

CURRENT TOPICS

ATTORNEY GENERAL Hadley of Missouri in a newspaper interview recently, said: "Concerted action is necessary to determine the jurisdiction of the various classes of courts in regard to railroad and anti-trust disputes. It probably will be necessary to ask congress to pass an act taking away a portion of the power of the federal courts in matters pertaining to state legislation, and in that way obviate future controversy. The question at issue is simply as to whether the people of the United States should direct their representatives in congress to take from the United States circuit courts the right to veto the acts of the state legislature. The power which thereby would be taken from the United States circuit courts could be exercised by the courts of the various states, and no injustice will be done to vested interests by requiring that they shall look to the courts of the state in which they do business for the prevention of injustice."

A JUDGE who undertakes to vindicate the law in the presence of the Standard Oil system acts, it seems, at his peril. Judge Landis lives at Logansport, Ind. A Logansport dispatch to the Philadelphia North American follows: "Friends of Judge K. M. Landis, who recently imposed a \$29,240,000 fine on the Standard Oil company, assert that the judge is being followed by detectives in the employ of the octopus and his every word and movement are being reported promptly to Standard Oil people. When Judge Landis came here two strangers followed, and when he went to Indianapolis they kept on his trail. On Landis' return to Logansport the two men came also, and have since been joined by a third. Judge Landis is reported as being advised of their presence and as saying: 'I guess I can stand inspection.' Just what is to be gained by keeping an eye on Judge Landis no one knows."

MR. BRYAN recently visited Peoria, Ill., and speaking to a representative of the Peoria Herald-Transcript he referred to a statement made by Robert G. Ingersoll, in Peoria, in the fall of 1896, after the election, concerning himself. Mr. Bryan said: "Colonel Ingersoll said 'when a man has been defeated for the presidency that is generally the last of him. I think Mr. Bryan has seen his best days.'" Mr. Bryan was going south and by the time he reached Georgia, Colonel Ingersoll's opinion had been sent out by the Associated Press and published in the newspapers generally. A Cincinnati paper telegraphed him the substance of the interview en route, and asked if he had anything to say. Mr. Bryan said: "I wired back the following reply: 'I do not care to discuss Colonel Ingersoll's interview. He is not an authority on the future. He does not believe there is a hereafter for anyone.'"

AND NOW IT IS John D. Rockefeller chief among the "defenders of national honor" and leader among "the calm, conservative thinkers of the country," who is preaching calamity. In an interview at Cleveland, Ohio, with a representative of the New York American, John D. Rockefeller, "speaking earnestly and deliberately," said: "The policy of the present administration toward great business combinations of all kinds can have only one result. It means disaster to the country, financial depression and financial chaos. The world already has a fair dose of this, since the extreme penalty imposed on one corporation, with a limited number of shareholders, has caused a loss of confidence, reflected in a falling stock market, a tightening of money and a fear of the future. The newspapers are full of this, and reflect the feeling of unrest. What will be the effect when similar action is taken against corporations with myriads of stockholders scattered throughout the country, the investors, the widows and orphans? There can be but one answer. The present situation will be intensified many fold. It does not require an expert to reason this out. The most superficial thinker can do it. I will go further and say today that because of the

administration, with its reports every five minutes of new actions and of heavy fines, the country is already beginning to drift toward the rocks of financial depression. Confidence is gone, and confidence is the basis of all prosperity. With confidence established there can be no stopping of the wheels of progress. Without it, all is at a standstill."

IN THE SAME interview Mr. Rockefeller further said: "There was a time not long before the present runaway, hit or miss impulsive agitation began, that I would be called up on the telephone, say by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., say by Mr. Morgan's office, and asked if I wanted to come in a syndicate and a certain allotment of shares would be given to me, but I was also told that I would have to make immediate arrangements. If my reply was that I needed several days for consideration, the telephone receiver would be hung up in all likelihood. When I called several days later and said I would go in the syndicate, I would be curtly informed that I had lost my opportunity—that the syndicate had been completed. What is the situation now? I am called and asked to participate in many syndicates, but in none of them is the time for decision fixed on the instant. Instead of the former attitude I know they are content to await my decision and I know there is no danger that I will be too late. I can judge in another way. Requests are coming in to me today for money from quarters it was least expected would be asking for money some time ago. Today I was offered the unprecedented interest of seven per cent for \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000. The security was beyond all certainty secure. If there was confidence enough to unlock the money vaults of the country, I would not have been asked this. What has been the secret of the marvelous cohesive force of the company? Nothing but absolute confidence in each other. Nothing but confidence in the men who directed the policies of the Standard Oil company. It could not have lasted had there been any of this browbeating and crushing they speak of."

