HENEY DECLARES MITCHELL'S ACTS SHOWED A GUILTY KNOWLEDGE

Theory of the Law.

It is a felony, says Senator Thurston. 'It is a matter involving great moral terpitude, and the thing Heney was sent here to stop, for Kribs to steal these lands, but there isn't the slightest moral turpitude in a United States Senator, whom you have placed in that position of trust, aiding Kribs for a fee to steal the lands. That is technical. That does not appeal to your sense of morality.' And right there suppose we see what the theory of this law is, anyhow. In order to understand any law and its meaning, Blackstone tells us that we should first look at the mischief before examining the remedy, because all laws are passed to remedy some mischief, some evil that exists, and the law is intended to put a stop to it if possible. To understand as to why this law was aimed at Congressmen and Senators it is necessary to understand the position of a United States Senator; how that body is constituted, how it works, and then see what evils existed that led Congress to pass the law. One of the best histories that has ever been written in regard to our constitution in that of Mr. Bryor, an Englishman, who visited this country and made a study of the subject. He has something to say in regard to the United States Senato (and I shall only read one paragraph, which I think will give us the clew to the purpose of this statute, and aid us to determine as to whether or not Congress itself thought that there was moral terpitude attached to this act.

Reads From Book.

Bennett; We object to counsel reading from the book.

The Court: I think counsel may read from the book as a part of his argument.

Defendant excepts.

Mr. Heney: Of course, as the court will tell you, this book is no evidence of anything. I read it as an illustration of my argument, because it gives the reasons which I conceive lie at the bottom of the passage of that law:

"The Senators, however, indulge in some social pretensions. They are the nearest approach to an official aristocracy that has yet been seen in America. They and their wives are allowed precedence at private entertainments as well as on puolic occasions, over members of the House, and, of course, over private citizens. Jefferson might turn in his grave if he knew of such an attempt to introduce European distinctions of rank into his democracy; yet as the office is temporary, and the rank vanishes with the office, these pretensions are harmless; if is only the universal social equality of the country that makes them noteworthy. Apart from such petty advantages, the position of a Senator, who can count on re-election, is the most desirable in the political world of America. It gives as much power and influence as a man need dealer. It seis the most desirable in the point at work of America. It gives as much power and influence as a man need desire, it secures for him the ear of the public. It is more permanent than the Presidency or a Cabinet office, requires less labor, involves less vexation, though still great vaxation, by importunate office-seekers.

Europeans Idealize Senate.

Senate Admiring its structure and function, they have assumed that the actors must be worthy of their parts. And there has been some considerable actors must be worthy of their parts. And there has been some considerable assumption of that sort indulged in by argument of the altorneys for the defense in this case. I say assumed, because the reputation for honesty of the defendant in this case was not put in issue. It could not be put in issue by the prosecution unless witnesses were offered as to his good character in that respect by the defense. Had such witnesses been offered, the prosecution would have a right, if it could, to combat that testimony, and to undertake to show that that wasn't true. Combat that testimony, and to undertake to show that has furnished you in his speech with a great deal of testimony mot under oath on that subject; and it has been all along the lines of assuming that the actor must be worthy of his part. Now, Mr. Bryce says. They have been encouraged in this tendency by the larguage of many Americans. As the Romans were never tired of repeating that the Ambassador of Pyrrhus had called the Roman Senate an assembly of kings, so Americans of refinement, who are ashamed of the turbulent House of Representatives, have been wont to talk of the Senate as a sort of Olympian dwelling place of statesmen and sages. It is nothing of the kind. It is a company of shrewd and vigorous mon who have fought their way to the front by the ordinary methods of American politics, and on many of whom the battle has left its methods of American politics, and on many of whom the battle has left its

Methods of Politics.

knowledge of the method by which a convention is afterwards handled by bosses and members of the Legislature selected, and we have some knowledge of the manner in which an election is secured by a United States Senator in a Legislature. We know that in a large majority of instances not the bribery money, but the bribery of place is offered for votes—political appointments. We know that in some instances even money itself is offered. We know that under such conditions we do not get the highest class of citizens as a rule in our public life. The world knows it. Occasionally we do.

