper distance of the polls.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed with the next one to whom you paid money.

Mr. RIORDAN. I paid \$50 at the same time to parties who were at his hotel who came there to me from Forest County; but I am unable to give their names or the amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. How much money did you pay them?

Mr. RIORDAN. \$50. I paid that to parties at the same time and at the same place that I paid Mr. Jillson the \$50.

The CHAIRMAN. To be used for what purpose?

Mr. RIORDAN. To be used for the purpose of employing men at the polling places across the line in Forest County on election day.

The CHAIRMAN. To do what on election day?

Mr. RIORDAN. To attend the polls and electioneer for Senator STEPHENSON.

The CHAIRMAN. Electioneer in what manner?

Mr. RIORDAN. In any lawful and proper manner. There are many ways, I presume.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you admonish them as to the manner in which they were to electioneer and instruct them as to the law?

Mr. RIORDAN. In regard to electioneering?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RIORDAN. I think I did in nearly every instance—especially in one particular, and that was not to attempt to talk to any elector within 100 feet of the polls.

Riordan gave as his opinion that \$200,000 could easily have been spent legitimately in the Stephenson campaign. He fails to account for about \$1,500 of the money which Edmonds gave him. Presumably he kept it—to use a common phrase, "knocked it down," or expended it for a purpose which he did not care to divulge. In my opinion, the evidence clearly demonstrates that he did not spend anything like that amount for legitimate traveling expenses during the short time that he was at work. The primaries were held September 1, and Riordan says that his agreement with Edmonds was made the latter part of July, so that if he had traveled continuously he would not have been out to exceed five or six weeks. In dealing with such characters it is impossible to tell how much money "sticks to their fingers." Being engaged in an unlawful business, the party providing them with money can not consistently require them to set down in detail the purposes for which the money is expended. From an affidavit submitted by one C. E. Brady, page 1281 of the hearings, it appears that STEPHENSON's managers did not want these agents of his to make detailed statements to them of the purposes for which the money was expended. Brady's affidavit states that within 30 days after the close of the campaign he called on Edmonds and offered to give him an itemized account of his expenditures, and says further in his affidavit that—

Mr. Edmonds then stated that he had not asked for accounts from those intrusted with the disbursements of money in said campaign, and that he had absolute confidence in the judgment of affiant in the use of said money, and was thoroughly satisfied with the manner in which affiant stated that the same had been used, and that he would much prefer to not take affiant's statement of account so long as he had not received such statements from all other persons similarly situated.

Brady worked in Manitowoc County and received \$500 of Stephenson money. It seems, also, that Senator STEPHENSON himself was not at all particular about these scouts of his fur-

nishing itemized statements of their expenditures. One Walter Alexander was an organizer or submanager for the counties of Marathon and Lincoln. In a letter to Alexander, of October 29, 1908, Senator STEPHENSON, among other things, says (page 2038):

Inclosed please find my check for \$588.30 in payment of the account which you sent me; it is not necessary for you to itemize the account. I feel very grateful to you, Walter, for the interest you have taken in my canvass and for the effective work which you have done in my behalf.

Mr. REED. Who wrote that letter?

Mr. BRISTOW. Senator STEPHENSON.

I have commented on the subsidizing of Dresser, a member of the board of control of the State of Wisconsin, who received \$2,350 of the Stephenson money, which he distributed to men throughout the State for the purpose of inducing them to "create sentiment for STEPHENSON." I now call the attention of the Senate to another very interesting emissary of Mr. STEPHENSON.

J. W. STONE.

J. W. Stone was the State game warden of the State of Wisconsin, and had under him a large number of deputies. I think it better, however, to quote from Mr. Stone himself as to the beginning of his campaign services for Mr. STEPHENSON. On page 1313 of the testimony I find the following:

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive money from Senator STEPHENSON, or from those representing him, to be used in his behalf during his senatorial campaign before the primaries in 1908?

Mr. STONE. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. STONE. Two thousand five hundred dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that all you received?

Mr. STONE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not receive \$2,840.50?

Mr. STONE. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the amount you received?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. When you received the \$2,500, in what shape did you receive it?

Mr. STONE. In currency.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. STONE. In the Wells Building, I think it was; at the headquarters in the city of Milwaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. From whom?

Mr. STONE. From Mr. Sacket.

The CHAIRMAN. No check or draft was drawn in your favor that you signed?

Mr. STONE. No, sir; not for the \$2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. Did Mr. Sacket have the money in his possession when you went to him on that day?

Mr. STONE. I went to Mr. Edmonds first.

The CHAIRMAN. I was referring, though, to Mr. Sacket. When you went into Mr. Sacket's presence, did he have that money with him, or did he go and get it after you went in there?

Mr. STONE. I do not remember seeing Mr. Sacket until he came in with the money.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose was that money given you?

Mr. STONE. It was to be expended in the interest of Mr. STEPHENSON'S primary campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it to be expended by you, or were you authorized to pay it out to others, to be expended by them?

Mr. STONE. I was to use it at my own discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you at liberty, then, as you understood the transaction, to handle all that money yourself?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. According to your discretion?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. No limitations were placed upon you whatever as to the manner of expenditure, were there?

Mr. STONE. No; I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay any part of that money out to others, to be by them distributed or disbursed?

Mr. STONE. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom did you pay it?

Mr. STONE. I paid H. A. Bowman.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. STONE. \$1,250.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you give him the \$1,250?

Mr. STONE. I give him \$500 the day that I received the money.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you next give him money?

Mr. STONE. I give him \$500 in the city of Madison; but I can not tell you the date.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it before or after the primary?

Mr. STONE. Some time in August, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you next give him money?

Mr. STONE. I gave him a check for two hundred and eighty some odd dollars.

Senator POMERENE. What was the amount?

Mr. STONE. I think it was two hundred and eighty some odd dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. That would make \$1,280?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give that to Mr. Bowman?

Mr. STONE. For him to use in the interest of Mr. STEPHENSON'S campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you tell him the use he was to make of it?

Mr. STONE. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you discuss with him the manner in which it was to be used?

Mr. STONE. I presume he naturally did—

The CHAIRMAN. What was said as to the manner in which that money was to be used?

Mr. STONE. It was to be expended for workers.

The CHAIRMAN. For workers where?

Mr. STONE. In the different parts of the State where he was located.

The CHAIRMAN. Workers to do what kind of work?

Mr. STONE. Ordinary election work.

The CHAIRMAN. You have now disposed of \$1,250 of the \$2,500.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. \$1,280. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. He received, altogether, \$2,849.50. We will assume that you had \$1,250 remaining in your hands out of that \$2,500, or thereabouts—a difference of a dollar does not matter. What did you do with that?

Mr. STONE. I gave John Craig, of Superior, \$75; G. C. Kolb, \$50; F. B. Brown, \$50; G. W. Dart, \$50; A. E. Stores, \$20; W. P. Porter, \$25; F. A. Tate, \$20; a man by the name of Gordon, \$25 (I do not know his initials); A. I. Hulbert, \$10; E. W. Pierce, \$10; E. W. Tuttle, \$75; J. Sather, \$10; Fred Gerhart, \$200. That is all the memorandum I have.

The CHAIRMAN. That accounts for \$620. What did you do with the balance of that money?

Mr. STONE. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you spend it?

Mr. STONE. I do not know whether I spent it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say you do not know what you did with it, do you mean to say you do not know whether you lost it or spent it?

Mr. STONE. No, sir. It was deposited with what little money I had in the bank; and these separate sums that I have named are the only record I have of money actually paid to individuals. How much of that money I spent myself in the campaign I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do during the campaign?

Mr. STONE. Wherever I was I interested myself in Mr. STEPHENSON'S campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay out money in connection with Senator STEPHENSON'S campaign in addition to the sums that you have given us?

Mr. STONE. I undoubtedly did, in the way of entertainment, more or less.

The CHAIRMAN. How much would you say that you paid out?

Mr. STONE. I have not any idea. I could not make an estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay out \$500?

Mr. STONE. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. \$100?

