cipality. It is emphatically a home rule measure.

The officers of the American Anti-Trust League deserve a reputation for patience and perseverance. In their efforts to dig out the trusts through the attorney general's office and the White House, they resemble nothing so much as a persevering dog industriously making the dirt fly at one end of a ground hog hole, while the ground hog suns himself at the other end and looks on. If the league hasn't already reached the conclusion, it must reach it soon, that the administration has no more intention of enforcing the anti-trust law than it has of living up to civil service principles. The attitude of this administration toward trusts was determined once for all when Mr. Roosevelt went to Pittsburg to make a Fourth of July speech under the chaperonage of his pro-trust attorney general, and warned his auditors that the trusts must be handled very tenderly lest they collapse and do untold damage to Republican prosperity.

—

Mr. Roosevelt now has before him a letter from a joint committee of the Anti-Trust League and an assembly of the Knights of Labor. It was written last July, but remains unacknowledged as it probably always will. This letter recites the experience of the committee for a year past in their work of trying to get the administration to move against the trusts. They wrote to the attorney general August 19, 1901, receiving in reply an admission that he had formerly been the legal adviser for the Carnegie steel trust, but accompanied with an assurance that his department was ready to enforce the Federal laws "wherever there is probable cause for believing that they have been violated." Acting upon that assurance the committee submitted a sworn brief of evidence of violation of the anti-trust law by the Carnegie steel trust, the great steel trust, the armor plate trust, several railroad combinations, the Standard Oil trust and the anthracite coal trust. The attorney general replied on the 11th of September, 1901, with a promise to "examine these papers with care at as early a date as is possible" and advise the committee of his conclusions. That is now nearly a year ago; but the attorney general has neither notified the committee of his conclusions nor proceeded against the corporations accused.

—

After waiting in vain more than three months for the attorney general to act upon their charges against the trusts named above, the joint committee already mentioned prepared the documentary evidence, absolutely conclusive as to the facts, against what is known as "The Eastern Railroad Association," and submitted it in person to President Roosevelt himself. This was on the 21st of December, 1901. The President utterly ignored the subject for three months, but in response to a reminder sent him on the 3d of April, 1902, he caused his secretary to reply that the papers had been "by the President's direction brought to the attention of the attorney general on March 27." The secretary suggested in his letter that the committee "communicate with Mr. Knox on the subject." They attempted to do so, but from that day to this have been able to get no further response about the case submitted than the assurance of a clerk in the attorney general's department that Mr. Knox "says he will not be able to take it up at all." Having waited three months longer, until the 9th of July, the committee laid all the facts before President Roosevelt, and as yet they have heard nothing from him. While they are digging away in this fashion for the trust ground hog, can't they see him cozily perched upon Mr. Roosevelt's shoulders and from that safe vantage ground watching their performances with amused curiosity?

—

The particulars of the case against "The Eastern Railroad Association," about which the administration manifests so much and such suspicious reserve, were given in full to Congress on the 21st of June last, in a series of documents which Representative Dudley G. Wooten embodied in a speech from the floor. From these documents it appears that "The Eastern Railroad Association" is a secret combination of nearly all the railroads of the Atlantic coast. By the terms of the combination agreement each railroad is prohibited from making terms for the use of any patented invention, without the consent of a committee of the "combine," thus subjecting inventors of railway improvements to the dictation of the combined railroad interests. The attorney general's office during Cleveland's administration, and again under McKinley's, gave opinions to the effect that this combination is not prohibited by the anti-trust law. But neither opinion referred to judicial precedent, nor was either based upon any definite and controlling legal principle. Both were personal rather than professional opinions. Against these adverse opinions the joint committee of the Anti-Trust league and Knights of Labor have submitted the opinion of William E. Chandler, together with a carefully prepared professional opinion by Senator Turner, both of whom advise that the case comes clearly within the anti-trust law. In the absence of direct judicial precedent their views are apparently borne out by the text of the law, while those of Attorney General Olney and Attorney General Griggs are apparently not. For that law forbids "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce, among the several states," etc., and also combinations "to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several states," etc. If the railroad "combine" above described is not such a combination it is hard to understand what would be. Clearly the combination is organized to nullify trade rights in patented inventions. While the owners of patents are not entitled as a rule to much sympathy, since they also are monopolists, there is abundant

truth in Mr. Chandler's remark, that if patents are objectionable it is for Congress, not for railroad "combines," to abolish them. However all this may be, the charge against the administration is that it refuses to prosecute a trust against which at least probable cause is shown, and that it haughtily and contemptuously ignores citizens who furnish it with evidence sufficient to convict should the courts hold the law applicable. This is only one case, and no more proves a pro-trust animus on the part of the administration than one swallow makes a summer; but when considered in connection with the manner in which other complaints against trusts have been treated by the administration, it goes far to confirm the growing and just belief that from top to bottom the administration is dominated by trust interests and sympathies.