Now, then with those conditions, Mr. Bryce says: "There are abundant opportunities for intrigue in the Senate, because its most important business is done in secrecy of committee rooms or ators are intriguers. There are opportunities for misusing Senatorial powers. Scandals have sometimes arisen from the practice of emotoring as

itself—but, invertheless, there has been some little, and that little was considered of sufficient importance so that a bill was introduced in Congress to prohibit a Senator or Congress to prohibit a Senator or Congress to prome Court of the United States. In 1836 a bill was brought in forbidding members of either House of Congress to appear in the Federal courts as counsel for any railroad commany or other corporation which might in respect of its having received land grants, be affected by Federal legislation." The evil was such that Congress or some of the Congression thought that it was advisable to have a bill to prohibit a Senator or Congressman from appearing even in the Subreme Court of the United States in any matter in which a railroad that had received a grant of land from the United States might have an interest.

Opportunities for Corruption.

Opportunities for Corruption.

Opportunities for Corruption.

Now says Mr. Bryce, "There are opportunities for corruption and blackmailing of which unserapulous men are well known to take advantage. Such men are fortunntly few, but considering how demoralized are the Legislatures of a few states, their presence must be looked for, and the rest of the Senate, however it may blush for them, is obliged to work with them and to treat them as equals," "The rest of the Senate, however it may blush for them, is obliged to work with them and to treat them as equals." Why? Mr. Bryce tells us, "The contagion of political vice is nowhere so swiftly potent

that the Government is seeking to convict him upon a purely statutory and technical offense.

Theory of the Law.

It is a felony, says Senator Thurston. "It is a matter involving great meral terpitude, and the thing liency was sent largitude, and the thing liency was sent largitude, and the thing liency was sent largitude in a United States Senator, whom you have placed in that position of trust adding Kribs for a fee to steal these lands. That is technical. That does not speal to your sense of morality." And right there suppose we see what the theory of this law is, any law and its meaning. Blackstone tells us that we should first look at the mischlef before examining the remedy, because all laws are passed to remedy some mischlef, some evel that a latte, and the law is intended to put a stop to it if possible. To understand as to why this law was nimed at Congress.

Rule of Congress.

Rule of Congress.

Rule of Congress.

You see that Congress had in mind when it passed this act prohibiting Senators from appearing before any of the departments, the fact that the influence of a United States Senator, a part of the appointing power as the Senate is, and a part of the power that regulates appropriations for the different departments; that the influence of that Senator may be so great that a weak man would fall to see his duty, and would act in accordance with the wishes of that Senator instead of in accordance with the facts in the case, and as his conscience and duty might otherwise prompt him; just as Hermann, as shown by Casey's testimony, in January, 1991, just before he went out of office, endeavored to expedite the Kribs' lieu selections and ordered them expedited, and the clerk to whom the order was sent, that subordinate evidently knowing that Hermann was going out of office, refused to put his initials to the order which he had prepared, which is the customary way of doing business there if the clerk approves or has advised the thing which is being done. A clerk prepares a paper in accordance with his views of what longit to be done in the matter, initials it and sends it to the Commissioner for his signature. his signature.

What Is to Be Feared?

and declaring the indiciments seed and sufficient.

What Is to Be Francisco

If there was a matter where the OneMirchell's requert, did order them excent Grant reduced to put his initiate

Mirchell's requert, did order them excent Grant reduced to put his initiate

of the second reduced to put his initiate

of the limit his initiate

of th

agree with him, and so did every Sena-tor and every Congressman agree with him who voted to pass that law and put it upon the Statute Books. Then why did they attach that penalty to the law? Because in their inmost hearts and consciences each and every one of them felt and believed that for a United and consciences each and every one of them felt and believed that for a United States Senator to use his influence in the Departments for money in a matter in which the United States was interested was equivalent to accepting a bribe. They placed that terrible punishment upon it because they thought that the man who committed that act was unworthy to ever again sit in that body, or even to occupy the most subordinate office in the United States. Tell me that they did not think there was any moral turpitude about it? That it was a mere technical officiae, when the men who voted for that law placed such punishment as that upon it, and did not issue it to the court to inflict, but made it a part of the law itself, following a conviction as a necessary consequence—tell me there is no moral turpitude in it. In the opinion of the men who passed the law? I tell you they considered it equal to bribers, We have in history an example, where the English House of a crime that to my mind is exactly similar in all respects; and in that case, as in this an appeal was made in as slar in all respects; and in that case as in this an appeal was made in as eloquent language as Senator Thurston used to remember the great services that had been performed by the defendant for the nation. And in that instance the services that had been performed by the defendant were so incomparably superior to those performed by the defendant in this case, even if we believe all that has been said about him, that his are not worthy to be mentioned in the same breath.

