

IT WHAT THE VOTERS OF GROSVENOR'S DISTRICT HAVE DONE TO HIM—THROW THEM OUT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE."

"UNDERWRITTEN BY WALL STREET"

On March 27, 1908, Ervin Wardman, editor of the New York Press, delivered an address at Utica, N. Y. In that address Mr. Wardman charged that the administration was using federal employes for political purposes in every section of the country. Then Mr. Wardman said: **"WE ARE STRUCK WITH HORROR AS THE DETAILS ARE UNCOVERED OF A COMPACT BETWEEN MR. TAFT'S MANAGERS AND THE HIGH FINANCIERS OF WALL STREET,** whereby his candidacy is underwritten by those very 'undesirable citizens' against whom so riproaring a war has been waged for seven years, to land the residuary legatees in the White House. Mr. Roosevelt denied that he has the federal machine under his orders to force the nomination of Mr. Taft or anyone. I, for one, say let us not show the disrespect to his high office to impugn his declaration concerning this prostitution of federal offices. Let us take him at his word—if you please. But the facts remain, whether it be by his command or against his desire and injunction, the federal machine is exerting all the power of the United States government to compel the republican voters to make the nomination of Mr. Taft, whether they want him or not. You will find a collector of the port, or internal revenue officer or a land agent or a post-master, or some other holder of a government office in charge of the Taft canvass in every state north and south, east or west. You will find the Taft delegations held by and composed of these federal officeholders. When Mr. Roosevelt says that he is not doing this, what's the use of doubting him. We need not blame Mr. Taft. Sufficient is the evil of the fact, whoever inspires—the fact—the indisputable fact—an attempt, arrogantly conceived and desperately prosecuted, to establish a White House dynasty by the decree of the federal machine. And this I say, this striving to take out of the hands of the American people the selection of the candidates for whom they may vote, is a thing that strikes at the elemental principles of our whole system of government."

A TERRIFIC ARRAIGNMENT

In an issue during the month of September, 1907, the New York Press printed the following editorial:

Attorney General Bonaparte said in a recent interview: "We tried in New York not long ago in the case of the licorice trust to convict the president of the corporation, but the jury found the corporation guilty and acquitted the president. The presidents of these big corporations are usually excellent men of high moral standing in their communities and unexceptionable in their private life, and usually they stand high in church work. I suppose the kind-hearted jury thought it would be cruel to put such excellent men as these behind prison bars."

A few days later Secretary Taft said in his speech at Columbus: "Again, it is difficult to induce juries to convict individuals of a violation of the anti-trust law if imprisonment is to follow. In the case of the tobacco trust the government declined to accept a plea of guilty by the individual defendants, offered on condition that only the penalty of a fine be imposed, and the result was that the jury did not hesitate to stultify itself by finding the corporation guilty and acquitting the individual defendants, who had personally committed the acts upon which the conviction of the corporation was based. In the early enforcement of a statute which makes unlawful, because of its evil tendencies, that which in the past has been regarded as legitimate, juries are not inclined by their verdicts to imprison individuals."

This was followed by remarks in the same strain by President Roosevelt at Provincetown: "In a recent case against the licorice trust we indicted and tried the two corporations and their respective presidents. The contracts and their other transactions establishing the guilt of the corporations were made through, and so far as they were in writing were signed by, the two presidents. Yet the jury convicted the two corporations and acquitted the two men. Both verdicts could not possibly have been correct; but apparently the average jurymen wishes to see trusts broken up and is quite ready to fine the corporation itself, but is very reluctant to find the facts "proved beyond a reasonable doubt" when it comes to sending to jail a reputable member of the business community for doing what the business community had unhappily grown to recognize as well-nigh normal in business."