Mr. STONE. I could not say just how much I did pay out.

The CHAIRMAN. You are engaged in the regular business of your office—game warden—were you?

Mr. STONE. At that time; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. During all of that time?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were under pay in the way of salary, or a per diem, or how?

Mr. STONE. Salary.

The CHAIRMAN. How much salary did you receive?

Mr. STONE. \$1,800 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what the men whose names you have given did with the sums of money that you have given us?

Mr. STONE. No, sir; I have no personal knowledge of that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they render you any account?

Mr. STONE. They did not.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no way of knowing what Mr. Gerhart did with the \$200?

Mr. STONE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay any of your game wardens, other than Mr. Bowman, any of this money?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one of the game wardens? Just give us the names of the game wardens. Are they included in the list you gave us?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Just indicate, then, so that we may mark them off.

Mr. STONE. Craig.

The CHAIRMAN. Craig is a game warden, is he?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir. He was at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STONE. Kolb, Brown, Dart, Stores, Gerhart.

The CHAIRMAN. Porter and Tate were not game wardens, were they?

Mr. STONE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or Gordon?

Mr. STONE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Or Hulbert?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; Mr. Hulbert was a game warden.

The CHAIRMAN. Pierce?

Mr. STONE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tuttle?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that name—Sager?

Mr. STONE. Sather. He was not a game warden.

The CHAIRMAN. Gerhart was?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That makes eight game wardens. Those are all the moneys you paid those game wardens?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You rendered no account of this money to anyone, did you?

Mr. STONE. I did not.

Senator POMERENE. Have you not any recollection as to what became of the balance of this money?

Mr. STONE. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What does the Senator make the balance, please?

Senator POMERENE. He first told us he had paid \$1,250 to Bowman. Then, in analyzing that, he gave us two payments of \$500 each and one of \$280. The other items he gave us total \$620. That would make \$1,870 or \$1,900, if you use \$250 as being the amount paid to Bowman.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That leaves a difference of how much?

Senator POMERENE. That would leave \$600 out of the \$2,500.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes; but there was \$349.50 in addition to that. The whole was \$2,849.

Senator POMERENE. Can you give us any account of this \$349.50?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Senator POMERENE. What did you do with it?

Mr. STONE. That was sent to me in full in a draft from Mr. Edmonds.

Senator POMERENE. You say that \$349.50 was sent to you in full?
Mr. STONE. I mean a check or draft was sent by Mr. Edmonds.

This seems to have been an afterpayment by Edmonds to make up some deficiencies of some kind which Stone claims to have had.

Senator POMERENE. Now go on and tell us what that was to pay for.
Mr. STONE. That was to pay a man by the name of Fridley, at Superior—

Fridley apparently is the attorney that our friend Perrin had employed, and to whom he paid about a thousand dollars. He seems also to have had financial relations with the game warden.

Senator POMERENE. What is his first name?
Mr. STONE. I do not remember now.
Senator POMERENE. How much?
Mr. STONE. I think it was \$140. That is my recollection; but I have not any memorandum of that.
Senator POMERENE. Who else?
Mr. STONE. John Craig.
Senator POMERENE. How much?
Mr. STONE. \$82, I think it was. It might have been a few cents more.
Senator POMERENE. Is that in addition to the \$75 you gave us awhile ago?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.
Senator POMERENE. Who else?
Mr. STONE. W. T. Porter.
Senator POMERENE. How much?
Mr. STONE. \$80.
Senator POMERENE. Was that in addition to the \$25 you gave him?
Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.
Senator POMERENE. Anyone else?
Mr. STONE. That is all.

Stone, in a way, accounts for all but about \$600 of the money which Edmonds gave him, and a part of this he says he expended in entertaining, but how much he says he does not remember. He was not asked to account for this money by Edmonds or STEPHENSON. I can not see how any intelligent man can come to any other conclusion from this testimony than that this \$2,849.50 was given to Stone as a bribe to secure the influence of himself and his game wardens in the election, and that after he had distributed approximately \$2,000 to his assistants, he retained the remainder as his part of this corruption fund which Senator STEPHENSON was distributing so lavishly throughout the State.

But it is interesting to trace this \$2,500, which Sacket handed in currency to Mr. Stone, to the "ultimate consumer." Stone testified that he paid John Craig \$75 upon one occasion and \$80 upon another. I have been unable to find any testimony of Mr. Craig in these volumes, so I presume that the committee did not call him before it, and therefore we can not trace the money which he received to the "ultimate consumer."

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator says Mr. Craig was not called, but every possible effort was made to secure every witness whose name was mentioned by any other witness.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not doubt that, but some of these men seem to have hid themselves because they did not want the embarrassing experience of testifying.

G. C. KOLB.

But Mr. G. C. Kolb, to whom \$50 was paid by Stone, did testify before the committee, and I will give you the cream of his testimony (p. 970):

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive any money during that campaign from anyone to be spent by you?

Mr. KOLB. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. How much?
Mr. KOLB. \$50.
The CHAIRMAN. From whom?
Mr. KOLB. From Mr. Stone.
Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Give us his full name, please.
Mr. KOLB. J. W. Stone.
The CHAIRMAN. When did Mr. Stone pay you this money?
Mr. KOLB. Oh, I think it was about three or four weeks before the primaries.

The CHAIRMAN. You were a deputy game warden at that time, were you?

Mr. KOLB. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Where did you receive the money?
Mr. KOLB. I think in Madison.
The CHAIRMAN. What did Mr. Stone say when he gave you that money as to the purpose for which he was giving it to you?
Mr. KOLB. To spend it for the interests of Senator STEPHENSON in his campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. He just gave you general instructions?
Mr. KOLB. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. How did you spend it?
Mr. KOLB. I spent it for cigars and treats.
The CHAIRMAN. All of it?
Mr. KOLB. Yes, sir; and in drug stores. Whenever I would drop into the saloons I would spend it.
The CHAIRMAN. You say in drug stores?
Mr. KOLB. In drug stores; yes. Whenever I would go into a drug store I would buy cigars, and whenever I would drop into a saloon I would buy beer, for instance.

Upon being interrogated by the chairman as to the nature of the saloon campaign, Kolb said:

Whenever I went to the saloons I bought drinks and cigars for the boys.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you spend it; in what place?
Mr. LITTLEFIELD. In what locality? That is what you mean, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KOLB. In towns where I would drop in.
The CHAIRMAN. What towns were they?
Mr. KOLB. Oh, they were towns—Elroy, Union, Camp Douglas—through that territory.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your business then?
Mr. KOLB. The saloon business.
The CHAIRMAN. Where?
Mr. KOLB. Hillsboro.

The CHAIRMAN. How did you come to be traveling around?
Mr. KOLB. I would be traveling around as a game warden.
The CHAIRMAN. You were traveling around as a game warden and you were in the saloon business?

Mr. KOLB. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you spend any of this money in your own saloon?

Mr. KOLB. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Were you alone in the saloon business?
Mr. KOLB. I have bartenders, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. You are the proprietor?

Mr. KOLB. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. When you were spending this money with the boys, as you have stated, did you tell them that you were favoring the election of Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. KOLB. Oh, I just simply said, "Have a drink on Mr. STEPHENSON."
The CHAIRMAN. That is what you would say—"Have a drink on Mr. STEPHENSON"?

Mr. KOLB. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. Then you would pay it out of this \$50?
Mr. KOLB. Yes, sir.

So much for Deputy Game Warden Kolb.

I have been unable to find any testimony from Mr. F. B. Brown, to whom Stone says he paid \$50. But Mr. George W. Dart, another one of Stone's lieutenants, is a very interesting witness. Stone says he paid Dart \$50. Now we will have Mr. Dart's story of the transaction (p. 974):

GEORGE W. DART.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you take any part in Senator STEPHENSON'S campaign in 1908, when he was a candidate for the United States Senate?

Mr. DART. Well, slightly.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive money from anyone to be used during that campaign in his behalf?

Mr. DART. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. How much did you receive?
Mr. DART. \$450.