Lord Bacon Found Guilty.

I refer to Lord Bacon, one of the great-est Chancellors that ever sat upon its High Court of Chancery; one of the greatest literary writers that ever lived in this or any other age, a man of whom scholars claim that he is the real author of Shakespeare, the greatest work that was ever written in the Eng-lish language; that man for whom ap-peal was made even by the king him-self, that the Lords should not condemn him, that man was found guilty and Now says Mr. Bryce, "There are opportunities for corruptions men are well known to take advantage. Such men are fortunately few, but considering how demoralized are the Legislatures of a few states, their presence must be looked for and the rest of the Senate, however it may blush for them, is obliged to work with them and to treat them as equals." The rest of the Senate, however it may blush for them, is obliged to work with them and to treat them as equals. Why? Mr. Erree tells us: 'The contagion of political vice is nowhere so swiftly potent as in hegislature bodies because you cannot taboo a man who has sot a vote. You may louthe him personally, but he is the peoples' choice. He has a right to share in the government of the country; you are grateful to him when he saves you on a critical division; you discover that he is not such a bad fellow when one knows him' people remark that he gives good dinners, or has an agreeable wife, and so it goes on till falsehood and knavery are covered under the cloak of party loyalty.

Senators May Not Denounce.

And so a Senstor, and especially one who has been in the Senate for many years—because they have a rule there (and this is a matter of history) by which Senators become chairmen of important committees by seniority of service, regardless of fitness for the position,

CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT EVENTS IN SENATOR MITCHELL'S INDICTMENT, TRIAL AND CONVICTION

According to the testimony shown at the trial of Senator Mitchell, the Senator was the first to speak of the now famous "Kribs indictment" and the impending trial. This was on December 21, when Senator Mitchell was met at Kalama by his partner, A. H. Tanner, and discussed, according to the testimony of Tanner, the books of the firm, especially as relating to the Kribs entries, the possible conduct of Kribs in his attitude toward the prosecution, and kindred subjects. Up to this time the Government had not taken up the consideration of the Kribs lands. It was not until January 10 that the Federal Grand Jury began the investigation of the Kribs claims and the connection of Mitchell and Tunner therewith. At the time Senator Mitchell returned from Washington the grand jury was considering the evidence in the Puter case against him, which is yet to be tried. The true chronology of the trial, considering the main events which led up to it and upon which the principal features have hinged, commenced in the middle of December, 1994, when the Federal Grand Jury was convened and rumors begun to fly connecting the name of Mitchell and Hermann with the Puter land fraud operations in Oregon. At the outset both Senator Mitchell and Mr. Hermann indignantly denied any complicity, and refused to pay heed to the gathering storm here, contending that the interests of the state demanded their presence in Washington. December 15, 1904-The rumors of impending investigation and indictment became so persistent that both Senator Mitchell and Mr. Hermann announced their intention of coming to Portland to appear before the grand

December 23-Senator Mitchell reached Portland and demanded the right to appear before the jury as a witness in order to explain away the charges that were supposedly being brought against him.

December 3-Senator Mitchell appeared before the grand jury and went through a long examination by that body. December 20-The Senator returned to Washington after defying the Government and the prosecution to connect him with the Oregon land frauds in any manner,

January 10, 196-The grand jury reconvened after the Christmas holidays and began the investigation of the

February 1-Senator Mitchell was indicted for having accepted compensation from Kribs for having performed services before the General Land Office contrary to the Federal statutes.

February 8-Harry C. Robertson, subpensed by the Government as a witness before the grand jury, left Wash-

ington for Portland. A. H. Tanner, the law partner of Senator Mitchell, was indicted for perjury committed in trying to shield the Senator from connection with the Frederick A. Kribs transactions before the Land Office. February 5-Robertson arrived from Washington and gave his testimony before the grand jury, at the same time surrendering the now famous "burn this letter" document sent by Mitchell to Tanner in the keeping of his

February II-Judge Tanner pleaded guilty to the inidetment of perjuty placed against him, in order to save his son from a similar indictment. The grand jury adjourned for a short time on this date. April 2-The grand jury was reconvened for the completion of the remaining business yet to be considered. adjourning April 8 after a five days' session.

