

experiencing no trouble. The building managers' union professed to regard these demands as outrageous enough to justify them in breaking their contracts with tenants and putting thousands of people — with whose rights and comforts they, and not the elevator men, were charged by contract—to the extreme of inconvenience and to serious risks of financial loss.

In those circumstances the merits of the conflict were of minor importance. It could make no difference to tenants of the buildings whether the elevator men were forcing extravagant demands or not. They do not appear to have done so, but that is beside the question. The important consideration is that building managers who had agreed to furnish their tenants with elevator service, arbitrarily refused to furnish it. This was not because they could not get the service; it was because they couldn't get it on their own terms. And they pride themselves upon being "business" men!

Serious as this indefensible breach of contract by the building managers' union was to the victimized tenants, it had its ridiculous aspects. One of them is the fact that many of the suffering tenants put the blame upon the union that represents labor interests, giving their sympathies to the union that represents financial interests. Could class prejudice go much further without becoming positively comical? Another of these ridiculous aspects of the situation was produced by the air of outraged innocence with which the walking delegates of the building managers' union condemned the exactions of the strikers; for a more exacting and arbitrary union could not be found in a year's journey than that of the building managers. The one-sided leases they require testify eloquently to the power of their union and the audacity of their walking delegates. They adapt to their peculiar requirements the same coercive methods to bring building managers into their union that the less

"financial" labor unions do, and they exert against tenants the same kind of combination to shut off competition. When a tenant deals with a building manager in Chicago, he finds himself in most cases "up against" the compactest kind of trade union. Yet this association of house renters turns cry baby when it faces a few slight exactions of an elevator men's union. In the vocabulary of expressive slang, "wouldn't that jar you?"

Congressman John S. Williams, of Mississippi, who will probably be the Democratic leader in the next House, a distinction he has richly earned and a place he would ably fill, pierced the trust question to the core in his speech on the trust publicity bill. A full report of his speech will be found at page 1924 of the Congressional Record of February 7. We call especial attention to this extract:

I do not suppose there is a man in this House that would deny the right to any individual in America to do all the business that is done in America in a given line provided he did it in free competition with the world, in an open and fair field, and with equal opportunity to all other men. Everybody knows that neither individual nor corporation can monopolize any business in that way. I defy the wisest Republican on the other side to give one single solitary instance of the successful operation of a monopolistic combination or a trust which has not rested upon special privileges granted either by law or by a corporation permitted by law to grant them. There is not one.

Whole volumes could not more clearly and truly diagnose the trust disease. In those few words all the complexities of the trust question, so baffling to the shacklers of cunning because they want to remedy the evil without disturbing its cause, are unraveled. Whoever reflects upon Mr. Williams's words with an open mind will conclude that there is nothing complex about the trust question except the financial interests of men who think it patriotic to earn their bread in the sweat of other men's faces.

We are not prepared to point out the cunning African in the wood pile

of the Livingston-Elkins-Nelson anti-trust legislation now before Congress, but we are sure that a particularly cunning one is working there. John D. Rockefeller's alleged demand upon the Senate to head off anti-trust legislation is proof positive. Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have sent this message to several senators:

We are opposed to any anti-trust legislation. Our counsel, Mr. —, will see you. It must be stopped.—John D. Rockefeller.

If Mr. Rockefeller did not send that message it is evident that some one wants it to appear that he did. Whoever that some one may have been he had one of two motives: anxiety to promote anti-trust legislation by making Congress believe that Rockefeller, the potentate of trustdom, is panic-struck; or anxiety to complicate and nullify anti-trust legislation by throwing Congressmen into a panic in which they will improvidently pass bad measures. The former motive is highly improbable. If Rockefeller had regarded the message as hostile he would have disclaimed it. The second motive is probable. Rockefeller may be willing to wink at the use of his name without authority, hoping that it will produce a panic. If he himself sent the message, as seems now to be generally believed, it is inconceivable that he did so with a view to preventing anti-trust legislation. Unless he has wholly lost his head he knows that nothing would be more likely to precipitate such legislation than impudent orders against it from him. His purpose, if he did send the message while clothed in his right (though not necessarily righteous) mind, could have been nothing else than to help rush through what looks like anti-trust legislation upon its face, but is within full of bad men's schemes and trust corruption. John D. Rockefeller is too "devilish sly" to make such a blunder as the trust organs accuse him of in connection with this most extraordinary message. The document smells rank of his dark and tricky ways, as Miss Tarbell de-