After a three months' investigation Mr. Frank B. Thurber reported to the Trans-Mississippi Congress at St. Paul on the 19th that he had been unable to substantiate the charge that there is a beef trust. There probably is none, then, for Mr. Thurber has a well-trained eye for trusts.

To thousands all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf far up into the primeval forests of Canada, this description by John Stone Pardee's Red Wing Argus, of Frank D. Larrabee, the Democratic candidate for attorney general of Minnesota, will be intensely interesting:

His father was a Republican of the Lincoln following, an abolitionist when abolition was a title to persecution, which is in itself sufficient reason for his son's being a Democrat. Larrabee himself took it for granted he was a Republican, and cast his first vote for a Republican President. But when he moved to Minnesota in 1882 he put in his kit a copy of "Progress and Poverty." He read it three times that winter. He saw the injustice of letting speculators hold land out of use while workers pay the taxes on their useful belongings for the speculator's enrichment. He saw that equality of rights was not accomplished by abolition of chattel slavery and that inequalities were perpetuated by Republican policies of tariffs and bounties. He became a Democrat down to the roots, and anyone who has traced the influence of Henry George knows that type of democrat. He never held office but that once in Clay county, never asked for it, took an honor that was thrust on him then as he accepts the nomination for attorney general now. He has never been looking for office, but he has never ceased to labor for the cause of Democracy, a cause to him for such earnestness and zeal as the ardor of abolition was to his father.

One of the gratifying features about the coming election in Illinois is the disposition of independent voters to break up the combination rings of Democratic and Republican politicians in legislative districts, by taking advantage of the law providing for minority representation in the lower house of the legislature. Under this law members of the lower house are elected at large in senatorial districts, three from each. Every vote counts three if cast for one candidate, one and a half if cast for two candidates, and one if cast for three candidates. It is possible, therefore, to elect a minority party candidate in almost any district by throwing the full party vote for one man, which multiplies it by three. Consequently, Republicans are accustomed to nominate only two candidates in Republican districts, while Democrats nominate only two in Democratic districts, each thereby leaving the way open for one minority candidate to be returned. A nomination is usually, therefore, equivalent to election. So, instead of promoting good government this system has made it easier than ever for monopoly corporations to control Illinois legislatures. They have had only to control the nominating conventions. But this year the independent vote of both parties is revolting against these corporate "combines" in politics.

One district in which a vigorous revolt is being made is the seventh senatorial, where Western Starr is the Democratic candidate for senator (p. 276) against the notorious John Humphrey. The corporations felt so certain of Humphrey's election in a district which is overwhelmingly Republican, believing that Republicans would vote for a yellow dog if he bore the regular party label, that they neglected the Democratic nomination for senator and Starr got it. He is indorsed by the Voters' League, and unless the Republican voters of the district have been correctly sized up by the corporations, he will defeat Humphrey. But the corporations were not so careless with reference to the Democratic nomination for the lower house. Under the minority system his election was assured. They accordingly looked to it, and secured their own kind of candidate, a member of the local Democratic-Republican ring. Now, however, a Republican candidate has been put forward. Like Mr. Starr for the senate, he is indorsed by the Voters' League. This is Frank E. Herdman, who has been for three years president of that remarkable exemplar of home rule and direct legislation, the village of Winnetka. If the democratic-Democrats of his district vote for him alone, each of their votes will count three and probably result in the defeat of one of the corporation candidates. If, on top of that, they and the democratic-Republicans of the district unite and elect Starr as senator, one of the worst nests of political and corporate corruption in the state will have been broken up.

Another district in which the Democratic-Republican combination is to be assailed by a representative minority candidate is that in which Alderman John Powers holds sway. Only one Democrat has been nominated there for the lower house, and his brand is no riddle. Nominations having always been equivalent to election, the corporations have seen to it that the nominee should not be too democratic but just Democratic enough. But this cozy arrangement is to be rudely broken into by Clarence S. Darrow, partner of the late Gov. Altgeld, who has been nominated by petition and will make a