The CHAIRMAN. From whom did you receive it?
Mr. DART. I received the first \$50 from J. W. Stone.
The CHAIRMAN. Who was Mr. Stone?

Mr. DART. Mr. Stone was the State game warden.
The CHAIRMAN. You were a deputy game warden, were you?
Mr. DART. I was a deputy game warden; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How did Mr. Stone come to give you that money?
Mr. DART. He gave it to me to help Mr. STEPHENSON'S interest—
The CHAIRMAN. What did he tell you when he gave you the money?

Mr. DART. I have forgotten the exact words.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do?
Mr. DART. That \$50 I took and used to put a man out to put up lithographs.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay him \$50 for it?
Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Give us the name of the man to whom you paid this money, if you have it.

Mr. DART. It was my son.
The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?
Mr. DART. George H. Dart.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you gave him the entire \$50?
Mr. DART. Yes. He hired a rig and went around putting up lithographs and campaign literature.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you receive any further sum of money for supporting Senator STEPHENSON?
Mr. DART. I do not know just the date of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get \$400 in a check from Mr. Edmonds?
Mr. DART. Yes; I did.
The CHAIRMAN. What did you do with the money?

That was the testimony given before the legislative committee in Wisconsin.

Mr. DART. I spent that. I put it out in different ways.
The CHAIRMAN. Tell us how.

Mr. DART. Paying men to take their teams and turn out to fetch the voters on the primary day.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you spend the entire \$400 in that way?
Mr. DART. No.
The CHAIRMAN. How much of that \$400 did you pay out to other people?

Mr. DART. How much did I pay out for labor?
The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay out for any purpose?
Mr. DART. I spent the \$400.

The CHAIRMAN. You paid it all out?
Mr. DART. Sure.

The CHAIRMAN. You did not keep any of that for yourself?
Mr. DART. Oh, no, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. To whom did you pay it?

Mr. DART. I could not tell you all the names. The biggest payment—

The CHAIRMAN. It will be necessary for you to account for that \$400—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. He was going on to say "the biggest payment," and something else, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I heard him say it. I am instructing him as to what I want him to answer.

Mr. DART. I did not keep a memorandum of it at all. I know the biggest payment I made was a payment of \$50 to a man.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom was that paid?

Mr. DART. His name is Frank Field.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give him that \$50?

Mr. DART. To go up through the edge of Adams County and through the town of Douglas.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you spend portions of this money in saloons?

Mr. DART. Very little of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I read from your testimony, page 4489:

"Q. What did you do with it?—A. Spent it.

"Q. How?—A. Every old way.

"Q. What is that?—A. Every way.

"Q. Tell us some way that you spent it?—A. Oh, I spent quite a lot of it in saloons."

Mr. HEYBURN. I hope the Senator has made it quite plain that that has reference, up to where he has just read, to the testimony before the State committee. There was nothing to indicate where that quit and where our testimony commenced.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is true. I will hereafter make that distinction.

Is that true?

Is the question asked by the chairman about the testimony before the legislative committee?

Mr. HEYBURN. The chairman of the subcommittee of the United States Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. The chairman of the subcommittee.

Is that true?

Mr. DART. Well, I should not go past any of them, if there was anybody there I wanted to see.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that statement true?

Mr. DART. I could not say just how much—

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking you how much. I am asking you if the statement which I have read to you from your former testimony is true. Do you say, now, that that statement is true?

Mr. DART. Yes; that is true. I spent some in saloons.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the answer, then. I proceed to read further from your testimony:

"Q. Do you know how much?—A. Spent quite a lot of it for putting up literature and all that. Every place I went to I spent money, extra."

You put up some literature, did you?

Mr. DART. No; I did not put up any literature myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay others for putting up literature?

Mr. DART. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you meant in the answer, is it?

Mr. DART. I suppose so.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

"Q. Did you make any payments to individuals?—A. Oh, yes; I gave them quite a little bunch of money."

Who were the persons to whom you gave "quite a little bunch of money"?

Mr. DART. Oh, I do not know; I could not mention half or a quarter of them.

The CHAIRMAN. You have told us about Field.

Mr. DART. A man by the name of Williamson.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give Williamson?

Mr. DART. I think I gave him \$10.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. DART. To go to see people around where he lived, in the town of Buffalo and Pewaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. Name some other person.

Mr. DART. And Carter.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was Carter?

Mr. DART. Carter is a farmer; Johnny Carter. He lives in the town of Buffalo.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did you give him?

Mr. DART. Either \$5 or \$10.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give him this money?

Mr. DART. To go to see quite a bunch of the fellows over there, and to take his team and fetch them in on the primary day.

The CHAIRMAN. Name another man.

Mr. DART. Quite a few around Westfield, around in there. Taggets was one. * * * I think it was \$5.

When he was testifying to paying some money to men whose names he could not remember, Dart was questioned by Senator POMERENE as follows (p. 980):

Senator POMERENE. Give the names of any of them.

Mr. DART. Albert Frank.

Senator POMERENE. How much did you pay him?

Mr. DART. I think I paid for a box of cigars and gave him either \$3 or \$5.

Senator POMERENE. Anyone else?

Mr. DART. There was a miller there.

Senator POMERENE. Before going to that, tell me for what you employed Frank.

Mr. DART. Frank was going to send out word to his brothers to come, be sure to have them come in to the primary.

Senator POMERENE. You paid him \$3 or \$5 for that?

Mr. DART. I paid him about \$2, I think.

Senator POMERENE. You paid him \$2 for that?

Mr. DART. Yes; and I bought a box of cigars to leave there so that he could give the boys a cigar when they came in.

Senator POMERENE. In addition to that, if I understand you correctly, you paid him \$3 or \$5, and now you say \$2.

Senator POMERENE. Whom else did you employ?

Mr. DART. A man that runs a sawmill there. His name is Lee, I think—oh, no; Smith.

Senator POMERENE. What is his first name?

Mr. DART. Theodore Smith.

Senator POMERENE. How much did you pay him?

Mr. DART. I think \$5.

Senator POMERENE. For what was that?

Mr. DART. That was to do what he could on primary day.

Senator POMERENE. That is, to get in voters and talk up Stephenson sentiment?

Mr. DART. Talk it over; yes.

Senator POMERENE. Anybody else?

Mr. DART. There is one saloon keeper there. His name is Otto Giesse. I think I paid for a box of cigars there.

Senator POMERENE. Anybody else?

Mr. DART. Over in Crystal Lake; I can not remember their names, but I paid two or three different men there.

Senator POMERENE. How much?

Mr. DART. \$3 and \$5, each one of them.

Senator POMERENE. The rate was from \$3 to \$5?

Mr. DART. Using their teams, you know, and bringing voters in. That is what I paid the most of them.

Senator POMERENE. Anyone else?

Mr. DART. Over to Neshkoro.

Senator POMERENE. Whom did you employ there?

Mr. DART. A liveryman.

Senator POMERENE. What was his name?

Mr. DART. His name was Scovey. * * * There are two brothers of them in the livery business.

Senator POMERENE. How much did you give them?

Mr. DART. I think I gave these fellows \$10.

Senator POMERENE. Did you employ anyone else?

Mr. DART. I went from there over to Red Granite and saw a lot of them up in Waushara County—quite a bunch. There are a lot of quarries up in there, and I stopped at all the quarries and—

Senator POMERENE. Whom did you employ?

Mr. DART. I do not know their names, all of them.

Senator POMERENE. How many?

Mr. DART. Probably three or four at each quarry.

Senator POMERENE. What did you pay them?

Mr. DART. \$3 to \$5—\$3 or \$5; I do not know which.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this man Dart is spending the money which Edmonds sent him by check. He made no accounting to Edmonds, and from testimony that I have read preceding this it clearly appears that Mr. Edmonds did not want any accounts rendered; and from this testimony you can readily see why he did not want these accounts. This testimony of Dart's is very illuminating, as it traces this money from Senator STEPHENSON, through Edmonds, his campaign manager, by the way of Dart, to the "ultimate consumer" in the rock quarries.

