

OCTOBER 12, 1905

right to play the "baby" when it is all over. Were it not that the dear chancellor will finger a part of the \$10,000,000 of tainted money donated by Rockefeller, people might believe he is not really as bad as he is painted.—Battle Creek Enterprise.

HARVESTER TRUST IN OHIO

The complaints of Ohio farmers have drawn from Attorney General Ellis a promise that he will look into the operations of the harvester trust. The Columbus Press-Post believes that this is a mere campaign buncombe and says:

The encroachments of the harvester trust upon the entire state of Ohio are well known, seemingly to about everybody except the man whose chief business it is to know about it. This company is now doing business in many counties. In this combine are merged the interests of the McCormick Harvester company, the Deering Harvester company, the Milwaukee Harvester company, the Plano Manufacturing company, the Wardner, Bushnell & Glessner company and the D. M. Osborne Harvester company. Such a gigantic pooling of interests could have been made for no other purpose than to suppress competition and to obtain control of the market in which the farmer must buy nearly every implement and tool which his trade requires. Why has the attorney general allowed this monster combination to rob the farmers according to its pleasure and to paralyze his power to curb its robberies until a petition for relief is necessary? Let the investigation proceed, and let it proceed with such rapidity that the result will be made known before the election. In no other way can Attorney General Ellis disabuse the minds of the people of the belief that his investigation is merely a "campaign promise."

THE INSURANCE PROBLEM

The insurance revelations and the agitation among insurance officials for federal regulation to replace state regulation of insurance indicate a fear on the part of these officials that state regulation will become so rigid that it will prevent further peculations and that their only hope for the preservation of theft and graft lies in federal control:

The Mutual disclosures show porcine greed. The McCurdys, father, son, son-in-law, brother-in-law, cousin, niece's husband and the rest, should have been satisfied to divide evenly and to give the policyholders a square half of the money coming to them. Son McCurdy alone showed a realization of the family bogishness in voluntarily reducing his bonuses, which otherwise would have soon swallowed up all the dividends. In its simplicity the McCurdy family system has commendable features. The money was not hid. It was not squandered on others. It was there, and the McCurdys took it for themselves. Naturally the dividends were "deferred"—a delusive word in that it held out hope that they would really be paid some day. There was no concealment of these family matters. They appeared on the books of the company openly. Everybody in the insurance world knew them. And all this time Francis Hendricks was blind and deaf and dumb. Why? And why is he still superintendent of insurance?—New York World.

The Iroquois club of Chicago, a democratic organization, having declared for federal regulation, the Jefferson club has come out in the following strong declaration for state regulation:

Whereas, The federal government by constitutional interpretation has come into absolute control of the banks, the railroads and the trusts, and, by pretense of regulating the same, has passed laws which have created a horde of officials and erected a centralized system which is at all times either identical with or which operates with the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the federal government, and which system in its essential nature lives, moves and has its being in graft and corruption; and whereas, the states have been cowed and discouraged by the action of the federal government since the war between the states, and useful legislation by the states has been set aside by the federal courts by strained constructions of the interstate commerce clause of the constitution, so that the states no longer possess even police power except at the discretion of the federal courts; and whereas the federal government has not regulated the trusts and the banks, but has used the interstate commerce clause of

the constitution to prevent the state from regulating them so that for at least twenty years the federal government, having obtained control of them, has not only neglected to regulate them but has prevented the states from regulating them; and whereas, the insurance companies constitute the one giant power of plutocracy yet within state control; and whereas, the states have ample and competent power to regulate them and to correct all insurance abuses; and whereas, this government was founded upon the democratic principle of local self-government, and the federal government has no power except that expressly granted to it by the states; and whereas, legislation declaring the business of insurance to be interstate commerce would be a transparent fraud upon the constitution and a repudiation of its meaning as it has been repeatedly construed by the supreme court of the United States; and whereas, the insurance companies, led by Senator John F. Dryden of New Jersey, president of the Prudential Insurance company, are anxious to take shelter behind a Washington bureaucracy; and whereas, the fact alone that they desire this centralization is evidence that it will be detrimental to the people and to the principles of free government; therefore be it resolved by the Political Action committee of the Jefferson club of Chicago, That we denounce the proposition that the states shall surrender their power over the insurance companies to the general government, and enter an earnest protest thereto.

