

interests of his principal. If we look to the agents of the trusts for relief we might as well look to the trust itself for relief. To say that the agents of the trust will regulate the trust is tantamount to saying that a trust will regulate itself, which is an absurdity.

"The republican party is the array of counsel for the trust. At the head of the table sits a man of the highest character, of unimpeachable integrity, against whom there is no breath of scandal. The trusts for their chief counsel never employ cheap 'skates.' They have money and they have honors to bestow. They get the best. They expect honest advice from their attorneys, and they receive it. Their chief counsel a short time ago told the railroads that they had better submit themselves to the law—that they had better advise their senators to pass a rate bill. That if a rate bill was not passed the people would demand public ownership. Under advice from their chief counsel the trusts had a rate bill passed—with holes in it.

"If the array of counsel prove recalcitrant to their trust they are discharged and other counsel are employed by the predominating form of wealth to conduct the affairs of government. If the democratic party can convince this predominating form of wealth that they will do a better job than the republican party, the democratic party will be called to the table. It is foolishness to denounce the republican party. That party is conscientiously performing its duties as the representative of this predominating form of wealth. In fact the republican party should be complimented for the adroitness with which it performs the work. Whilst its class-conscious principal—the interlocked directorate—is closeted in a room, fixing the price of everything the people have to sell and fixing the price of everything the people must buy, the republican orators are on the stump addressing the people who are exploited and robbed, about our destiny as a nation, our greatness as a people, our battleships. They will even give us an apostrophe to the flag and wind up with a peroration on prosperity. The prosperity, my friends, they speak about is not our prosperity, it is not the prosperity of our class, it is the prosperity of those who own the wealth represented by the interlocked directorate. It is not the prosperity of the people. It is the prosperity of a class, and a class to which we do not belong. The adroit attorneys of this predominating form of wealth resort to other expedients to keep the people divided and prevent them from becoming class conscious, and prevent them from uniting and overthrowing the power of the interlocked directorate. They appeal to every prejudice and passion, sectional, racial, religious and partisan. They have kept us divided up until this time, and as long as we are divided we will be exploited and robbed.

"When the democratic party is led and commanded by trust captains, any pretended fight between the democratic party and the republican party is a farce. It is nothing more than the pretended fights of attorneys in a court room representing different interests. If the democratic party is led by men other than the hirelings of the trust, and the people as a mass know their own enlightened self-interest, then the fight will be genuine, and the fight will not be between parties, but it will be between the people and the trust, the power behind the republican party. The people of the United States at last know the truth. They know their economic status. They know that the price is fixed for them both ways. They know that if present conditions exist much longer the boys of ten today, when they meet each other fifteen years from now, will not ask each other: 'What business are you in?' They will ask each other: 'Who are you workin' for now?' The time, in my judgment, has finally arrived when every man must take sides in this struggle."

Washington Letter

Washington, July 22.—The long delayed "Harriman report," prepared by the interstate commerce commission has at last been made public. Mr. Harriman contends that it is replete with gross errors, and announces that he will reply to it later. Inasmuch, however, as all the charges contained in this official report were contained in the preliminary document issued by the commission's counsel, Mr. Kellogg, eight weeks ago, Mr. Harriman's decision to postpone his reply sounds a bit lame.

The report is disappointing in the mildness with which it condemns Mr. Harriman's clearly criminal methods. While it is clear that the criminal clause of the federal anti-trust law has been violated with impunity, nowhere is there a word in the report urging that Mr. Harriman

be prosecuted or that the attorney general begin proceedings to set aside his illegal combinations and mergers. The word "prosecution" can not be found in the report. A few recommendations of a purely legislative character are made and much historical data is carefully compiled. But that is all.

If the interstate commerce commission is satisfied it has properly diagnosed the Harriman case, it is very certain from reading its report that the commission is unwilling or unable to prescribe the proper remedy. It may be very well for the commission to contend that it is only called upon to report facts, and that it is not justified in making recommendations of legal prosecutions because that is a matter for the department of justice. Of course it is a matter for the department of justice, but the commission has spent considerable time and treasure upon this investigation, and it certainly ought to be in a position to advise and recommend remedies. It has, in fact, recommended several legislative reforms. Why not be consistent? If its opinion on legal proceedings can not be given with propriety, why its opinions on legislative proceedings? If it must leave law to the lawyers, why not leave legislation to the legislators? Why advise congress and refuse to advise the department of justice? There seems to be something strangely inconsistent in such an attitude. The interstate commerce commission is a body which ought to recommend a prosecution when necessary. The commission's counsel, Mr. Kellogg, in his preliminary report, did not think it improper to recommend the prosecution of Mr. Harriman, and he has from the start insisted that such a recommendation be inserted in the final report. It is said that Attorney General Bonaparte protested against this on the ground that the matter of prosecution was purely a question for the department of justice. It is hinted that with the aid of the "big stick" the members of the commission were led to desert their eminent counsel who so ably worked up the Harriman case upon this proposition. All this leads one to inquire why federal funds should be so lavishly expended to get the expert advice of an able lawyer if that advice is to be ignored.

The matter, however, is now up to the department of justice, and one awaits with interest to see if the present administration has the courage to send to jail one who has so clearly violated the federal criminal laws with impunity.