The close relationship of these arguments and of the three gentlemen who advanced them, the similarity of their attitude, the likeness of their scarce illustrations and the sequence of their almost identical utterances, point to more than a coincidence. Apparently there has been a concert of action between President Roosevelt, Secretary Taft and Attorney General Bonaparte, whose purpose

was to show that the reason for the failure of the department of justice to put the big criminals in jail was that juries of American citizens had refused to convict the malefactors and would continue to refuse to convict them.

To support this apology for failure to bring prosecutions looking to imprisonment of monopolists and rebaters Messrs. Roosevelt and Bonaparte both cited the single instance of the licorice trust. This was a case so obscure that it was almost ignored by the newspapers where the trial was had.

Furthermore there was no great public demand for the conviction of the officers of the licorice trust. Licorice is not a necessary of life, and the existence of a monopoly in that commodity was known perhaps not to one man in a thousand. Everybody, on the other hand, knows there is a coal trust, a beef trust, an oil trust and a monopoly on sugar. For this reason the people cared little or nothing about the conviction of the licorice trust officers. For the same reason the writers for this newspaper have devoted no attention to the licorice trust, being kept busy with inquiry into the facts about the corporations that monopolize the necessities of life and keep the highways of the country open or closed at will.

Our deliberate neglect of the licorice trust case makes it impossible for us to say whether the jury was to blame for the escape of the culprits or whether the department of justice had blundered its case, as it did those of the Chicago & Alton recently and of the beef trust a year ago. Possibly the jurymen may have felt that the evidence was improper or insufficient. Maybe they felt that the attorney general was beginning with the smallest of the trust criminals and they were unwilling to convict little licorice trust presidents while the Rockefellers, Baers and Armours were permitted to go free.

In any event, Messrs. Taft, Bonaparte and Roosevelt are scarcely warranted in citing one or two cases wherein American juries have refused to send "reputable members of the business community" (we deny that lawbreakers are reputable because they are wealthy) as proof that it is not possible to send this class of criminals to the penitentiary. If the president and his cabinet officers are willing to form their judgment of what American juries will do in one hundred cases upon what two American juries have done, why did they not cite the two trials at Toledo where jurors who were neighbors of the men on trial condemned several "reputable" fellow-members of the community to imprisonment for violating the anti-trust laws of Ohio?

We should say that a great deal depends on how the crooks are prosecuted. If they are not prosecuted at all it will always be easy to say that the juries would not send them to jail. If they are lathered with immunity soap and doused in an immunity tub the jurors can not do their share. If the big lawbreakers are prosecuted in the half-hearted manner that might be expected from an attorney general who talks like Mr. Bonaparte of course the jury is not certain to convict. But the uproarious enthusiasm with which President Roosevelt's declaration of war on the trust and railroad criminals has been received by the country warrants the belief that he and his advisers are happily mistaken about the powerful malefactors whom the president has charged with organizing a stock panic in order to protect themselves from the consequences of their crimes.

Bring the indictments against the Harrimans and Rockefellers. Let the little counterfeiters and the licorice trust pikers wait. Give the juries a crack at the way-up lawbreakers—then see what will happen! Let the department of justice do its duty and there need be no fear that American citizenship will not vindicate itself from the charge that it wants its worst enemies to go unwhipped!—New York Press.

HOW SENATORS SNEERED AND JEERED

In the month of May, 1906, the New York Press printed, from the pen of its Washington correspondent, the following description of the manner in which Mr. Roosevelt's message relating to the Standard Oil was received in the American House of Lords:

"What the American people have to expect in the regulation of the trusts was disclosed today in congress when the president sent to the senate and the house the report of the bureau of corporations, showing that the Standard Oil corporation not only violates the law, but is a partner with many railroad corporations in preventing competition and raising prices of all Standard Oil products throughout the country. The report of the bureau of corporations was accompanied by a strong message from the president. In the house of representatives the closest attention was paid to the reading of the message and the report, and there was generous applause which proved that party lines were broken. The situation in the senate suggested plainly that there would have to be a great change in the body before any good results can come from the president's campaign. Not two-thirds of the senators had the