April 24-The Mitchell plea in abatement was argued before Judge Beilinger and taken under advisement by May 1-Judge Bellinger rendered his decision in the plea of abatement, overruling the arguments of the defense

and declaring the indictments good and sufficient. June 8-Judge Gilbert arrived in Portland from San Francisco to prepare for the land-fraud cases. June 12 was set as the day for hearing the demurrers to the Mitchell indictment and the opening of the Mitchell trial. June II-Judge De Haven reached the city from his home at San Francisco, ready for the convention of

to go when his guilt was plain, what was there to deter others from doing like-wise in, the hope that they, too might be let off?

· Object of Punishment.

Now, I have pointed out to you that

Re-elected United States Senator, 1891. Re-elected United States Senator, 1981. Indicted by Federal grand jury, Febru-

ary 1, 1965 Found guilty, July 3, 1905,

b.........

Pay for Two Months.

Following this up he gets his check of \$727 for the month of June and \$780 for the month of July, and he arrives here on August 1 or is here on August 2, and examines the books at that time, according to Robertson's testimony; he asks Robertson to bring them to him and he has them before him for three hours. Now I have shown you that you could go through that book and notice the large items in three minutes from the time that the copy of the book closed up to the time he arrived here. Now, he has been told that Kribs had paid the thousand dollars in the letter of June 18, received by him about June 21. Did he, when he took his check on August 2, know that that money had been paid in? Can there be any reasonable doubt of it? But run along from that time on, we bring him back here in 1904, when he sees the book again, because he looked at his contract and has a copy of it made by Robertson ; and then he returns to Washington and more business is done, more letters pass advising him, and then he arrives here in October of 1904. He gets back here some Ume early in October, before October 3, how, the Kribs payment of \$290 on account of these lieu ands is made October 5, 1904. Mitchell examines the book for five days, hetween the 29th of October and the 29th of October. That is after the entry appeared in the book of the payment of \$290 by number; Kribs No. 4 and Kribs No. 5. So that is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; it is not upon the theory that we are soins to exact from him penance for what he has done. It is twofold only. First in its object; itrest, the reformation of the defendant immedi. And in this case, as in that we are soins to which the conviction woll be lost sight of, because the sge of Lord Bacon, that purpose could well be lost sight of, because the sge of Lord Bacon, that purpose could with crime. We always the lost sight of, because the sge of Lord Bacon, that purpose could well be convicted and the sight of the defendant was great. Then there was nothing left for the furty to consider except the effect for the furty to consider except the effect that this conviction will follow darkness.

Received the Checks.

Received the Checks.

Received the Checks.

Now, I have taken up so much time that be book of the payment of 190 by the says in that what he call your attention to the fact that I hesitate to go back to this matter, and I will not do to say this crime is common; that stealing is common and because we haven't every their or trial at this moment that we will left this fellow go. Punish the one to deter others from Going likewise, because he looked at his contract and has a copy of it made with crime. We. a jury of his country, of his

Now as I pointed out, he had to look through the books to see where the money was coming from, the large amounts and I have shown you there were no large amounts of money except from this source: and therefore I have shown that it is utterly impossible to imagine that he did not see them, and see where they came from. Now, on October II, 1904, he signs that agreement for a different division and on the next day, having examined the books for five days, he accepts his one-half of that \$200. Did he know it? Did he know what it was for and where it was coming from? Is there any reasonable doubt of it from the evidence in this case?

But then what happened on November Is after doing this? Right after this things were coming along pretty rapidly, and on November IS, right after doing this, he went back to Washington. He was out here again in a month from that time to come before the grand jury to testify. When he came here it was in December, about a month later. Senator Thurston recognizes the significance and weight of the testimony that shows that nothing whatever had been said about Kribs or the investigation of Kribs up to the time Mitchell met Tanper on the train and Mitchell brought up the conversation himself. That testimony that nothing had been said was brought out by them from Tanner. They said to Tanner. "You had heard rumors of what was going on?" Yes. "You told him the rumors?" Yes." "Now, don't you know, Mr. Tanner, that here have not been a single rumor about Kribs?" "Yes." says Tanner. "that he so, I hadn't heard anything about it from any source.

