French navy, and that this is enough. Here is the place to pull up. The future naval policy of the United States should be simply to maintain the present strength, replacing old ships and keeping the efficiency of the establishment up to the mark of today. Thus another of President Roosevelt's policies strikes an obstacle in the senate. The thing he has done most talking and writing about since he became president is the need of going on with the upbuilding of the navy. He has championed the big navy in almost every public address he has delivered as president, but here comes the senate—republicans as well as democrats—with the plainest sort of notice that the limit has been already reached. The navy is big enough. Henceforth we should simply maintain what we have. And so far as the senate is concerned there are to be no more big battleships, no more additions to the fighting line."

REPRESENTATIVE VANDIVER, a democrat of Missouri, introduced in the house on February 24, the following resolution: "Resolved, That the attorney general inform the house at his earliest convenience whether or not any proceedings have been instituted, either civil or criminal, against the armor plate trust, and if not, why not, and further, Resolved, That the attorney general also inform the house what steps have been taken by him to determine whether or not the said armor plate trust should be prosecuted for violation of the United States anti-trust law of July 2, 1890, or other United States statutes against trusts and combines in restraint of trade." The resolution was referred to the judiciary committee.

A PREAMBLE to the Vandiver resolution recites that on September 6, 1901, the attorney general was petitioned to institute civil and criminal proceedings against the Carnegie Steel Co., and the Bethlehem Steel Co., as combining and constituting what, the petition alleged, was an armor plate trust for controlling the price of armor plate, and that there was filed with the attorney general and with the president a statement of facts and evidence showing a conspiracy whereby the trade and commerce in armor plate had been monopolized, and the armor plate trust enabled to sell many thousand tons of armor plate to the United States government at prices ranging from $445 to $520 per ton, after a duly appointed board of expert naval constructors had reported that the actual cost of the armor did not exceed $197 per ton.

IT IS further set forth in the preamble that an agreement was made between the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies as to prices and that they have divided the contracts of the government between themselves, each bidding lower than the other for one-half of the armor required at any time by the government. It is also charged that further evidence of this conspiracy was shown in the hearing of the present secretary of the navy, when on January 26, 1905, Secretary Morton stated to the house committee on naval affairs that the bids of the Bethlehem and Carnegie companies of 7,820 tons of armor plate, which had been opened on January 12, last, were discovered to be identical.

BUT as the preamble recites, in spite of this evidence, the secretary of the navy awarded contracts to these two companies at $453 per ton, when an independent company outside of the trust had offered to furnish exactly the same armor for $398 per ton, thus increasing the cost to the government $63 per ton in order to favor the trust, and "indicating the powerful influence which the aforesaid armor plate trust has acquired over the government and officials of the United States."

MANY of the most familiar hymns were written by a blind woman. A writer in the Denver News says: "Few persons among those who attend prayer meetings or revivals and join in the singing of such hymns as "Rescue the Perishing," "All the Way My Savior Leads Me," and other familiar ones—a score or more all told—are aware that the words of the hymns were written by a woman, blind since 6 months of age. Miss Fanny Crosby, the writer of the hymns, is now a resident of Bridgeport, Conn., and will, if she lives until March 24 next, celebrate her 85th birthday. She is said to have enjoyed the friendship of Presidents Tyler and Van Buren, Henry Clay, William H. Seward, General Winfield Scott and other men conspicuous in American history. In a recent interview she said: 'I believe everything happens for a purpose, and what may seem to some a misfortune is part of the great plan that has enabled me to bring happiness to many through my hymns. Not that I desire any credit, for if I have this gift it would be wrong not to use it. We are inspired to do things by a higher power and should not take credit to ourselves.' The hymns quoted and others of her writing, such as "Safe in the Arms of Jesus" and "Savior More than Life to Me," voice a sublime faith and confidence rarely found in man or woman."

REPRESENTATIVE MANN of Chicago has pointed out some interesting instances of rate discriminations and the Chicago Tribune editor directs special attention to the statements made by Mr. Mann. The Tribune says: "Chicago is 533 miles nearer to Montgomery, Ala., than is Boston, but the rate per hundred pounds on first class freight is $1.26 from Boston and $1.38 from Chicago. It is 1,106 miles from Boston to Atlanta, and the rate is $1.17. From Chicago to Atlanta the distance is 733 miles and the rate is $1.38. Chicago is penalized 21 cents per hundred pounds of freight for being 373 miles nearer Atlanta than is Boston. According to Representative Mann the rates from Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore are much less to the markets south of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi than are the rates from the manufacturing centers of the middle northwest to the same markets. New York city is much disturbed over a differential of 1 cent on export grain which Philadlphia and Baltimore enjoy. The advantages in rates which New York enjoys over Chicago make the differences about which the eastern city is wont to complain look small, indeed."

REFERRING to freight rates from New York to the cities on the Pacific coast, Mr. Mann shows that it is uniformly cheaper to ship goods across the continent than it is to ship them only part way. While it costs $1 per hundred pounds to ship cotton piece goods from New York to San Francisco, the charge is $2.50 for the same goods from Chicago to Salt Lake City and $1.75 from this city to Denver. It costs $1.75 to ship merchandise a thousand miles that can be hauled four thousand miles for $1.