At about this time Mr. Littlefield began to take part in the interrogatories. On page 982 he said:

Go right ahead and give us the names of all that you can now remember.

Mr. DART. There were a few down in the town of Megan. There was John Wagner, I gave him \$5; and a fellow by the name of Bill Ming, and Louis Zellmer.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. How much, if you remember?

Mr. DART. Those fellows—either from \$2 to \$5.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Go right along.

Mr. DART. There were certainly more than that, but I can not think of them. There is one man out in the township of Montello whose name is Callahan; I gave him \$5.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do you remember Scovey brothers?

Mr. DART. I gave that—Andrew Scovey.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do you remember any others now?

Mr. DART. No; not now.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. State whether the men that you employed in that way were or were not friends of Senator STEPHENSON.

Mr. DART. You bet they were, or else they would not have got anything.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. When you were on this trip, were you using a carriage or an automobile?

Mr. DART. No; I had a team.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did you have a team of your own?

Mr. DART. Yes; I had my own team; that I charged up to the State; and when I drove any nights, I paid that out of Stephenson money.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. During any part of this time were you discharging any of your duties as game warden also?

Mr. DART. All the time; every day.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What were you doing as game warden during this time?

Mr. DART. I forget just what the complaints were, but I was out on some complaints, protecting the game.

I think that the conclusion is entirely justifiable that instead of being out protecting the game, Dart was out hunting the game—searching the rock quarries in the region and paying from \$2 to \$5 for votes for STEPHENSON. Yet we are told by a majority of the investigating committee that there was no corruption used in the election of Mr. STEPHENSON to the United States Senate.

I have quoted largely from the testimony of these men because I want to present to the Senate the story as it comes from the supporters of Senator STEPHENSON.

H. A. BOWMAN.

We will now take up the testimony of Mr. H. A. Bowman, to whom Stone says he paid \$1,250 or \$1,280. On page 984 will be found the following interrogatories:

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive any money from Senator STEPHENSON's campaign managers during the time that you were supporting him?
Mr. BOWMAN. I received \$150 from the headquarters in Milwaukee and \$1,250 from J. W. Stone.

It seems there were a number of these deputy game wardens who were not satisfied with the amount Stone gave them out of his \$2,849, and evidently in order to encourage them to greater activity or to satisfy their greed and avarice the headquarters gave them a supplementary amount.

The CHAIRMAN. You received \$150 about the middle of August?
Mr. BOWMAN. I think it was all received about that time; yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. What did you do with the \$150 that you received from Mr. Edmonds out of the Stephenson campaign fund?
Mr. BOWMAN. I think that was given to Robert Clark.
The CHAIRMAN. All of it?
Mr. BOWMAN. I think so; yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Who was Robert Clark?
Mr. BOWMAN. I am not sure whether he was a game warden at that time or whether he quit shortly before that.

There were a number of these men employed who were not then game wardens who had previously been game wardens.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Please give us the address of Robert Clark.
Mr. BOWMAN. Palmyra at that time, but I think he is now in Fort Atkinson.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is that in Wisconsin?
Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you give it to Clark?
Mr. BOWMAN. To use in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON's primary campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you instructed by Edmonds or anyone to give it to Clark?
Mr. BOWMAN. No; I do not think I was really instructed by Edmonds.
The CHAIRMAN. Why did you turn it over to Clark?
Mr. BOWMAN. I had a talk with Mr. Edmonds about Jefferson County. He asked me if I knew any good worker in Jefferson County, and I think I remember mentioning the name of Mr. Clark.
The CHAIRMAN. Then he really gave you the money to be paid to Mr. Clark, did he?
Mr. BOWMAN. That is the way I took it; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You received from Mr. Stone \$1,250. That was about the same time, was it not?
Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Kansas inadvertently omitted the question and answer at the top of page 985.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have put some stars here because I did not want to quote all the details, but everything that I do quote is complete within itself. I am not reading the entire testimony, but I show by stars where it is not complete.

Mr. HEYBURN. The question was by the chairman—
So that you had nothing to do with the expending of that money?
To which Mr. Bowman replied—
Nothing at all.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes. I think that will appear as I go on. It is covered.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do with the \$1,250 received from Mr. Stone, or any part of it? Account for it.

Mr. BOWMAN. \$125 was paid to E. W. Tuttle.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?
Mr. BOWMAN. In the interest of Mr. STEPHENSON's primary campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?
Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Tuttle resides at Oconomowoc.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you give him any instructions as to how the money was to be used?

Mr. BOWMAN. No; I gave him no instructions. I had a general talk with him, in which I suggested—as a suggestion on my part—that it be used in keeping up the Stephenson literature, making lists of the voters that were Stephenson supporters, and seeing that the people were at the polls on primary day—that the voters on these lists got out.

Then I omit some of the testimony and proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his business?
Mr. BOWMAN. He was a game warden.
The CHAIRMAN. He was a deputy game warden also?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. What further sums did you pay out of that \$1,250?
Mr. BOWMAN. \$300 to Edwin Bissonette.
The CHAIRMAN. Where does he live?
Mr. BOWMAN. Milwaukee.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his business?
Mr. BOWMAN. He is with the General Fire Extinguisher Co.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you pay him that money?
Mr. BOWMAN. The same as Mr. Tuttle; to use in the interest of Mr. STEPHENSON's primary campaign.

The CHAIRMAN. In what way?
Mr. BOWMAN. I had the same talk with him that I had with Mr. Tuttle.

The CHAIRMAN. * * * Was he to pay out any part of the money that you gave him?

Mr. BOWMAN. Not that I know of; no, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. That was for his own services?
Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir. He was to use it as he saw fit.
The CHAIRMAN. He might keep it all for his own use?
Mr. BOWMAN. There was nothing said by me as to how he should spend it in paying it out to others.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have any talk with him as to what he had done with that money?
Mr. BOWMAN. No, sir. I do not know what he did with it.
The CHAIRMAN. He never rendered an account?
Mr. BOWMAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed and give the name of any other person to whom you paid any part of it.
Mr. BOWMAN. C. W. Johnson.
The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay him?
Mr. BOWMAN. Fifty dollars.
Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Give his address, Mr. Bowman.
Mr. BOWMAN. Oshkosh.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?
Mr. BOWMAN. To use it in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON's primary campaign.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think, inasmuch as the Senator is omitting considerable parts of his testimony, in fairness it should be indicated.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is indicated in the manuscript and will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HEYBURN. It requires a comparison. I have been following the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator desires, I will indicate where I am omitting as I proceed.

Mr. HEYBURN. That will enable those who take up the Senator's remarks for consideration to see what was omitted.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes. It will appear in the RECORD. The manuscript shows just where there is an omission, and I will state it orally if the Senator desires it. I will say that it would have become entirely too voluminous to have covered the entire testimony, but every part to which I refer is a complete story. It is here exactly as it will appear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3812) to regulate public utilities in the District of Columbia and to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the duties and powers of a public utilities commission.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The Senator from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. HEYBURN. I had reference to such testimony as refers to the expenditure of money in saloons. One of the omissions, one part of the testimony passed over, was where this witness testified that the money was not expended in saloons, and the man was not a saloon campaigner. I merely make that suggestion so as to let it appear that it does not follow, because the Senator does not read the testimony, that there is not testimony here that would be favorable to the other side of the question.

Mr. BRISTOW. In quoting this testimony I have stated what he did spend it for, according to the testimony, and of course the fact that he says he did not spend it in saloons follows. Of course, if he had spent it in saloons, that would have appeared. It does appear in the part I quoted what he says the money was spent for, so there could be no misconception.

Mr. HEYBURN. He says it was not spent in saloons.
Mr. BRISTOW. It was not. It was spent for these other purposes which are narrated.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he to pay it out or to keep it for his own services?

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not think I had any talk with Mr. Johnson as to whether he should keep it or—
The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what he did with it?
Mr. BOWMAN. I do not.
The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever render any account of it?
Mr. BOWMAN. He did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you name some one else to whom you paid a part of that \$1,250?

