

features the department of justice will not be under the necessity of adopting the roundabout method of prosecution for conspiracy. It will be able to uncover cases of rebating and to punish with imprisonment those who violate the law by conspiracy or otherwise.

* * * * *

PROFESSOR ROSS NEEDED

It is to be hoped that Chancellor Andrews will succeed in retaining Professor Ross at the state university. The divergent views of these two noted educators have not lessened their esteem for each other, and that is as it should be in a great institution of liberal education. But Nebraskans are especially interested in keeping these two gentlemen in close proximity.

As an economist Professor Ross is one of the nation's most acute social and political critics. It may even be said that he wields a scalpel which lays bare with unerring science the cancers in the body politic. An accurate diagnosis almost always suggests the remedy, but if Professor Ross has not offered a panacea for our ills it is not because he has no remedy to suggest but because the nation is passing through a period of evolution that requires a different remedy for every new stage of the disease.

Professor Ross has been a most successful critic and has shed light upon many dark places, because he is not one who believes that he should "let well enough alone." Chancellor Andrews, on the other hand, is rather inclined to take that shibboleth as his maxim. He holds that the ills from which the nation suffers are not deadly. They are no worse than the ills that afflicted us half a century or a century ago. It is well to criticize, but much that is thought to be evil is really good. Great fortunes are good. Concentration of the titles to wealth is good. At all events, it is no worse than unrestricted competition. Every stage of economic evolution has its compensations, and the millenium is never reached. "It is better to bear those ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of."

If Chancellor Andrews is to remain at the Nebraska university, he could have no better counter-irritant than Professor Ross. Such an association of opposing intellectual forces will be beneficial to the students. It would be a distinct evil to have the impression go abroad among the students that in a university which bears the stigma of Rockefellerism a professor holding antagonistic views to almost all that is meant by Rockefellerism cannot be retained as an instructor when it is possible to retain as a chancellor one who is an open and sincere apologist for Rockefellerism.

* * * * *

COMMISSIONER GARFIELD'S FAILURE

Commissioner Garfield has again invited contempt by issuing a weak and foolish report. It contains nothing of value and much that deserves censure. Perhaps the most amazing part of it is the passage in which he defends his beef trust report.

The commissioner declares that only in a few instances were his figures shown to be wrong. The impertinence of this statement is realized when it is recalled that there has been no investigation for the purpose of disproving his figures. The refutations which have been made from time to time have been necessarily of a restricted character. It was more by inference than by proof that Mr. Garfield's report was discredited, but the inferences were inevitable. The most striking evidence against the reliability of his report was the discovery that he accepted as correct the figures submitted to him by the packers in a set of books kept for the purpose of deception. The true figures as to profits were concealed by various fraudulent accounts or in books that Commissioner Garfield never saw.

The commissioner strives to answer the severe criticisms of his reports that have appeared in the newspapers. It transpires that he did not publish his findings relative to illegal combination among the packers because the department of justice was then taking steps to prosecute the packers under the anti-trust law and required secrecy as to the evidence it possessed. If time shall develop that this evidence is valuable to the government the commissioner may yet have the joy of hearing some words of praise for his work, but the public will doubt his worth as a commissioner until that time, and especially now when it is currently reported that he is to be a witness for the beef trust in the trial at Chicago.

Another criticism of the beef trust report was that it contained nothing concerning private car line abuses. Commissioner Garfield states that at the time the report was made "the extent and nature of government control over such companies was the subject of pending legislation, and it would have been improper to anticipate the decision by assuming in advance any jurisdiction over them." The

very name of Commissioner Garfield's bureau "the bureau of corporations" is a sufficient answer to this feeble plea.

After apologizing for his former report the commissioner proceeds to discuss control of corporations and railways. His suggestions are all of a vague character. He writes:

It is universally recognized that the great highways of commerce should be open to all upon equal terms. It is likewise true that the opportunities for the individual to engage in industrial enterprise should be equally free. The individual is not strong enough ordinarily to protect himself against a great corporation. He can be secure in his rights only under a law which subjects the corporation to regulation by a government whose jurisdiction is broad enough and whose power is great enough to compel obedience. Such a law the question of the reasonableness of combination, of conspiracies in restraint of trade, of monopolistic control, would be left, as they should be, for the determination of the courts; and the government would then have, as it should have, the opportunity at all times to know the detailed operations of those corporations to which it has granted such powers, upon which it has imposed great responsibilities and over which it will exercise its full measure of protection so long as they obey the laws of the land.

There is nothing definite in the entire passage, but it seems to contain an intimation that the courts should be allowed to deal with corporations unhampered by government regulation. Presumably when the courts have decided that a corporation is violating the law the government will not "exercise its full measure of protection" over that corporation. This is a terrible threat. When the corporations do wrong the government withdraws its protection. It will not punish the lawbreakers; it will merely frown on them. Such is Commissioner Garfield's remedy. He may be sure that he will not be frowned upon by lawbreakers.

* * * * *

LAMAR SHOULD PROVE IT

Representative Lamar has made a serious charge against Representative Williams that calls for immediate explanation.

"He's a dog, that's what he is," says Mr. Lamar. "I'll show him with his swelled head and his Heidelberg jokes, that he cannot charge me with something he cannot substantiate."

No gentleman should ever make a charge that he cannot substantiate, and Representative Lamar should hasten to tell a curious world about this dreadful Heidelberg joke. What is it? Can it possibly be as bad as some of Chauncey Depew's jokes? If it is Mr. Lamar should be made to prove his horrible charge or apologize.

One argument used by those who oppose an elective railway commission is that it will increase the aggressiveness of the railways to control Nebraska politics. Could the railways be any more aggressive than at present, and if that is possible, must the people refrain from passing laws for their own protection lest the railways override these laws? If they were to adopt such a policy the people would admit that self-government is a failure in Nebraska. The cure for the present evils of self-government is more self-government. The people of Nebraska should have a direct primary system and the initiative and referendum.

President Roosevelt's latest defense of Paul Morton is the least excusable of all. The case against the Santa Fe rebaters was dismissed because of a technical error in its presentation, and yet the president declares that his exoneration of Mr. Morton was completely sustained.

Paul Morton has appealed to policyholders to protect the New York Life against blackmailing legislation. Insurance officials willing to conduct business on an honest basis need never fear blackmail.

Indications now point to a complete revision of the present revenue law by the next Nebraska legislature if the people are true to themselves and elect men who stand for "a square deal."

The senate gave some attention a few days ago to the question whether a member accused of crime should be left off committees. This should be referred to Messrs. Platt and Depew.

Senator Millard has been assigned to the interoceanic canals committee. Is this because of his railway proclivities?

The most surprising part about the recent bank failures is that there has been no panic. Perhaps that is to come.

The bank failures in Chicago have given Tom Lawson an other lease of life.