what is Kribs going to do with the Government?" Could there be any stronger or better evidence of the guilty conscience of this defendant at that time, and if he had it at that time he must have had it before he took the payments on November 2, 160t, because nothing had happened to bring it to his attention since. Now, he says, "What is Kribs going to do with the Government?" Then he says, "How are those entries in the books?" And he wants to see the books; then he goes to the office next day with Tanner, and goes through the book item by item with Tanner. And they say that conversation there must have been true, because it was not intended for the public gaze or for the court house, and I agree with them. Just as it was proved and just to the extent that it was true, and no more than to that extent, when Robertson and Mitchell had the conversation in regard to the interview Mitchell was going to give out to the newspapers in Washington in February, when Mitchell had put in the statement that he never saw Kribs in his life and never had a talk with him on any subject in his life.

Not Intended for Papers.

Not Intended for Papers.

When Robertson and Mitchell got alone together, their talk there was not intended for the newspapers and you can assume that Mitchell, just as much as you can assume in the case of his talk with Tanner, was taking the truth. And what was he doing? He sent out of the room Mrs. Bierbower and his grandson because he knew that Robertson knew the facis in regard to the Kribe matter, and he did not want Robertson to state those facis in the presence of Mrs. Bierbower and his grandson to be otherwise than what Mitchell intended to swear they were whenever he took the stand or went before the grand jury. So he wanted them out of the room, to talk with Robertson alone. It was not Robertson who sought that interview to have it alone. Robertson was willing to talk it before anybody whom Mitchell was willing to trust. But what did Mitchell say? They say Robertson called, him a lar, but there is no such evidence in the case; they say the poor old man needed advice; well, he did need advice and he got good advice, sound advice right then and there from that young man, advice that was exactly identical in character to what Mitchell was giving Tanner in the letter. "Don't be interviewed; Nobody could be trusted to hatch up a story and fabricate a defense except himself, he could not trust Tanner to fix one that he thought would suit; he wanted nobody could be trusted to hatch up a story and fabricate a defense except himself; he could not trust Tanner to fix one that he thought would suit; he wanted nobody interviewed but himself; he wanted to fabricate the evidence himself, and the make everybody else swear as he swore.

he thought would suit, he wanted nobody interviewed but himself, he wanted to fabricate in evidence himself, and ther make everybody else swear as he swore.

Flies Into a Rage.

And so when Robertson said to him. "Why. Senator, it won't do to let this go out in this way." what did Mitchell do? Did he thank him for the advice? No, he flew into a rage, and counsel say that now that they were alone and this was not said for publication, it must be truc. What was it? He flew into a rage, and counsel say that now that they were alone and this was not said for publication, it must be truc. What was it? He flew into a rage, and counsel say that now that they were alone and this in a lie? Hadn't he seen Kribs? It is a lie? Hadn't he seen Kribs? Cau there be any question about it? And yet he tried to stuff that down Robertson's throat? Why? Because he was prepared and ready to swear to it himself, and he wanted to make Robertson swear to it, by making Robertson believe, and this was also before the House isome of the evidence which had heer some of the evidence which had beer some of the same of the same and common some compel me to uspose that wicked acts have been done upon motives correspondent to their nature. Otherwise, I reverse all the principles of judgment to their nature. Otherwise, I reverse all the principles of judgment with the human find, and accept even the symptoms, the marks and common sense compel me to suppose that wicked acts have been done upon motives correspondent to their nature. Otherwise, I reverse

what object in view? To determine whether he would consent that the fees should be divided so that Tanner would get three-fifths and he only two-fifths, whereas they had been getting half and half since he had been in the Senate this last time.

Looks Through Books.

Now, as I pointed out, he had to look

Now, as I pointed out, he had to look made out a liar. Say he would be made out a liar. Whereupon a recess was taken until 3 o'clock P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION. Heney Goes On With Argument.

through the books to, see where the through the couling from the large were no large amounts of money except were no large amounts of money except were no large amounts of money except when the did not see them. And continued the books for the continued that he did not see them. And continued the books for the day, having examined the books for the day, the west back to Washington. He was not bree spain in a manh from that was on the spain in a manh from the washington the day, then he came here it was done weight of the leatimony that shows that the day of the leatimony that shows the day of the leatimony that shows the day of the day o

Mitchell's Subterfuge.