THE TRIBUNE says: "If there be justice in this arrangement it is not apparent. The rates on coal are peculiar. From Pennsylvania to Chicago the rate on hard coal is $3.50 per gross ton and on soft coal $2.05 per ton. West of Chicago it costs more to haul soft coal than it does to carry hard coal, for the rate on the former to Buffalo lake is $2.40 and on the latter $2.25 per ton. The city of Milwaukee comes in for a little favoritism at the hands of the railroad companies. The rate from Milwaukee to Missouri river points is 25 cents less per ton than it is from this city. This, too, in spite of the high rates which Governor La-Follette says prevail in Wisconsin."

THE COMMONER is in receipt of an interesting communication signed by L. N. Yart, president, and J. H. Catron, vice president of the Farmers' bank at Nebraska City, Neb. This communication was called out by an article entitled "Unsafe Banking" recently printed in The Commoner. Referring to the statement that "There is a wrong somewhere in our banking system," these Nebraska bankers say: "There is a wrong somewhere. We will name it without any argument or without any fear of successful contradiction. It is in the reserve that our state banking board requires us to have. We are required to keep on hand 15 per cent of our deposits, whereas the national banking laws require the larger national banks to keep on hand 25 per cent. We contend that this is insufficient. Let the state and national banking laws compel all small banks to keep at least 33 1-3 per cent of their deposits on hand, and whenever a bank has ten times as many deposits as it has capital, then let it be compelled to have 50 per cent of its deposits on hand. If these things were in force, banks would be safe. If a bank can not do this, let it go out of business. No bank, either state or national, has a right to take charge of the money of the country and offer less protection than the plan we have outlined. How much better a plan of this kind would be than one just incorporated in a bill, recently introduced in the recent session of the legislature, whereby the banks of this state were to be assessed a certain sum to take care of the losses occasioned by the failure of banks who ignored the laws consistent with good banking. We might make another suggestion. If the bills receivable of a bank are made "gilt edged," and under pressure, are made to pay out seventy-five cents on the dollar; then, this precaution, taken with the plan for an adequate reserve which we have just outlined, will make every bank in this state and in this country a safe one, and banking will become what it should be, barring all losses made through theft and embezzlement. If you desire, you can give this letter publicity over our signatures."

SENATOR KEARNS of Utah, who retires March 4, delivered in the senate on February 28, a bitter speech against the Mormon church. Senator Kearns addressed the senate concerning the anti-polygamy resolution introduced by Mr. Dubois of Idaho. The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald says: "Senator Kearns declared that the Mormon leaders had broken every pledge they made when Utah was given statehood, and accused President Smith of the church with setting up a monarchical institution within the republic. It is the duty of the senate of the United States to serve notice on this church monarchy that it must live within the laws, that the nation is supreme and that the compact on which statehood was granted must be preserved inviolate,' he declared. Senator Kearns recited the pledges given by the people of Utah, as follows: "That the Mormon leaders would live within the laws pertaining to plural marriage and the continued plural marriage relation and that they would enforce this obligation upon all of their followers, under penalty of disfellowship. That the leaders of the Mormon church would no longer exercise political sway, and that their followers would be free and would exercise their freedom in politics, in business and in social affairs.' Continuing, he said: 'Utah secured her statehood by a solemn compact made by the Mormon leaders in behalf of themselves and their people. That compact has been broken wilfully and frequently.' Religion, declared Mr. Kearns, is not involved, and he passed to a denunciation of President Smith, whom he accuses of building up a business monopoly through the power of the tithes from all the Mormons in the world, the annual income being $1,600,000. The social autocracy of Smith, he said, had now reached its highest point and the president of the church had affected a regal state. 'Parties are nothing to these leaders, except as parties may be used by them,' declared Mr. Kearns. 'No man can be elected to congress against their wish.'"

THE SUPREME COURT recently rendered a decision in the case of Texas vs. The National and Southern Oil company. Referring to this case, the Chicago Record-Herald says that while no new principle is laid down, "there is considerable significance in the manner in which an established, though still imperfectly understood principle has been applied, by the court in this interesting suit." The Record-Herald adds: "The corporations named were organized under the laws of New Jersey, and they operated in Texas by virtue of licenses issued to them by the proper authority of that state. Suit was brought against them by the attorney general of Texas alleging that they had entered into an unlafwul combination, doing away with competition and fixing the price of cotton seed throughout the state at $14 a ton. The court was asked to cancel the licenses permitting them to do business in Texas. Forfeiture having been declared by the trial court and affirmed by the appellate tribunals, the companies carried the case up to the federal supreme court. They contended that the anti-trust act under which the state proceedings had been taken and the cancellation of their permits decreed violated the constitution of the United States, in that it provided for the confiscation of property without due process of law. Clearly this amounted to the claim that, though the state had licensed them to do business within its borders on condition of obedience to its laws, it had no power to oust them for disobedience. The supreme court refused to sustain so manifestly untenable a position. It held that the Texas trust law was valid and that a permit might be canceled for violation thereof without offending the clause of the fourteenth amendment guaranteeing due process of law. In short, a corporation licensed in accordance with the principle of comity to enter and do business in any state must obey the laws of that state and respect the express and implied conditions of the permit. It can not assert privileges superior to those enjoyed by "domestic" corporations, nor does it acquire vested rights in the patronage and business of the state."