

ment is for life and, therefore, for an indefinite period he will decide cases with a constant consciousness of his obligation to Senator Platt and the great corporations for which Senator Platt stands. A Washington dispatch to the New York Herald says that Judge Ray, as chairman of the judiciary committee of the house of representatives, opposed anti-trust legislation and took the position that "the United States congress had no right to interfere with the operations of private corporations." Here we have it. A congressman opposes interference with trusts; Senator Platt, the prince of corporation representatives, takes him up and urges his appointment to a life position on the bench; and the president pauses long enough in the discussion of the trust question to put this man in a position to help the trusts for years to come. As a member of congress Representative Ray was in danger of being overruled by a majority of his colleagues, but Judge Ray can only be overruled by a higher court and as the trusts can dictate appointments to the higher court also there is not much danger of his being overruled at all. The trusts might paraphrase a familiar sentiment and say, "Let us select the judges of a nation and we care not who makes its laws." Of course, the president does not know this, but some intimate friend ought to explain it to him. And yet there are republicans who actually expect this administration to take the people's side of the trust question—poor, deluded mortals!

### A Sublime Faith.

The Philadelphia Record prints an interview with the president in which he says that he is "grieved beyond measure at the difference in Pennsylvania and other coal mining states over the wage and kindred questions." When asked if a remedy was at hand, he said: There is a remedy, and then without suggesting it, added:

"I would refer you to the men at the head of the republican party, who are in control of affairs in Pennsylvania. I am sure that their conservative opinion of the difficulties rampant will ultimately result in an amicable settlement of this great question. Of course politics do not enter into the mining problem, yet I sincerely hope that the republican principles, which are framed alike for high and low, will level the problem to an equity."

Here we have it with as much explicitness as a republican leader usually employs. "Of course politics do not enter into the mining problem," and yet the president sincerely hopes that republican principles will "level the problem into an equity," and he therefore refers his enquirers "to the men who are at the head of the republican party in Pennsylvania." He is sure that "their conservative opinion of the differences rampant will ultimately result in a settlement of this great question."

Each republican leader seems to have sublime faith in the wisdom of all the rest of the leaders, but not enough faith in himself to suggest a remedy for anything. The president will have to excuse the rank and file if they remind him that "faith without works is dead."

### The Packing House Merger.

The Chicago Record-Herald is authority for the statement that the long expected merger of the great meat packing interests of the United States will go into active operation Saturday, September 27, unless there should be an unlooked for change in the plans agreed on by those concerned in the deal. When this merger is accomplished, according to this republican paper, "an industrial combination second to the steel trust will become practically an accomplished fact." According to the information secured by the Record-Herald, the new concern is to be capitalized at the rate of twenty-five times the last year's earnings of the constituent companies.

If anything were needed to demonstrate the impotency of the republican administration's so-called campaign against trusts, the fact of this packing-house merger would supply the deficiency. If the president, instead of permitting his attorney general to adopt the clumsy and ineffective injunction proceedings, had insisted upon the enforcement of the chief feature of the federal anti-trust law, which is the criminal provision, these packing house magnates would be pleading for mercy and would be quite willing to conform to the ordinary and decent rules of competitive business.

The announcement that this merger is about to be accomplished, suggests another interesting question. Mr. Roosevelt has told the people that every power would be exhausted in order to protect the people from these trusts. He has so far failed to explain why he has neglected to enforce

the criminal clause of the federal anti-trust law. Let him now explain how it happens that he has not employed even the injunction proceeding in order to lay a restraining hand upon this proposed merger.

If the packing house merger is covered by the writ of injunction already issued, then we may expect the president's legal representatives to see that the packing house magnates are called promptly to account under contempt of court proceedings. It is not at all likely, however, that the merger has been covered in those proceedings and that being the case, how does it happen that Mr. Roosevelt has taken no steps to prevent the organization of this mighty trust?

For several months the newspapers have been filled with the news of this proposed merger. Mr. Roosevelt has not been ignorant of it. His legal representatives must have known of it, because every newspaper reader in the land has been told that this great consolidation was under way.

Mr. Roosevelt authorized injunction proceedings to be commenced in order to prevent the proposed Northern Pacific merger. It is significant that all the time the scheme for the packing house merger was being laid, and laid before the very eyes of the people, Mr. Roosevelt has been traveling about the country telling the people what he proposed to do to protect the public from the impositions of the trusts. In one of his speeches Mr. Roosevelt, after making great predictions concerning the benefits to be derived from his constitutional amendment, said that "in the meantime, we will do the best we can with strawless bricks, but remember, they will be strawless." The people do not need this reminder from Mr. Roosevelt to assure them that in the hands of the republican authorities the present anti-trust laws are "strawless bricks."

The president's failure to enforce the criminal clause of the anti-trust law or to proceed against the proposed packing house merger as he did against the proposed Northern Pacific merger should serve as revelations to those who have placed confidence in Mr. Roosevelt's "strenuosity."