Mr. BOWMAN. C. E. Hitchon.
The CHAIRMAN. How much did you pay him?
Mr. BOWMAN. \$450.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does he live?
Mr. BOWMAN. At Marinette.
The CHAIRMAN. What does he do?
Mr. BOWMAN. He keeps a hotel.

The CHAIRMAN. What hotel?
Mr. BOWMAN. I do not know what the name of the hotel is.
The CHAIRMAN. Marinette is the home of Senator STEPHENSON?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever have an account from him as to the manner in which he expended that money?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not.
The CHAIRMAN. You do not know how he expended it?
Mr. BOWMAN. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. What instructions did you give him when you gave him the money?
Mr. BOWMAN. I did not give him any instructions. I had the same talk with him that I did with the rest of the fellows.

Bowman then proceeded to submit names of others to whom he paid smaller amounts, leaving a surplus of between \$200 and \$300 in his hands for which he never accounted and, of course, for which he never was expected to account. This money was paid to the game wardens by Edmonds, some of it through Stone and some of it direct, to purchase their influence in behalf of Senator STEPHENSON in the primary campaign; and it was left to their honor—that is, the traditional honor that is said to exist among thieves—to use this money as effectively as they could to accomplish the desired result—to secure votes in the primary for Senator STEPHENSON.

The item of \$450 paid to Hitchon, a hotel keeper in Senator STEPHENSON'S home town—

Mr. REED. Has the Senator disposed of the game wardens?

Mr. BRISTOW. Not quite.

Mr. REED. I wanted to inquire at the appropriate time how many game wardens there were and how many Senator STEPHENSON secured.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not know. There are 12 or 15 who seem from the testimony to have been employed, but I think there were probably a good many more than that. How many of them received money I do not know. One, Stone claimed, he paid some money to, but he denied he received the money from Stone. I do not remember just what his name was. I will speak of that later on.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it would seem fair to state that Stone confessed that he had committed perjury in regard to the payment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; I think Stone was a great liar. Why he lied, whether to save himself from criminal prosecution for improperly using this money, or whether he lied in order to deceive Senator STEPHENSON is a matter of conjecture.

Mr. HEYBURN. It was clearly shown that he made the statement to defend himself against accounting for the money. He made statements that he had paid it to men who came forward and swore he had not paid them any money. Mr. Stone found himself in that position, and the committee left him there.

Mr. BRISTOW. As I understand it, he had a meeting of a number of game wardens, and he said, "I have got to account for this money some way, and I want you fellows to admit that you got so much." Some of them did, and one fellow refused and told the story about how it was and showed how it was. To my mind the whole business is saturated with rottenness.

Mr. HEYBURN. It was what was termed "a frame up," where some of these game wardens were called to Mr. Stone's house in the nighttime and asked to concede it to be a fact that he had paid the money, because he had sworn that he had paid them the money.

Mr. BRISTOW. Before the committee of the legislature.

Mr. HEYBURN. He sought to fortify that sworn statement by procuring these men to admit they had received the money. More than one of them notified him that they would not be used in that way, and Stone stood properly charged with perjury and was not inclined after that to be so aggressive.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think there is no doubt that Stone and Perrin and Riordan and a lot of these men perjured themselves as to what they did with the money that was given them. As I have said, whether they perjured themselves in order to avoid disclosures that would have been more embarrassing than to lie about it and tried to frame up an excuse, or whether they did it in order to deceive STEPHENSON, who expected them to use it, or whether it was given to them to subsidize them and purchase their influence and induce them to work and exert what influence they had through the State in STEPHENSON'S behalf, and they felt they had to account for it or admit they had sold out in this political campaign, and rather than admit that they had sold out they thought they would frame up some kind of a lie to tell to the committee—all these reasons for accounting for the expenditure of this enormous amount of money among the people of Wisconsin in that election of course are mere matters of conjecture, but to my mind it makes no difference as far as the merits of its bearing on this case go. In my judgment the enormous expenditure of money given to men as it was to these men is the corrupt use of money in an election, and I do not see how the Senate is going to escape that conclusion.

I am simply going over the details here to show what these men say they did with the money. The patent, indisputable fact is that they got the money to work for STEPHENSON. That is admitted by STEPHENSON and his managers, and the men themselves admit that they got it. If they violated in the disbursement of this fund throughout the State the laws of Wisconsin, and might be indicted for it, or if they were expected by STEPHENSON'S managers to spend it and did not, but kept it instead, or whether they received it simply as a bribe or a corruption fund to induce them to talk for STEPHENSON, and to cre-

ate Stephenson sentiment, an expression that is used so much, is only an incident.

The item of \$450 paid to Hitchon, a hotel keeper in Senator STEPHENSON'S home town, attracted the attention of Senator POMERENE, who asked (p. 939):

Mr. Bowman, why was it that you gave this sum of \$450 to Mr. Hitchon?

Mr. BOWMAN. I had a talk with Mr. Hitchon, and I thought he was in a position to do some good work.

Senator POMERENE. He was a brother of one of the game wardens?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator POMERENE. And Mr. Hitchon lived in Senator STEPHENSON'S own home?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator POMERENE. You went into Senator STEPHENSON'S own home county and placed \$450 there?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did.

Senator POMERENE. What was that for?

Mr. BOWMAN. I had a talk with Mr. Hitchon; I thought he was in a position to do Mr. STEPHENSON some good in the northern part of Marinette County and De Forest and Florence.

Senator POMERENE. What was his business?

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Hitchon's?

Senator POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. The hotel business.

Senator POMERENE. And the saloon business?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Senator POMERENE. How was he to use this \$400?

Mr. BOWMAN. To see that the Stephenson literature was kept up and to get people to make lists of Stephenson supporters and for men at the polls on primary day.

Senator POMERENE. Did it not occur to you that Mr. STEPHENSON and his home friends could look after their own county?

Mr. BOWMAN. No; I did not think anything about it.

Senator POMERENE. You paid \$450 to one man, \$125 to another, \$300 to another, \$100 to another, \$50 to another, and \$20 to another, and you received no accounts for any of these sums?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not.

Senator POMERENE. And you never asked for them?

Mr. BOWMAN. No, sir.

Senator POMERENE. During the time that you were campaigning you were on duty as game warden and receiving a compensation?

Mr. BOWMAN. I was; yes, sir.

Senator POMERENE. A compensation of \$2.50 a day and your expenses?

Mr. BOWMAN. \$3.50.

Senator POMERENE. And expenses. During that campaign what did your expenses amount to?

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not remember.

Senator POMERENE. What expenses did you charge up to the State?

Mr. BOWMAN. My actual expenses that I thought should be charged up to the State.

Senator POMERENE. What were they?

Mr. BOWMAN. Mileage and hotel bills.

Senator POMERENE. You did not charge any mileage to the Stephenson account?

Mr. BOWMAN. No; I did not.

Senator POMERENE. Nor any of the meals?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not.

Senator POMERENE. Did you have any livery hire at any time?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did.

Senator POMERENE. Did you charge that up to the Stephenson account?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not.

From the testimony, it clearly appears that this man Bowman was an official crook and a political blackleg—a fit man to be associated with the Stephenson campaign, under the generalship of Edmonds, Sacket & Co. But I call the attention of the Senate now to a deputy game warden of a somewhat different type.

A. I. HULBERT.

A. I. Hulbert was a resident of Barron, Wis., and was a deputy game warden. On page 953 of the testimony, he was asked by the chairman:

Did you receive any money from Mr. Edmonds during that campaign?

Mr. HULBERT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. HULBERT. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. How did it come to you?

Mr. HULBERT. I can explain it to you, maybe.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you do.

Mr. HULBERT. When the campaign first started out I got a letter from Mr. Edmonds, I think, asking me to take charge of Barron County. I told him I could not do it; that I had all the work I could do, and was under civil service and could not do it. It went on from that time down until, I think it was, the 29th of August. Mr. Porter later on took charge of Barron County.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What name is that?

