

Rear Admiral Crowninshield presided at the inquiry concerning the grounding of the battleship Illinois, which was Crowninshield's flagship. The result was that Rear Admiral Crowninshield absolved himself from all blame in connection with the affair. Then Rear Admiral Crowninshield proceeded to approve the verdict of the court of inquiry. These things prompt the Utica Observer to say that "he will be voting himself a medal next thing you know."

**An Interesting Inquiry.** In his speech from the bench after sentencing certain labor leaders to jail, Federal Judge Jackson of Parkersburg, W. Va., referred to labor organizers as "vampires that live and fatten on the honest labor of the coal miners of the country." One may search this judge's speech in vain to discover any reference other than a complimentary one to the coal barons who not only fatten on the honest labor of the coal miners, but who grow rich through their impositions upon the coal consumers of the country.

**Big Constabulary Force.** A cablegram from Manila, under date of July 22, refers to a conflict between the "constabulary" and the Filipinos. Twelve hundred men under command of Captain Baker comprised this "constabulary." The word "constabulary" is a strange one to Americans. It is a familiar word in Ireland, but even there the constabulary is not so strong in numbers as the "constabulary" of the Philippines. One is inclined to suspect that after all the war is not ended, and that the 1,200 "constabulary" was in fact a body of regular soldiers.

**Babcock Now Reverses Babcock.** Congressman Babcock, chairman of the republican congressional committee, says that the republicans will cheerfully welcome a contest with the democrats with the tariff as an issue. Mr. Babcock is the gentleman who, prior to the last session of congress, insisted that the tariff should be removed from trust-made products. For some time Mr. Babcock occupied a conspicuous place in the newspaper dispatches. He said he was determined to accomplish his purpose in this matter because it was in the interest of the people, but for some reason unknown to the public Mr. Babcock suddenly lost interest in the proposition, and now he declares that he would be very glad to meet the democrats on this issue; in other words, he would be very glad to dispute the very proposition which during a considerable period of time, he maintained was distinctly in the public interest.

**Roosevelt by Acclamation.** The New York World announces that it has the best authority for stating that President Roosevelt expects to be nominated in 1904 by acclamation. According to the information received by the World, Mr. Roosevelt expects the support of Senator Hanna, Governor Odell, Senator Platt, and Senator Quay. If there were no reason for doubting the administration's sincerity in its professed attack upon the trusts, the very fact that at this moment Mr. Roosevelt has good grounds for believing that he may be renominated without opposition would justify the suspicion that the trust magnates are satisfied with the Roosevelt administration. Does any one believe that the powerful influences that have manipulated the republican party to the advantage of the trust system would permit Mr. Roosevelt to be nominated by acclamation if the trust magnates had any grievances against the president?

**Little Hope for Peace.** A Washington dispatch to the Chicago Tribune under date of July 2, refers to the speech delivered by Major Edwin F. Glenn during the Glenn court-martial proceedings. Glenn was charged with administering the water cure, and in his speech before the court-martial, Major Glenn said: "As to conditions, I found soon after my arrival in Panay that every man's hand was against us and that every man, woman, and child in the island was an enemy, and in my best judgment they are today and always will be." This is somewhat inconsistent with the statements made by republicans. If Major Glenn is to be believed, and he certainly must know what he is talking about, every man, woman, and child in the Philippines is an enemy. They are enemies today and "they will always be enemies."

**Concerning Mr. McKinley's Policies.** The Pittsburg Dispatch makes an interesting point when it says: "It has been declared on the floor of the senate by some of the anti-reciprocity senators that it is next door to sacrilege to criticize President McKinley's decision on any subject. Yet where the large profits of a special clique are threatened with a little diminution the same men flatly repudiate President McKinley's declaration and his official pledges." Many people have observed that the republican leaders while claiming for themselves the right of repudiating Mr. McKinley's opinions and policies whenever the interest of the trusts require such repudiation, are very quick to brand as "traitors" any who object to other policies to which Mr. McKinley was devoted. If, however, the republicans may repudiate such policies of Mr. McKinley as do not happen to suit the present day notions of republican leaders, why may not the democrat who never claimed Mr. McKinley as a leader oppose, with all possible vigor, Mr. McKinley's policies without being subjected to the charge of treason?

