The Public

Fifth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1902. Number 229.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Fitzsimmons, the prize fighter, has been made somewhat of a butt for ridicule because in referring to his recent defeat in the prize ring he said:

> I prayed to win this fight. It was the first time I ever prayed to win. I lay in that room and prayed: 'God give me strength to win this battle, and I will be thankful. Amen."

There does seem to be a false ring about that. But why should it be any more incongruous for a prize fighter to pray with sporting zeal for divine strength to "slug" his adversary, than for a clergyman to pray with patriotic fervor for military victories? Is it so much more religious to kill than to "slug."

If a report of the 19th from London is true, a use has been found for idle "nobles," Lady Raglan having agreed to place her coronation robes and coronet on exhibition for the benefit of a charity, wearing them herself just as in real royal life. She thus becomes as educational as a wax figure, while the exhibition is more lifelike. Admission fee six cents.

Anglo-Saxons, proud of their lineage and contemptuous of the dark-hued Ethiopean, might profitably pause to consider the simple plea for fair play which the Negro congress recently held at Atlanta has put forth. "In spite of theorists and their theories," they say, "we have shown ourselves able to live and thrive. A generation ago we came out of bondage without a foot of land, without a home, without a name. Even the clothes which covered our poorly clad bodies were not ours. To-day we have some land, some homes, some money. Yesterday we had nothing; to-day we own millions of acres of land, pay taxes on property worth millions of dollars, and raise more cotton under freedom than under slavery." With all his boasted superiority, the Anglo-Saxon will find it hard to match that record of triumph, achieved, be it noted, in his own peculiar and chosen field—acquisition.

John W. Gates is one of the most "successful" men of the time. He is, therefore, worth listening to when he talks about success, as he did one day last week in a special newspaper interview given out at Saratoga. The airy way in which he scouts the growing idea that there is less chance for a boy now than formerly, rises almost to the plane of certain kinds of high art. It is delicious. Greater successes than were ever dreamed of are yet to be made, he says, but there will not be "so great a chance for success per man!" What can young men ask better than that? If the successes of the successful are sufficiently spectacular, who cares if the chance per man is worse? Yet Mr. Gates is making dangerous concessions when he thus confirms the idea that however roomy the top may be in business life, things are getting more and more crowded at the bottom. It is the chance per man that counts with all but gamblers.

Early next week the legislature of Ohio is to meet in special session to consider the enactment of a municipal code applicable to all the cities and villages of the state, this having been made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court of the state (p. 249) holding that the municipal charters of the state are special legislation. Among the proposed codes to be submitted is one prepared for and approved by the State Board of Commerce. This is not complete, its authors having announced their intention of adding clauses with reference to taxation, borrowing, etc. But as far as it goes it is as nearly an ideal code as the constitution permits.

Under the Ohio constitution the legislature is required to provide for the organization of cities and villages. The authors of the code in question therefore assume that it need only provide a method of organization, leaving the details to each municipality upon home rule principles. Also that the method must be uniform as to all cities and uniform as to all villages, the distinction between cities and villages being the only distinction which the state constitution recognizes. Upon this hypothesis, which appears to be valid, the proposed code rests. It provides for municipal constitutions to be adopted by the villages and cities respectively at local constitutional conventions, the candidates for which are to be nominated only by petition and voted for upon ballots which shall not distinguish them by party names or symbols. These constitutions are to be easily amendable, and except in certain particulars, not many, are unrestricted. There must be a mayor elected by popular vote, who shall have the veto power; also a council, vested with legislative authority. And certain ordinances—notably those granting franchises or levying taxes—can be adopted only in compliance with specified formalities intended for public protection. But in the main, this code would leave the responsibility for good city and village government altogether with the inhabitants of each muni-

Digitized by Google

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

Digitized by Google