And then they attack the testimony of anner, who tells you that when he said here was no use in destroying the books. And then they attack the testimony of Tanner, who tells you that when he said there was no use in destroying the books, and that is where the suggestion came from the first time, from Mitchell's lipe to him, that there is no use in destroying the books because the contract stands in the way: that Mitchell then said, "We can yewrite the contract." That is the testimony. That then he said what? Senator Thurston says this old man needed some good advice. Did he get it? Did this lifelong friend of his who was willing to go the length he did go for him, give him good advice. Does not Tenner testify that when Mitchell suggested that, Tanner says. "Senator, the best thing you can do is to make a clean breast of it." Was better or sounder advice ever given any man on earth than that? Wes more wholesome advice ever given than that? But what did he do? Instead of accepting that advice, he did what the guilty mind always does, resorted to subterfuge, to fabrication and destruction of evidence—the sign of a guilty mind nine times out of ten. Mr. Bennett read to you from the book. He objects to anybody else reading from books; he wants a monopoly. He said he thought he had found in Dickens the source from which I gained my inten. Mr. Bennett read to you from the book. He objects to anybody else reading from books; he wants a monopoly. He said he thought he had found in Dickens the source from which I gained my inspiration for the prosecution of this case, and he read to you the argument of Sergeant Burfuz to the jury upon those letters. It was amusing, and yet Mr. Bennett wonders why he is in this case? I can tell him: It is because throughout Oregon he has the reputation of being able either to laugh or cry a case out of court; and when he finds that he can do neither one of those two things he is like a pigeon with its wings clipped, and when he attempts to fly he flutters bur the least way off the ground. Now, I did take some inspiration for this argument from the argument of one of the greatest lawyers the world has ever seen. Edmund Burke, certainly the greatest of English orators. Upon the trial of Warren Hastings had been Governor-General of Bengal, I believe, and this was also before the House of Lords-Burke had this to say about some of the evidence which had beer given by Warren Hastings.

UNITED STATES SENATORS WHO HAVE BEEN PLACED ON TRIAL CHARGED WITH VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTES

OREGONIAN NEWS BUREAU, Washington, July 2.- In all the history of the United States Government there have been only three prosecutions of Senators, charged with violation of Federal statutes while they have held that high office and all the trials have occurred within the past two or three years.

The Senators who have thus had to face a jury of their peers are: Burton, of Kansas; Dietrica, of Nebraska, and Mitchell, of Oregon. Burton and Mitchell were indicted under the same statuts, section 1781, which forbids any member of Congress from practicing before the Department of the Court of Claims, or from accepting pay for appearing before any of the departments in any matter in which the Federal Government is interested. It is interesting to note that this statute was not enacted until 1863 when the Government was in the midst of the great Civil War. It was passed because one member of the upper branch, Senator Simmons, of Rhode Island, had been found to be interested in ordnance contracts. The publication of tala fact aroused the public so much that Simmons resigned Juring the recess of Congress in 1862, having served five years of his

The first indictment under that act was one brought against Senator Ralph Burton, of Kansas, two years age, for his connection with the Get-Rich-Syndicate operated by J. J. Ryan, of St. Louis, Burton was charged with having appeared before the Postoffice Department as Ryan's attorney in an effort to secure a modification of the fraud order tasued against the St. Louis man and with having accepted money for his services. Burton has always claimed that he did not know of the existence of the statute and until it was made public in his case, dozens of Senators and Representatives were ignorant that there was such a law, Burton was convicted in St. Louis and sentenced to a fine and to be imprisoned. On appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States the decision of the lower court was reversed on the grounds that the payment of the money to Burton was made in Washington, although the check in payment was on a St. Louis bank. Further proceedings have not been had in this case.

The second indictment and trial of a Senator was that of Senator Dietrica, of Nebraska, for naving rented quarters for a postoffice at Hastings, Neb., his home town, to the Government while he was a member of the Senate. Mr. Dietrich was acquitted by the jury after an exhaustive trial. Subsequently on his demand he

was investigated by a committee of Senators and was acquitted by them also. The third and last trial of a Senator was that of Senator Mitchell, of Oregon, for practicing in a land case before the Interior Department. All the facts in that case are well known to the people of Oregon and

The one recent indictment and conviction of a member of the House of Representatives for being interested in a Government contract was that of Congressman Driggs, of Brooklyn, N. Y., on account of his interest in a contract for time clocks. He was sentenced to pay a fine of \$10,000, and imprisonment for a day. He paid the fine and served the allotted term in jail.