**Are no Self-Enforcing Laws.** "Will new laws enforce themselves?" is an interesting question submitted by the New York World to President Roosevelt and Congressman Littlefield. The World says: "The existing anti-trust laws provide heavy fines and terms of imprisonment for men who organize to monopolize trade either by a trust 'or otherwise,' and for any railroad official who gives rebates or makes discriminating freight charges. But not one man has ever been indicted under those laws, though sworn proof that hundreds of men have violated them has been spread before the public time and time again. Will new laws work any better with the same sort of 'enforcement?'" In his speech at Pittsburg Mr. Roosevelt said that more important than the enactment of new laws "we need an honest and fearless administration of the laws as they are on the statute books." The administration has failed to enforce the criminal clause of the anti-trust law. Will Congressman Littlefield's proposed law enforce itself, or will the administration agents enforce it in the same spirit with which they "enforce" existing laws?

**Trust Magnates Oppose it.** It must be evident to every one that the very large majority of American people are in favor of the election of senators by popular vote. Republicans, democrats and populists very generally stand together on this proposition and yet the United States senate rejected this amendment. An explanation for this stubborn opposition is provided by the New York Journal. The amendment is opposed "because the predatory wealth of the country fears it." The Journal hits the nail squarely on the head when it says: "All the

trusts are against the amendment. All the men of money who are in the enjoyment of special privileges—like the illegally banded railroad owners of the coal trust, the monopolists of the food trust, the freebooters of the Standard Oil trust and the tariff-fattened millionaires of the sugar trust—fight against the innovation. The more power the people have, the larger their direct share in the government, the harder it will be for 'captains of industry' to procure and retain the special privileges which bring them most of their colossal revenues. What they dread is legislation by the people for all the people, instead of legislation for some of the people."

**There is the Criminal Clause.** A Washington dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald speaks of a conference between Mr. Roosevelt and Senator Spooner and Attorney General Knox. This dispatch says that these two eminent lawyers, Knox and Spooner, "pointed out to the president some of the difficulties, the almost insurmountable difficulties which stand in the way of a prosecution of the trust system." If the president seriously intends to make a campaign against the trusts, what he needs is a consultation with eminent lawyers who will show him the way to prosecution rather than to point out the "insurmountable obstacles." There are thousands of lawyers in this country today, and indeed thousands of men who are not lawyers, who could give Mr. Roosevelt some valuable information on this subject. These would suggest to him that instead of considering the "insurmountable obstacles," he might at least try the experiment of enforcing the criminal clause of the anti-trust law. After the criminal prosecution experiment has failed, it will then be time enough to talk about "insurmountable obstacles." A great many people are beginning to suspect that the reason criminal prosecution is not resorted to is that there is great probability that criminal prosecution would be successful, and would land the conspirators behind the prison bars.

**Evidence Not Lacking.** Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, has been making an investigation in the anthracite region and in a dispatch to his paper Mr. Wellman says: "There is a coal trust. It has created a

monopoly in the anthracite business. It is operating in restraint of interstate commerce. It is violating the federal law.

President Roosevelt and Attorney General Knox have said that they are not hunting for trusts to prosecute, because they do not care to go into a wholesale business in this line. They have also said they do not care to embark in any more trust prosecutions unless it be in instances where the law is not only being violated, but such violations are working injury to the public through the suppression of competition, the creation of a monopoly and the imposition of unnecessary high prices upon consumers.

All these conditions are found in the anthracite coal trust, and found in most flagrant form.

The president and the attorney general have further said they could not move against the coal trust in the absence of complaints. Let this serve as a complaint. I file it at the White house and the department of justice.

The same thing has been said before by newspapers, by public men, and by others after investigation. In fact, Mr. Roosevelt and his attorney general undoubtedly know, without being told by Mr. Wellman, that there is a coal trust. While every one hopes that the president and his attorney general may act with respect to the coal trust it is very doubtful whether any prosecution along these lines would be fruitful when the prosecutors must be dragged into the fight and when they have clearly shown their disinclination to "hunt for trusts to prosecute."