A failure on the part of the federal government to prosecute Harriman in view of the evidence at hand would be a national disgrace. But it would only be a further evidence of the apparent inability of the federal government to deal effectively with our corporate abuses. The criminal clause of the Sherman anti-trust law has been on the statute books for something over a decade and a half. And yet the present attorney general is forced to make the unfortunate admission that its imprisonment penalty has been used but in two minor instances; in fact, the non-enforcement of the criminal provisions of our federal statutes in regard to illegal combinations in restraint of trade, especially the enforcement of the imprisonment provisions of those statutes becomes almost odious when compared with what has been accomplished by similar statutes in the several states.

Out in Ohio they have what is known as the Valentine anti-trust law. It has been on the statute books there hardly as many years as the Sherman law has been on the United States statute books decades, but its application differs from that of the Sherman anti-trust law in that the imprisonment provision is utilized to the best advantage. Only the other day some two dozen representative and wealthy business men of Ohio were sentenced to six months in jail for a violation of this law. It is safe to say that these sentences will do more to prevent the illegal combinations in restraint of trade than all the fines that could be imposed, and all the injunctions that might be issued.

The federal government recently conducted an expensive investigation of the Standard Oil company. The investigators found the trust guilty of the grossest violation of both our federal criminal and civil laws, but as yet the federal government has taken no steps, and as far as it is concerned the Standard Oil is as powerful as ever. Compare this with the action of the state of Texas. It has fined this company over a million and a half of dollars, and forbade it to operate within the state. Why is it the several states seem to be able to cope so effectively with the trusts while the national government seems so impotent? Is it any wonder then that our mighty corporations are rushing

with unseemly haste to subscribe to the Roosevelt-Root doctrine of centralization, and to go upon their knees before the national authorities at Washington with the plea of "save us from the states."

Perhaps the silliest story of the silly season is that which suggested that the president is angered with the Hon. James Bryce, ambassador of Great Britain, because of the latter's applause of the proposed Oklahoma constitution. It has been rumored that an investigation into the actual utterances of the ambassador is under way in the state department. The department denies it, and while as a rule no one believes what is said in that home of diplomacy and evasion, everybody believes this particular denial.

American politicians are not fond of British ambassadors or ministers. President Cleveland drove out the luckless Sackville-West. President Roosevelt elbowed out Sir Henry Durand, and was not much pleased when Mr. Bryce, whom the American people love to honor, came in his stead. But it is inconceivable that with all his well known desire for a British favorite of his earlier days, the president should permit even the suggestion of an affront to Mr. Bryce.

Mr. Bryce's book, "The American Commonwealth" is today the text book for Americans who desire to study their own political organization. It is done better than any work by an American writer, partly because of its author's notable ability, but chiefly because his detached point of view enabled him to study our institutions as those of us who have lived under them never can. His book is that of a true democrat, a true republican, if you wish; namely a man who believes in the government of the people and for the people. It is a matter of history that the one serious error in the first edition of the book was committed by a Columbia college professor of economics to whom Mr. Bryce committed the chapter on Tammany Hall. The Professor printed a gross libel, which Mr. Bryce accepted as truth. The person libelled, the late Oakley Hall, of New York, sued for libel in English courts, where the penalties are onerous, and Mr. Bryce practically was mulcted of all the earnings of the first edition of his book.

All of which is beside the fact of immediate import. Bryce, being recognized throughout the whole world as a student of governmental institutions, and a specialist on those of the United States, happened to visit Oklahoma. Naturally he was asked what he thought of its proposed constitution—now being held up by the administration. He applauded it specifically as to certain sections, but generally as to its whole tone. Now the partisan press is trying to force a diplomatic issue on the ground that an ambassador should not express opinions upon a matter still under consideration by the president.

It may be accepted as a fact that if by delay, subterfuge or positive opposition Mr. Roosevelt can prevent the 1,600,000 people of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory from voting for the next president, he will do so. Just now his policy is delay. He has ordered a census of the territories, though by what authority from congress or under what appropriation none can tell. But that will put off the dreaded election for a time. His appointees are governors, judges, marshals, collectors of revenue, Indian agents, yet his party fears the admission to statehood of these communities lest their people vote against the administration that has so favored them with Rough Riding officials.

In the end it is the business man; the speculator learns first of what is likely to happen in cases of this sort. Washington is overrun with men of this type from the two territories. With one accord whatever their personal politics, they say: "I'm making my business arrangements with perfect confidence that there will be no statehood while Roosevelt is in power."

But even accepting the truth of this it is incredible that the administration should seek to discipline the ambassador of a friendly power for saying pleasant things about a constitution adopted by a convention of Americans by a vote of one hundred to ten.

WILLIS J. ABBOTT.

John M. Crutchley, prominent for more than fifty years in democratic circles, died at his home in Canton, Ill., June 25, age seventy-two years. Mr. Crutchley never held an office, but he was ever a zealous worker in the councils of the democratic party. In recent years Mr. Crutchley was an invalid but he never lost his interest in the political principles to which he had contributed so generously and even during the years of his affliction he contributed materially to his party's cause.