CIVIL WAR AMONG REPUBLICANS

Senator Foraker's rebellious utterances on the stump in Ohio, where he has announced his hostility to the Roosevelt program for the regulation of railroads, have disclosed a factional difference in republican ranks which foretells interesting developments. The Washington correspondent of the New York Journal of Commerce writes:

Senator Foraker's speech is likely in one way to strengthen the psychological influence exerted by Mr. Bryan's letter. It is the first gun probably in the campaign against the acceptance of a strictly administration candidate for the presidency by the next republican national convention. The fact that Mr. Taft, before leaving for the Philippines, strongly indorsed the president's views on railway rebates adds a complicating feature to the situation. If Taft is really to be the administration candidate for the nomination, the situation in Ohio and the possible developments of the coming winter, when rebate legislation is up for discussion, might furnish to the opposition republicans a very powerful handle owing to President Roosevelt's expected support of Taft and to the fact that what the latter has already said doubtless commits him in a way that would make it impossible to temporize with the issue if it were presented in a national convention. This might compel the administration to abandon railway legislation or to take up some other man as its candidate, or if no satisfactory man proved to be available, it might conceivably lead the president to yield to solicitation and go in for a third term himself. This would simply be a case of the kind attributed to a certain English statesman, who was not solicitous for office for his own sake, but who, seeing that no one else could or would carry out his ideas, and feeling sure that his own ideas were the ones upon which the country must stand or fall, continued to hold his place out of pure patriotism. Diverse and conflicting as the present influences now working under and about the railway problem seem to be, it is the opinion of many that all the materials for producing a sharp split in the republican party are at hand, and that such a split, if avoided, will be escaped from merely by the withdrawal of the program of railway reform by the administration and the substitution of something that will be purely nominal in character. The weakest element in the administration's position is regarded here as being the apparent fact that it does not know precisely what it wants or how far to go. The other side know exactly what they want and what they do not want.

The bomb exploded right in the midst of the Herrick-Roosevelt camp, and after the smoke subsided, and the campaign managers rushed up to gather up the fragments of the carefully builded air castle which had contained the Herrick-Roosevelt friendship, not a vestige remained. And thus one bubble

of the republican campaign has already burst, and the very foundation of the entire campaign structure totters in consequence thereof. The Herrick-Roosevelt friendship myth is a myth no longer, for by the statement of Ohio's senior senator, it cannot exist while Theodore Roosevelt occupies the position he does concerning railroad rebates and Myron T. Herrick sits with the board of directors of two gigantic railway companies, namely the M., K. & T. and the Santa Fe, two of the most notorious lawbreakers in the entire southwest. Senator Dick really believes as Foraker does on this question, but he didn't intend to put his views into language, neither did he intend to have them voiced during the campaign. But Foraker has shouted them from one end of the state to the other, and all the efforts of a disgusted and demoralized republican state chairman cannot call them back. Senator Dick is now in a position to fully appreciate the words of the ancient philosopher who said: "What you keep by you, you may change and mend; but words once spoken can never be recalled."—Columbus Press-Post.

RAILWAY REGULATION

As the session of congress approaches interest in the railway problem increases. It is to be the chief question before congress and the fate of restrictive legislation is much in doubt:

The rate regulation compromise which has been suggested to the president, providing for an amendment to the law whereby the interstate commerce commission shall be vested with authority to inquire into rates, and, if it finds them unreasonable, so to declare, has a decided aspect of fairness. The commission is not to be authorized to fix rates, but, under the proposed compromise, when it declares a rate unreasonable, the transportation company is required immediately to cease charging it and to fix a reasonable rate. By experiment only can the common carrier determine what rate will meet the approval of the commission. To all appearances, a measure of this description will amply meet existing needs. It is doubtful that any sentiment really exists in favor of empowering the commission to fix rates. This would not only give the government supervisory power but it would practically transfer to the hands of the government the management of railroad finances, which would be a long step towards government ownership. To the principle of government ownership of the railroads the American people have not yet subscribed, nor do they show signs of being disposed to it. They ask that the railroad companies shall be compelled to observe the rule of common honesty. Ought not this to be susceptible of accomplishment without moving in the direction of confiscation?—Pittsburg Leader.

The "nigger" of railway discrimination is scarcely elected from one woodpile before he is discovered hiding in another. The interstate commerce law requires that the same rates shall be given to all shippers, big or little, and in the printed tariffs this requirement is met. The Elkins law contains stringent provisions in regard to rebates, and rebates in the old form are now seldom paid. But some of the big shippers have been amply compensated for the abolition of the earlier kinds of discrimination by the introduction of the private car line and the private terminal track and sidetrack systems; and it has been developed at the hearing at present going on in the federal court in Chicago that the packers have been receiving rebates in the guise of damages. Many thousands of dollars, it appears, have been paid them for injuries to live stock and dressed meats in transit which never occurred. There is the best reason for believing that the packers are by no means the only large firms that have been and are receiving rebates disguised as damages. A thorough investigation probably would reveal that rebates are being paid in this form to many other concerns in Chicago and in all parts of the country, despite the earnest protestations of railway managers that the rebate evil is dead. The claim department of a railroad is an excellent place to cover up rebates. Property in course of transportation is constantly being damaged by delays, rough handling and wrecks. It is an easy matter to hand over to a favored customer larger sums than his losses entitle him to, and even regularly to indemnify him for losses never sustained. Such action is plainly as much a violation of the Elkins law as the direct payment of rebates, and should be so treated by the courts.—Chicago Tribune.