

publication. It involves more. By issuing an injunction against any probable or possible publication, proceedings for contempt of court could be used to punish the publisher though his publication were absolutely lawful. This power, once established, would make freedom of the press dependent entirely upon the caprice of judges.

+

In the Gompers-Mitchell-Morrison case, two judges have decided, a third dissenting, that this dangerous power exists in the courts. If that case is abandoned without a decision by the Supreme Court, where it is now pending on appeal, there is danger that the decision of the lower court may be followed by other courts and crystalized firmly into precedent. The situation would be no worse than it is, if the Supreme Court were to sustain the lower court; if it were to reverse the lower court, one at least of the dangers of government by injunction would be removed.

+ +

### Illegality of Labor Unions.

Of the intention of President Taft and the plutocratic interests surrounding him to subject labor organizations, simply as such, to the pains and penalties pronounced by law against the Big Business trusts, there is no other room for doubt than such as might come from an inference that they did not know what they were doing when they insisted upon striking out the Hughes amendment (p. 628) to the bill appropriating funds for prosecutions under the anti-trust law. Mr. Taft urges that labor unions must be law abiding or suffer the usual penalty. This was his reason for demanding that the Hughes amendment be struck out of that appropriation bill. But the Hughes amendment did not propose to shield labor unions from lawlessness. What it did propose was to prevent their prosecution unless they became lawless.

+

The exact terms of the Hughes amendment were "that no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the condition of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof *not in itself unlawful*." The House agreed to this amendment; the Senate rejected it, and, says the Coast Seamen's Journal significantly, "incidentally increased the sum appropriated for prosecutions from \$100,000 to \$200,000!" The Senate

refused to recede in favor of the Hughes amendment, and under pressure from President Taft the House did recede by consenting to strike it out. This means, as Congressman Hughes implied on the floor of the House—it can mean nothing else—that there is a deliberate purpose, backed by the Administration, to spend public money in prosecuting labor unions, *not for lawlessness*, but for organizing.

+ +

### Senator Beveridge.

We are admonished on good authority from Indiana, that our news article on the Republican convention in the First Congressional District of Indiana (p. 683), which we based upon newspaper dispatches, is misleading—especially the statement that the action of the convention was "a complete victory over the Beveridge supporters, who withdrew." Although it is true that Beveridge's tariff vote in the Senate was not approved by this convention, the district is in the heart of anti-Beveridge territory. In these circumstances a victory for his enemies in that district could hardly be regarded as an overwhelming defeat—not by well informed and honest correspondents. It is to be observed that news dispatches from other places than the First Congressional District of Indiana, have conveyed similar misleading information regarding Insurgent strength within the Republican party.

+ +

### Shippers, Freights and Consumers.

Attention is called by the Milwaukee Journal (one of the Republican dailies of the West), to an illuminative experience. It will be remembered that when the railroad freight rate bill was under consideration in Congress, Senator La Follette argued that while it protected shippers from extortion by railway combines, it did not protect consumers. In reply he was blandly told that shippers would protect consumers, since higher freight rates would necessitate higher prices, and shippers find difficulty in increasing prices. Senator La Follette, though unconvinced was beaten. And now it appears that George W. Perkins—the "left bower" in the Morgan Big Business "euchre deck"—has induced the manufacturing and packing trust interests to withdraw their objections to higher freight rates, arguing, as the Journal says, "that the higher freight rates would be shifted to the consumer, and that to prevent the railways from making the increases in rates would have an injurious effect upon the status of American securities in foreign markets."