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Warren Porter. I met him at Cameron. He is an old soldier and was going to the soldiers' reunion. He said he had Barron County fixed up all right, with the exception of the city of Barron. He wanted to know of me if I would not pay certain parties that he had spoken to some money to look after the polls in the city of Barron. He wanted to know if I would not do that for Uncle Ike. That is the way he mentioned it. I told him I had kept out of it so far, and I did not want to be mixed in it. He said, "Will you do it for me?" and I said I would. So I paid different parties there a small sum of money out of my own pocket, which I was to receive from Mr. Porter when he got back. I did not expect any money. He went to Milwaukee.

Senator POMERENE. Whom do you mean by "he"?

Mr. HULBERT. Warren Porter. He went to Milwaukee; and the next day or so, or maybe two days afterwards, the check came from Mr. Edmonds. Whether he sent that or not I could not state.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Whether who sent it?
 Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Porter.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh! Whether Mr. Porter had the \$100 sent to you, you can not tell?
 Mr. HULBERT. No. I got that check, and that is the way I got it. I can not explain it any other way than that.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Go right on and state the parties to whom you paid the sums and the amounts. There is no objection to that I suppose.
 Mr. HULBERT (referring to memorandum book). It is rather dim. I wrote it with a pencil. I took it down at the time I paid each one. You see I expected to get my money from Warren Porter. I paid E. W. Pierce \$5 and \$2.50. The \$5 was for working at the polls, as I understood it, and the \$2.50 was for posting bills. He is a billposter and did some posting of bills. I do not know just what it was. I paid John Webster \$3.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. For what? Give the names and the amounts. State for what the money was paid.
 Mr. HULBERT. I could not tell you what it was for. Warren Porter told me who to pay.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh! You were paying out these sums at the request of Mr. Porter?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. By virtue of an arrangement that had previously been made by him?
 Mr. HULBERT. I met him at Cameron. He was going away and said he had not done it.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. He gave you these names and requested you to hand the men these different sums?
 Mr. HULBERT. He did not tell me how much. He said to give them what they asked, but not to give over \$5 to any one of them.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Go right along.
 Mr. HULBERT. Tom Case, \$2; Charles Wyckoff, \$1; John Timblin, \$2.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Give their residences.
 Mr. HULBERT. All in the city of Barron. I paid "Chuck" Post \$3. He lives a mile and a half from Barron, in the town of Barron. He was to look after the polls, as I understood it. They held their caucus in the city in a hall, and he was to look after the polls there. That is what I understood from Porter. I paid Charles Miller \$3. He lives about 9 miles from Barron in a town there. I did not pay that until three or four weeks, probably a month, or maybe two months afterwards. I do not remember. I paid it later on. I phoned him. He told me to phone him, and I phoned him with regard to it. Charles Williams I gave 50 cents. Williams was a man that drove a team; that is, he drove a team to haul voters to the polls. I paid all but the men that drove the teams before I received any money at all, before I knew I was going to get any money or had any idea of it.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Have you finished the list?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What does it aggregate?
 Mr. HULBERT. \$24.50.
 Senator POMERENE. What is that amount?
 Mr. HULBERT. \$24.50.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you receive a check in an envelope from Mr. Edmonds?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. Without any letter accompanying it at all?
 Mr. HULBERT. There was a letter in with it.
 The CHAIRMAN. What did you do with the letter?
 Mr. HULBERT. I think I burned it up later on.
 The CHAIRMAN. Do you remember the contents of the letter?
 Mr. HULBERT. As near as I can remember, I think the letter said: "I am this day mailing you a present which should have been mailed before, but was overlooked."
 The CHAIRMAN. Was that before or after the primary election?
 Mr. HULBERT. I think I got that either on the 31st or on the 1st. That is as near as I can remember.
 The CHAIRMAN. You got it either the day before the primary election or on that day?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; I do not know which. I would not want to swear to that.
 The CHAIRMAN. Did you expend that in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir; I did not.
 The CHAIRMAN. In whose interest did you spend it?
 Mr. HULBERT. I used that for myself; I kept it.
 The CHAIRMAN. You kept the \$100?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. You did not pay out any of it at all?
 Mr. HULBERT. I paid out my own money, and that is the way I was reimbursed.
 The CHAIRMAN. Disregard the identity of the money. Did you pay out any money of your own in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. When did you pay it out?
 Mr. HULBERT. I paid it out, as I say, all but for the boys that drove the teams, before I got this money from Mr. Edmonds.
 The CHAIRMAN. How much, altogether, did you pay out before you got this \$100 from Edmonds?
 Mr. HULBERT. I would not state certainly whether I saw Mr. Post before that or not. He lives up in the country.
 The CHAIRMAN. Assume that you did. How much did you pay out?
 Mr. HULBERT. About \$3.50, as near as I can remember.
 The CHAIRMAN. Altogether?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. \$3.50?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; that is, if I paid Mr. Post before.
 The CHAIRMAN. What was the amount paid Mr. Post?
 Mr. HULBERT. \$3. That would make \$6.50, if I paid him after I got the money.
 The CHAIRMAN. So that this \$100 more than reimbursed you for the money that you had paid out?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. You had paid that money out in the interest of Senator STEPHENSON'S campaign, had you not?
 Mr. HULBERT. I understood I was to pay that out for Mr. Porter, and that Mr. Porter was to pay me. I took it down here—
 The CHAIRMAN. I mean, were you working for Senator STEPHENSON'S nomination?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. Were you friendly to Senator STEPHENSON?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; I was.
 The CHAIRMAN. You were not working against him, were you?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir; I was not.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever you did was friendly to him?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. When you received the \$100 you kept it and counted it a present, did you?
 Mr. HULBERT. I kept it; I did not know what else to do with it.
 The CHAIRMAN. The reason you have been questioned about this is because the Senate committee, in its report, on page 2247, comments upon you having been paid \$100. You are called for the purpose of explaining whether or not you received that to work for Senator STEPHENSON. Were you already working for Senator STEPHENSON?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. Did you commence working for Senator STEPHENSON after you received the \$100?
 Mr. HULBERT. Maybe I do not exactly understand; but my understanding of this is that I had not been counted on to work in the campaign for anybody. I did not ask anybody—
 The CHAIRMAN. Whom were you supporting? For whom did you vote?
 Mr. HULBERT. I voted for Senator STEPHENSON.
 The CHAIRMAN. When did you first make up your mind to vote for Senator STEPHENSON?
 Mr. HULBERT. When he first came out.
 The CHAIRMAN. Then you were a friend of Senator STEPHENSON'S?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 The CHAIRMAN. You were not doing any friendly act in the interest of any other man's nomination, were you?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir; I was not.
 Senator POMERENE. You spent \$24.50 at the request of Porter?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; at the request of Warren Porter.
 Senator POMERENE. And then you spent \$3 in addition to that?
 Mr. HULBERT. No.
 Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is part of it.
 Senator POMERENE. That is part of it?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. Were you reimbursed by Porter?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir. He did not pay me back at all.
 Senator POMERENE. So, with the \$100, you had a balance, then, of \$75.50?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. Which was a present to you?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. From the time Senator STEPHENSON announced his candidacy you had been working in his behalf?
 Mr. HULBERT. I did not understand it that way.
 Senator POMERENE. Were you? Were you talking in his behalf?
 Mr. HULBERT. I did not talk politics with anybody.
 Senator POMERENE. What did you get this \$100 for?
 Mr. HULBERT. That is what I say—I do not know.
 Senator POMERENE. You do not know?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. Do you often get presents of that kind?
 Mr. HULBERT. No, sir. It is the first one I ever got, and I am sorry I got that.
 Senator POMERENE. You did go around and employ a number of these men, though?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; at the request of Mr. Porter I did that.
 Senator POMERENE. What did you say to them when you employed them?
 Mr. HULBERT. I told them just what Mr. Porter told me. He said that he had gone off in a hurry; he wanted to go to meet some of his company in Milwaukee, and he forgot to pay those bills and wanted me to pay them for him. I told every one of them I was paying those bills for Mr. Porter.
 Senator POMERENE. Was that before or after the primary?
 Mr. HULBERT. That was before the primary.
 Senator POMERENE. How long before?
 Mr. HULBERT. I think it was—well, I met Mr. Porter in Hamburg, 6 miles from home, and he was then on his way to Milwaukee. I think that was on the 29th. I could not swear positively.
 Senator POMERENE. It was near the date of the primary?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. You never asked Porter for the money afterwards, did you?
 Mr. HULBERT. I spoke to him about it; yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. What was said between you?
 Mr. HULBERT. I do not know just exactly what there was said, but I spoke to him about the fact that he never had paid me that money yet, and he asked me if I did not get my pay. I said I got some money, but where it came from I did not know, or what it was for. He said, "If you are paid well enough, if you are satisfied, all right; keep still."
 Senator POMERENE. "If you are satisfied, all right?"
 Mr. HULBERT. "Keep still"; yes.
 Senator POMERENE. "Keep still" ?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. Why did he say that?
 Mr. HULBERT. I do not know, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. When was that said?
 Mr. HULBERT. That might have been a month and it might have been six weeks.
 Senator POMERENE. After the primary?
 Mr. HULBERT. After the primary. As I understood it, as I remember now, he went away on a visit somewhere. He went to the soldiers' reunion.
 Senator POMERENE. This was Edmonds who sent you this check for \$100?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; as I remember it.
 Senator POMERENE. You had had some talk with him before, had you not?
 Mr. HULBERT. I never had any talk with Mr. Edmonds, any more than he wrote me a letter and asked me to take charge of Barron County.
 Senator POMERENE. And you declined?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir; I declined. I told him I could not do it.
 Senator POMERENE. And notwithstanding that fact he sent you \$100?
 Mr. HULBERT. Yes, sir.
 Senator POMERENE. I wish you would explain to us why he should send you \$100.
 Mr. HULBERT. I can not do it, Senator.