THE RECENT deaths of Alabama's senators, Morgan and Pettus, the former on June 11, and the latter on July 27 are, in the brevity of the time within which the state lost two senators without a parallel in the history of the union. Referring to this fact a writer in the New York Evening Post says: "The nearest approach to it occurred in the case of South Carolina in 1850, when Senator John C. Calhoun and Franklin H. Elmore, the man who was appointed as Calhoun's successor, died within less than two months of each other, Calhoun dying on March 31 and Elmore on May 29. In 1857-1858 South Carolina again lost two senators by death within a brief period, Senator Andrew P. Butler dying on May 25, 1857, and Senator Josiah J. Evans on May 6, 1858. Some forty years ago Vermont lost two senators, Jacob Collamer and Solomon Foot, within a period of less than five months, Collamer dying on November 9, 1865, and Foot on March 28, 1866; and some ten years ago Mississippi lost two senators, James Z. George and Edward C. Walthall, within a period of a little over eight months, George dying on August 14, 1897, and Walthall on April 21, 1898."

IN A NEWSPAPER interview given out at Cleveland, John D. Rockefeller said some good words for Secretary Taft and Governor Hughes. The New York World report says: "Mr. Rockefeller was unstinting in his praise of Secretary Taft and Charles E. Hughes, governor of New York. 'Both of them,' he said 'are deliberate men, safe men.' Secretary Taft, Mr. Rockefeller said he believed to be a man who would do as his conscience dictated, and that he would not be guided by the beliefs and policies of a predecessor. He said the public utilities bill, the gas investigation and other public acts of Governor Hughes all characterized him as a thinking man and not an impulsive,

heedless one. This is the first interview Mr. Rockefeller has ever given of this character. Throughout he was most earnest. He had evidently carefully thought over what he was going to say before he consented to be interviewed."

SECRETARY TAFT, returning from his summer retreat in Canada, visited the president at Oyster Bay. A correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald made to the secretary this statement: "Mr. Taft, the Standard Oil king has placed you seemingly in the position of not being in sympathy with Mr. Roosevelt's agitation against the trusts. He attacks the administration, which in this case means the president, and singles you out as a safe and sane man." Mr. Taft replied: "I can't help what Mr. Rockefeller says. The president and I understand one another. As far as the confidence of the American people in President Roosevelt is concerned their support of his administration is the best answer. Any action taken by Mr. Roosevelt or his officials is not the result of an hour's deliberation. Depend on that." A later Cleveland dispatch says that Mr. Rockefeller denies giving out the interview.

AT THE TIME Judge Landis imposed the \$29,240,000 fine against the Standard Oil trust he instructed the grand jury to take up the part played by the Chicago & Alton Railroad company in the granting of the rebates for the acceptance of which the oil trust was fined. It began to look as though there would be "something doing" in the prosecution of rebate evils and other sins of trust magnates. But little by little it began to leak out that the situation was not so serious for the magnates as it seemed. The first news was given by the Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, who said: "The government many months ago promised the Chicago and Alton railroad officials immunity from prosecution for 'granting' rebates to the Standard Oil company if those railroad officials would furnish information with which to convict the Standard Oil company of 'receiving' those rebates. This promise of immunity was made on behalf of the department of justice by former District Attorney Charles B. Morrison of Chicago, with the approval of William H. Moody, who was at that time attorney general of the United States. On the strength of this promise of immunity, the officials of the Chicago and Alton did grant information respecting the transactions which were involved in the case in which Judge Landis recently imposed the fine of \$29,240,000 upon the Standard at Chicago. Several days before Attorney General Bonaparte left Lenox, Mass., on his way to Washington, via Oyster Bay, these facts were laid before the attention of Mr. Bonaparte in a letter, which he received from District Attorney Morrison. Attorney General Bonaparte, who returned to Washington today, has written an official letter to Judge Landis, calling his attention to these facts."

IN THE SAME Washington dispatch it is said: "One thing is almost a foregone conclusion—the Chicago and Alton railroad or Mr. Harriman will not be prosecuted in connection with the same transaction for which the Standard Oil was fined at Chicago. It is not known here what action Judge Landis will take when he receives Bonaparte's letter. When that letter was written Mr. Bonaparte probably expected that Judge Landis would call off the investigation which the Chicago grand jury is now understood to be making in an effort to return an indictment against the Chicago and Alton for 'granting' the rebates for which the Standard was fined for 'receiving.' For some days the grand jury at Chicago has been investigating, with a view, it is understood, of returning indictments against the Chicago and Alton. If this grand jury investigation relates to something not related to the 4,391 indictments which the federal grand jury at Chicago returned in 1906 against the Standard for receiving rebates from the Chicago and Alton, Chicago, Burlington and