

In a speech delivered in support of his anti-trust bill, Mr. Littlefield, the republican member from Maine, presented a list of 800 trusts with an aggregate capitalization of more than \$13,000,000,000. Mr. Littlefield did not include all the trusts and yet his showing should at least be sufficient to challenge the attention of those republican leaders who have all along insisted that there are no trusts.

No Trusts Here.

A bit of food for thought is provided by the Indianapolis Journal in a statement that "most of the controversies between European powers and South American states grow out of their citizens going there in search of trouble. If there were collusion between European governments and their subjects to breed and bring on controversies with South American states it could hardly operate more directly to that end."

Searching For Trouble.

Senator Quay announced in the senate that he would not vote on the passage of the Littlefield anti-trust bill because he held stock in certain corporations that might be designated as trusts. And yet when Senator Blackburn moved to take up the Littlefield bill, Senator Quay had no hesitancy in casting his vote against the proposed consideration of that measure in spite of the fact that he held stock in trusts.

Mr. Quay's Conscience.

In a recent speech Senator Hoar declared that "the rash meddling with the southern race question by the men of the north is unwise and that men of the south know the conditions best and are the negroes' best friend." Not long ago Senator Hoar objected to Mr. Roosevelt's interference with legislation. Can it be that the venerable senator from Massachusetts is bent upon being brought up under the charge of lese majeste?

Mr. Hoar's Danger.

The St. Paul Dispatch refers to a statement made by another paper to the effect that "Bryan will bolt," and the Dispatch adds: "No one would complain if he were to bolt himself on the inside of a coffin." This brutal statement is reproduced here simply for the purpose of showing the extremes to which corporation controlled newspapers will go in their effort to assail one who objects to corporation domination in public affairs.

Merely a Sample.

The newspaper dispatches say that Attorney General Knox has already put the new anti-trust law into operation by advancing the case of the United States against the Northern Securities company in all federal courts. We have yet to hear, however, that Attorney General Knox has undertaken to enforce the criminal clause of the old anti-trust law with respect to trusts generally, although it is reported that indictments have been returned against the representatives of the salt trust in California.

Why Not Indict?

Although the entire country was somewhat agitated by the report that John D. Rockefeller, the great trust magnate, had sent telegrams instructing members of the United States senate to kill all proposed anti-trust legislation, and although it was suggested by a number of newspapers that the "dignity" of the senate required a thorough investigation of these charges, the regular session of the senate adjourned without any effort on the part of that extremely dignified body to probe into the great mystery.

No Probing There.

Now that an indictment has been returned against the representatives of the salt trust in California, why may not the attorney general proceed under the criminal clause of the Sherman law against the representatives of other trusts? If the accusations he has made in the civil proceedings against the beef trust are well founded, they will serve as adequate ground upon which to begin criminal proceedings. It is to be hoped that Mr. Knox in his enthusiasm over so-called anti-trust legislation enacted at the recent session of congress will not entirely overlook the very formidable weapons provided him for a campaign against trusts in the Sherman law.

There Are Others.

In his weekly letter, under date of February 14, Henry Clews, the Wall street banker, said: "A favorable factor is the approaching adjournment of congress on March 4 and the prospect of no radical anti-trust legislation during this session." Evidently Mr. Clews and other Wall street men understand that the trust magnates are not at all alarmed because of any legislation proposed or pushed through by the republican leaders.

"Anti-Trust Laws.

"An old Jerseyman" writing to the New York World, compliments that paper upon the suggestion that Grover Cleveland would be a strong candidate for the presidency. This Jerseyman says that speaking as an old citizen of New Jersey, he can say that Cleveland "would carry Jersey all right." Perhaps that is true. Jersey is a state under whose laws the trusts are organized and in that state the trusts are all powerful. New Jersey's affection for Grover Cleveland is only equalled by New Jersey's affection for the trusts.

Strong in Jersey.

"Life" throws a bit of humor into the situation when it says: "Senator Aldrich's protest against the sacrifice of the manufacturing and industrial interests of the country to the greed of the agricultural interests of the west is timely. Congress should keep it ever in mind that whereas the people of the east have mostly had the sentiments of sordid avarice refined out of them, the people of the west are new yet and pretty hoggish. We cannot, as a Christian nation, afford to let any class suffer through being deficient in greed."

The Greedy West.

Senator Hoar recently delivered an address on Washington in which he urged his hearers to fight against taxation without representation and to oppose the subjugation of a weaker race. He also denounced lust of empire and conquest by Americans. And yet if one of Mr. Hoar's auditors had asked him if men should refuse to vote the republican ticket, it is not at all unlikely that the Massachusetts senator would have urged men to stand by the republican party in the face of the fact that the republican party is, in this day, responsible for all the evils against which Senator Hoar's fine rhetoric is thrown.