Hulbert's inclination was to be an honest and upright citizen. The laws of his State provide that—
 No officer, agent, clerk, or employee under the government of the State shall, directly or indirectly, solicit or receive or be concerned in any manner in soliciting or receiving any assessment, subscription,

or contribution for political service, whether voluntary or involuntary, for any political purpose whatever, from any officer, agent, clerk, or employee of the State.

Mr. Hulbert naturally felt that such statute forbade his accepting any money to work in political campaigns, and so when Edmonds first asked him to take charge of the Stephenson campaign up there he declined. But when his friend, Porter, asked him to pay certain parties some money which Porter had agreed to pay them, but which he could not because it was necessary for him to take a train to fulfill an engagement, Hulbert felt that it was nothing improper for him to accommodate Mr. Porter. And so he paid the money to the parties, as requested, and thereby became involved, somewhat to his chagrin, in the Stephenson campaign financial "propaganda." His weakness, of course, was in retaining the \$75.50, to which he thought he had no right and which he believed he should not have taken. But that simply illustrates the demoralizing influence on a community of having political corruptionists searching the country throughout for men who will accept bribes and be influenced and induced to take part in political campaigns for money. The kind of political corruption practiced in this Stephenson campaign is most insidious and dangerous to the welfare of the country. Indeed, I think it is more demoralizing on public morals than open and flagrant bribery in the legislature, such as was practiced in the Lorimer case.

Now I come to the last witness I am going to quote from, and it presents another interesting phase of this Stephenson campaign.

F. J. EPPLING.

So persistent and determined was Edmonds to bring within his net every element of Wisconsin's population that even the ministry did not escape his vigilance, as is shown by the testimony of F. J. Eppling, on page 903:

The CHAIRMAN. * * * Mr. Eppling, where do you reside?
Mr. EPPLING. Sheboygan, Wis.
The CHAIRMAN. What is your occupation?
Mr. EPPLING. I am at the present time in the insurance business, temporarily.
The CHAIRMAN. What is your profession?
Mr. EPPLING. I was a clergyman.
The CHAIRMAN. Were you a clergyman during the summer of 1908?
Mr. EPPLING. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Of what denomination?
Mr. EPPLING. The Lutheran.
The CHAIRMAN. Where were you located at that time?
Mr. EPPLING. Algoma, Wis.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you participate in the campaign of Senator STEPHENSON for the United States Senate in the year 1908?
Mr. EPPLING. I did.

I omit some of the testimony and proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you at that time receive any money from him?
Mr. EPPLING. At the first interview? I did.
The CHAIRMAN. Yes.
Mr. EPPLING. I did.
The CHAIRMAN. How much?
Mr. EPPLING. \$75.
The CHAIRMAN. You can not give the date, you say?
Mr. EPPLING. I could not.
The CHAIRMAN. How much altogether did you receive from him?
Mr. EPPLING. \$400.
The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose did you receive that money?
Mr. EPPLING. It was for the purpose of covering my expenses in helping to organize the various counties.
The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by the term "organize"?
Mr. EPPLING. To find somebody who is familiar with political work to help to bring out the voters, to properly present the candidate to the people.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you enter upon that work?
Mr. EPPLING. To some extent.
The CHAIRMAN. How long did you engage in it?
Mr. EPPLING. About six weeks.
The CHAIRMAN. During that time you received these sums of money?
Mr. EPPLING. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Did you pay any of that money to other people for working?
Mr. EPPLING. Not at all; not one penny.
The CHAIRMAN. It was all for your services?
Mr. EPPLING. Personal expenses and compensation.
The CHAIRMAN. What class of work did you do?
Mr. EPPLING. I did none at first—it was not my intention to do any work at all.
The CHAIRMAN. Then for what were you to receive the money?
Mr. EPPLING. That is, you must take into view—which will be properly explained later—how I was drawn into this campaign.
The CHAIRMAN. Please answer my question. How were you to expend the money?
Mr. EPPLING. For my personal expenses.
The CHAIRMAN. What were you to do for the money?
Mr. EPPLING. I was to look up certain parties in various counties who could do political work for Mr. STEPHENSON.
The CHAIRMAN. Who were those parties?
Mr. EPPLING. Mr. Werner Pflughoeft, in Taylor County; Dr. Frank, in Clark County; Mr. Bratz, an insurance solicitor, in Washington County; and another son of Mr. Pflughoeft, in Outagamie County.
The CHAIRMAN. Those were the persons that you were to look up. Was any part of this money in the nature of a subscription to the church?
Mr. EPPLING. Not at all.
The CHAIRMAN. It was all for your personal compensation?

Mr. EPPLING. Positively.
The CHAIRMAN. And for work to be done by you?
Mr. EPPLING. By myself personally.
The CHAIRMAN. Who gave you the money?
Mr. EPPLING. Mr. Edmonds.

It appears also from the testimony, on page 905, that, in addition to this \$500 paid this man by Edmonds, STEPHENSON made a contribution of \$200 to his church, for which he was given due credit. This contribution was made on the 22d day of August, a little over a week before the primary was held.

But be it said to the credit of the ministry that this man is not now disgracing that high and holy calling. He has found it necessary to engage in the insurance business, doubtless since he has become known to be a boodling politician whose services are for sale in political campaigns.

I might continue for hours to read testimony from other witnesses and participants in this campaign of corruption, but it is unnecessary. It would simply weary the Senate and only fill the Record with additional disgusting details. The evidence which I have presented shows conclusively that Mr. STEPHENSON and his representatives have violated the laws of Wisconsin by paying money to inspectors or judges of election, by hiring officers of the State administration to work in this political campaign, and have employed men to perform political services contrary to the statutes of the State. But, as I said in the beginning, the important features of this case for the Senate to consider is not the violation of the laws of Wisconsin, but the moral turpitude involved in the election itself. The evidence of Dee, Perrin, Riordan, Dresser, Knell, Stone, Ring, Wayland, Dart, Kolb, Bowman, Hulbert, Eppling, and many others shows conclusively that men, in consideration of money received from STEPHENSON and his managers, supported STEPHENSON in the campaign and induced other men, through the use of money, to vote for Mr. STEPHENSON in the primary election. No other conclusion can be drawn from the testimony submitted. And the action of Sacket, the bookkeeper of the campaign, in destroying his records, as shown in his testimony; the efforts of STEPHENSON to evade the investigation by the State authorities; and the sending of the correspondence to Michigan, as shown in the testimony of some of the witnesses, so that it would be out of the reach of the legislative committee when it undertook the investigation, are strongly corroborative evidence showing that Mr. STEPHENSON and his managers knew that they had violated the State law.