### What About the Merger?

The Kansas City Journal says that in his Fitchburg speech President Roosevelt "pointed out the folly of the man who says 'destroy the trust' and stated in clear and succinct English what ought to be the exclusive aim of all anti-trust measures and legislation, that is not the destruction of the trusts, but the destruction of trust evils."

The republican platform of 1900 declared: "We condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business and create monopolies, to limit production and to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of producers, laborers and all who are engaged in industry and commerce."

Isn't that a promise that the trusts will be destroyed?

Trust evils are made possible only by the creation of trusts and the destruction of trust evils can only be accomplished by the removal of the cause of those evils. This does not mean any destruction or attack upon legitimate corporations or business concerns. Men who do not contemplate conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, men who do not desire to create monopolies, to limit production or to control prices, do not organize trusts. The trusts are organized for the very purpose of accomplishing the things which were denounced by the republican national platform of 1900; and the only legislation that will effectively restrain and "prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of producers, laborers and all who are engaged in industry and commerce" is legislation honestly and fearlessly enforced—enforced in a way that strikes not a feather blow at the monopoly, the conspiracy and the combination, but strikes rather that telling blow that results in the conspiracy's destruction.

If the destruction of the trusts is not to be aimed at by the intelligent opponent of the trust system then why did President Roosevelt instruct his attorney general to commence proceedings against the proposed Northern Pacific merger?

If it is not proper to destroy the trusts, why is it proper to prevent the creation of trusts? And if "not the destruction of the trusts, but the destruction of trust evils" is the thing to be sought by the intelligent man, why did not President Roosevelt permit the Northern Pacific merger to be accomplished and then wait until the evils of that trust showed themselves before he struck the blow?

If Mr. Roosevelt took the proper position in

his Fitchburg speech, and if the Kansas City Journal is correct, then Mr. Roosevelt was in error when he commenced proceedings against the proposed merger of the Northern Pacific.

### Attempting Deception Again.

Governor Taft is reported as making a speech at Manila in which he said that the United States would retain the Philippine islands indefinitely with a view of educating the Filipinos to a state of self-government and other conditions which would enable them to decide whether they desired to become independent or be made into a state like Canada or Australia.

The Chicago Times-Herald, commenting on this promise says that "the all-important word in the promise or prediction is the word 'indefinitely,'" and suggests that it might run for centuries. What right has Governor Taft to suggest the possibility of independence if he has not the power to grant it, or to bind the American government? The difference between the lot of a subject under a colonial system and the lot of a citizen in a free country is so great and so essential that no time ought to be lost in letting the Filipinos know which condition they are to expect. If we are going to keep them as subjects common honesty would require that we tell them and not gain advantage over them by deception or misrepresentation. If, on the other hand, we are going to give them their independence at some future time we owe it to them and to ourselves to let it be known when and upon what conditions.

It looks very much as if the republican party was resorting to its old tactics and laying the foundation for another betrayal of the people. When the question was up in congress Mr. Cole offered an amendment promising independence to the Filipinos, the same to be given as soon as they showed themselves competent for self-government. This amendment was objectionable in that it assumed present incapacity, and assumed that that incapacity would continue for an indefinite period. And yet it had the virtue of giving the Filipinos hope of ultimate independence. But the republican members of congress, with two exceptions, voted against this declaration and refused to declare in any way the purpose of the party, or to disclose its plan for dealing with the Filipinos. The situation in the senate was the same. Now, however, Governor Taft is quoted as giving, without the authority of congress, a sort of qualified promise of independence, and this qualified promise will be used by republicans to answer those who insist that the republican party stands for imperialism. If they can carry a few elections on this basis they will then be in a position to declare that the policy of the administration has been indorsed, and the blame will be shifted from the administration to the voters. The republican leaders pursued that method in regard to the money question, and they are pursuing that method in regard to the trust question, and it is quite evident that they are going to adopt this plan with reference to the Philippine question. This course may satisfy those republicans who are so partisan that they will not inquire into the tendency of republican policies, but those who are intelligent enough to think and act for themselves will readily see that we are in the position of a continuing trespasser and that as such we can only justify ourselves by a prompt and complete disclaimer of any intention to remain longer than necessary to assist in the establishment of a stable government.

The Teller resolution asserted our purpose in regard to Cuba and nothing short of a similar resolution can place us right on the Philippine question. If we attempt to justify the permanent holding of the Philippine islands we must be prepared to make them citizens at some future time or to keep them as subjects forever, and the republicans are not willing to advocate either alternative. If we are not willing to hold them as subjects or to make them citizens we ought to be willing to declare our intention to give them independence, and the sooner that declaration is made the better. Democrats ought to insist upon the issue being met squarely. If a republican quotes the vague promise of Governor Taft he ought to be asked by what authority Governor Taft makes the promise. If the president has authorized Governor Taft to hold out the hope of independence, why does he not ask congress to put the hope in such form that the honor of the nation will be pledged to a fulfillment of the promise. Why permit the assurance to be given in such a way that no one can be held responsible for its withdrawal?

The republican party has employed deception so long and so successfully that it seems either unable or unwilling to meet an issue honestly and openly, even where every dictate of honor and conscience join in requiring candor.