A Bit Inconsistent.

A striking illustration of one power acquired by the formation of trusts and one brazenly announced in academic essays on the virtues of such organizations is pointed out by the Pittsburg Post. The Post directs attention to the shutting down of the refineries of the sugar trust at Williamsburg, N. Y., throwing out 5,000 employes and thus depriving independent families of support, adding: "The closing of the cooper shops, an incidental sequence, will almost double the number of the unemployed. The reason for the closing is the regulation of production. That is, to follow out the process, to maintain prices and secure more profits to enable payment of larger dividends."

The Usual Way.

The New York World says that the Rockefeller telegrams were "so peremptory and imperative in their character," that they angered republican leaders. Is it not true that Mr. Rockefeller and other trust magnates have good reason to believe that they may address "peremptory and imperative" messages to republican leaders? Does any one imagine that these trust magnates thought that when they gave enormous sums to the republican campaign fund that they were not to receive something in return for their generosity and is it not true also that the very generous treatment which republican leaders have accorded trust magnates in the present as well as in the past justifies these magnates in issuing orders without any particular regard for the language in which the orders are couched?

Very Plain Orders.

The Fremont (Neb.) Tribune, a republican paper, says: "On general principles it may be set down that Rockefeller is too oily to play such a coarse game as sending telegrams to United States senators warning them not to enact any anti-trust legislation. If he is going to communicate with them it will be at his office in New York or, if in Wash-

The Old Method.

ington, through some trusted third party. He wouldn't be scattering telegrams around among his friends to be 'pulled' on him at the critical moment." The Tribune evidently understands the methods adopted in the past by trust magnates in communicating with republican legislators. Those methods have been very successful and it is not at all surprising that a republican paper would be loath to believe that an experimental plan would be undertaken.

The Littlefield anti-trust bill passed the house on February 6 without a dissenting vote. The measure is not what the democrats would have had and yet they regarded it as a step in the right direction and they voted for it. The democrats were not permitted to amend the bill and the republicans were arraigned by Mr. DeArmond of Missouri because of their disinclination to give the democrats a chance to offer amendments. In his speech upon the measure, Mr. DeArmond pointed out that the bill under consideration was quite a different measure from that originally introduced by Mr. Littlefield. "When the gentleman from Maine started out," said he, "he had blood in his eye and a tomahawk in his hand. But by the time he and his colleagues caught up with the trusts they were smoking the pipe of peace. The sky was clear, and the pickings were to continue good for the trusts."

Some Hard Blows.

Senator Aldrich introduced a bill intended to authorize the secretary of the treasury to deposit government money in national banks to be designated by the secretary and accept as security therefor, instead of United States bonds, bonds of any state in the Union, bonds of municipalities, or railroad bonds which have been paying 4 per cent annually for a period of ten years. The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune says that the government "is positively suffering from the results of prosperity," and he explains that it is to correct this serious difficulty which grows out of too much prosperity that Senator Aldrich introduced his new financial bill. If there is any such thing as "too much prosperity" Senator Aldrich and his associates and the men whom he represents may be depended upon to provide the remedy with accuracy and dispatch.

"Too Much Prosperity."

The Chicago Record-Herald thinks that the fact that "the Mexican silver dollar current in the Philippines had depreciated to a point practically equivalent to the lowest reached by American greenbacks during the civil war," is "an impressive object lesson on the dangers which this country escaped through the election of 1896." The Record-Herald says "by the free, compulsory, and unlimited coinage the inevitable quantity of this fiat would stagger the strongest of governments." This republican paper evidently cannot understand that there might be a marked difference in the silver dollar under conditions wherein the United States government was doing everything in its power to depreciate the value of silver, discriminating against it at every possible opportunity, and conditions wherein this discrimination was removed and the silver metal was given the opportunity to work out its own salvation.

"An Object Lesson."

The Kansas City Journal says that if the preliminary injunction granted by Judge Grosscup in the beef trust case in Chicago shall in the final hearing be made permanent, "the government will have won the greatest victory it has ever accomplished under the Sherman act and that law will be shown to be a powerful feature which can be effectively resorted to at all times for the purpose of preventing and destroying those criminal and injurious agreements and combinations of capitalists of which the people complain." It is well known to the people that the first restraining order issued by Judge Grosscup and the preliminary injunction have not had any effect in restraining the representatives of the beef trust from continuing their conspiracies in restraint of trade. Have we any reason to believe, therefore, that when Judge Grosscup shall make this injunction permanent, it will have any more effective results? The charges made by the attorneys for the government, upon which charges these injunctions were issued, are sufficient as a basis for a criminal indictment. If the representatives of the government really desire to win a great victory, why not proceed against the beef trust under the criminal clause of the Sherman law?

Not a Great Victory.