It is a disagreeable duty to pass upon the action of the venerable Senator from Wisconsin, for whom no one in this body personally has anything but the most kindly feelings. We are called upon, however, to pass upon the integrity of the Senate and to protect its seats from being made the subject of barter and sale as pieces of political merchandise. If such campaigns as the one conducted in Wisconsin which resulted in the election of Mr. STEPHENSON are to meet the approval of this body, then it will lose the respect of the American people. The Senate can not have the confidence of the people if men immensely rich, with little qualification for the great office of Senator of the United States, but who desire the position as a child wants a toy, are to be permitted to employ political highwaymen as managers and organizers, such as the agents of STEPHENSON were, and then turn over to them vast sums of money to be used in purchasing the support of men, wherever they can be found, who will yield to such inducement.

If this Government is to live, corruption in high places must be made as heinous as treason, for it is in the end more dangerous to the Nation's welfare. For the reasons given I can not support the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is rather a late hour to commence the discussion of this case, and I ask the Senator from Idaho if he will not consent to the laying aside of the matter at this time?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not think there is any sufficient reason for now laying aside the order of business. It is a question of the highest privilege, and there is considerable time left in which to discuss it this afternoon.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Gardner	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bourne	Gronna	Nelson	Smoot
Bristow	Heyburn	Overman	Stephenson
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Page	Swanson
Burnham	Kenyon	Perkins	Warren
Culberson	Kern	Poindexter	Wetmore
Curtis	Lodge	Pomerene	

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, before the announcement is made, apprehending that there will be no quorum, I should like to give notice—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that nothing is in order except to secure a quorum or to adjourn.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suspend putting the motion made by the Senator from North Carolina until the result of the roll call has been announced.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say for my colleague [Mr. CLARK of Wyoming] that he was obliged to return to his home to-day on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the roll discloses the presence of 27 Senators—less than a quorum.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I ask that the names of absentees be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks that the names of the absentees be called. Without objection, the Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. OVERMAN and Mr. HEYBURN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], who first addressed the Chair, is recognized.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HEYBURN. I rose to make that motion; I was on my feet for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] had first addressed the Chair on the same subject.

Mr. HEYBURN. He could not have the floor until the result of the roll call had been announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the motion. It is a matter of small importance who makes it when two Senators make the same motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1912, at 2 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we would draw near to Thee in faith, hope, and love. Realizing our dependence upon Thee for all things temporal and spiritual, we most fervently pray for wisdom to guide and strength to sustain us in all our undertakings which may be in accordance with the laws Thou hast ordained. Help us, we beseech Thee, to pray as we work and work as we pray, lest we discredit our Maker and bring down the temple upon our own heads and thus ignominiously perish in the conflict 'twixt right and wrong. Hear us and make us Thine now and always. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. SAM HOUSTON.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, March 2 is eventful in the history of Texas. To-day is the seventy-sixth anniversary of the Texas declaration of independence and the one hundred and nineteenth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Sam Houston. [Applause.] I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address to be delivered to-night before the Legislature of the State of Virginia in presenting to that State, on behalf of Texas, a portrait of Gen. Houston.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech to be made by him to-night before the Legislature of Virginia in presenting a portrait of Gen. Sam Houston. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the address above referred to:

"MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, GENTLEMEN OF THE VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: I am commissioned by the governor of Texas, in behalf of the people of that State, through you to present to the State of Virginia a portrait of Gen. Sam Houston. A native of Virginia, he became the liberator of Texas and the most illustrious character that has ever adorned the eventful history of that great Commonwealth.

"In doing so to-night I want to present Houston as he was, obscuring neither his virtues nor his vices, to feature as best I can before you the real man of flesh and blood, with his frailties and faults as well as his fortitude and constancy, with his

bitter passions and narrow prejudices as well as his fervent patriotism and dauntless spirit. It is no easy task to do this.

"Much has been said of him, much has been written of him; much that was false, much that was true. Even at this day, when many men still live who knew him, it is difficult to separate the true from the false. It is true of all people and all ages that really great men undergo a process of idealization in which the furrows are all smoothed away and the angles all rounded out. It is difficult for us to think of Washington as suffering from hunger or thirst, from cold or heat, as ever stumbling into error or perplexed by doubt. We have stripped him of all these human attributes and think of him deciding between right and wrong by intuition and achieving great results and solving great problems by inspiration. For nearly 50 years this process of idealization with respect to Houston has been going on. In addition to that, from the time Houston reached Texas, in the glory of his prime until bent and withered and weary his great spirit answered the call of its Maker, he lived in the very midst of storm and tumult. So intense was his personality that when he engaged in a political contest the people forgot former lines of political division and divided into Houston and anti-Houston factions.

"Men thought of Houston and talked of Houston in terms of the superlative. On the one hand he was an orator of brilliant equipment and unexcelled power and on the other he was an unlettered and untutored clown; on the one side he was a statesman with a keen insight and profound grasp of governmental problems and on the other he was a stupid mountebank and a dangerous demagogue; on one side he was a soldier combining the wisdom of Washington with the daring of Napoleon while on the other his military capacity was denied and his courage questioned. It is with this curious compound of all alleged to be good and all alleged to be bad that we have to deal to-night.

"Samuel Houston was born March 2, 1793, in Rockridge County, Va., a county that was the cradle of many distinguished Virginians and that holds the sacred dust of many of your illustrious dead. He came from strong and sturdy Scotch-Irish stock. His father served with credit as a rifleman in the Revolutionary Army. His mother was of magnificent physique and great force of character, giving confirmation of the truth that behind every great man stands a great woman as his mother. When Sam was 13 years of age his father died, and his mother with her six sons and three daughters moved across the mountains and settled on the Tennessee River in what was then a wilderness and on the very border line of civilization. To the west of them the Indian tribes were their only neighbors. Here a rude cabin was built and the family experienced all the trials and encountered all the privations incident to a life on the frontier.

"When he was about 14 years of age he ran away from home to the Cherokee Indians, with whom he lived for several years as the adopted son of the Cherokee chief. When the War of 1812 came on he enlisted as a private, was desperately wounded at the battle of the Horseshoe Bend, where he first saw Andrew Jackson. After many months of suffering he rejoined the Army and received rapid promotion. He resigned from the Army and studied law; in six months was admitted to the bar; was district attorney. In 1823 he was elected to Congress, and reelected in 1825. During this time he renewed acquaintanceship with Jackson, and from that time until Jackson's death was his friend and devoted follower. In 1827 he was elected governor of Tennessee. In January, 1829, he married, and in a few weeks' time he and his wife separated. Upon Houston were turned all the batteries of scandal and slander, but he made no answer save to testify to the virtuous character of his wife, and never to mortal man did he ever breathe one word as to the cause of the estrangement. He resigned the governorship of Tennessee, and, wounded almost unto death, he left the walks of civilized man and once more took refuge among the Cherokee Indians. In resigning from the governorship he wrote a letter, one paragraph I quote as indicating the character of the man:

"That veneration for public opinion, by which I have measured every act of my official life, has taught me to hold no delegated power which would not daily be renewed by my constituents, could the choice be daily submitted to a sensible expression of their will. And although shielded by a perfect consciousness of undiminished claim to the confidence and support of my fellow citizens, and delicately circumstanced as I am and by my own misfortunes more than the fault or contrivance of anyone, overwhelmed by sudden calamities, it is certainly due to myself and more respectful to the world that I retire from a position which in the public judgment I might seem to occupy by questionable authority.

"He was adopted as a member of the tribe and resumed the dress and habits of a savage. In 1832 he reappeared in Washington, and because of some aspersions cast upon him by a Member of Congress from Ohio name Stanberry, Houston assaulted Stanberry. He was arraigned before the House for a