

Jasper Weekly Courier.

VOL. 51.

JASPER, INDIANA, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1908.

No. 6.

BONAPARTE ELUSIVE

Fails to Furnish Correct Information Asked by Josephus Daniels.

ATTY. GENERAL IS DIPLOMATIC

Mines Up the Prosecutions Under Anti-Trust Law.

Records Show That 287 Trusts Are Thriving Under the Republican Administration—Prosecutions Slow—Department of Justice Answered.

Chicago, Oct. 22.—(Special.)—Josephus Daniels, chairman of the public bureau at the executive national headquarters, recently wrote a letter to Attorney General Bonaparte, in which he asked for information showing the character and extent of suits instituted by the federal government against the trusts. Mr. Bonaparte was very prompt in his reply, but was careful not to give the information requested. Mr. Daniels has forwarded a second letter to the attorney general which is reproduced herewith.

Hon. C. J. Bonaparte, United States Attorney General.

My Dear Sir:—I am in receipt of your letter of Oct. 21. On the 30th day of September I wrote you and asked for a statement showing how many of the 287 trusts doing business in the United States had been prosecuted by the department of justice, the amount of fines collected, etc. In your answer you do not furnish the information desired. The inquiry was specifically directed to the action taken with reference to the 287 trusts named. Instead of furnishing that information, you ask me to give the information under the Sherman anti-trust law with the prosecutions of railroads and individuals under other acts. No question was asked as to proceedings against railroads or other corporations except the well known and recognized trusts that are daily, by violating the law, "taking from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." The public is well aware that a number of railroads have been fined for giving rebates. That law ought to be enforced, even though your department refused to prosecute the admitted violations of the law by a railroad official who received an immunity bath and was given a place in the cabinet; and those two able attorneys, Hon. Judson Harmon and Hon. Frederick N. Johnson, who had been employed to prosecute, refused to continue with your department when it would permit them to prosecute the equally guilty secretary of the navy as well as the lesser railroad officials who had nearly all given rebates.

Having failed to furnish the specific information requested, and wishing to have a statement of exactly what has been done to prevent the extortions and to end the existence of the trusts, I am forced to ask you, omitting all prosecutions against railroads and other legal corporations, the following questions:

1. How many of the 287 trusts, giving the names, doing business in the United States, have been prosecuted by the present administration?

2. How many of these trusts, naming them separately, have been fined, and the separate amounts?

3. After a trust has been fined, what other steps have been taken to prevent its continuing its illegal practices for which it was forced to pay the penalty?

4. How many of the officials of these 287 trusts have been criminally prosecuted, and how many have been convicted and the term of imprisonment, giving the names of each person who has been imprisoned for violating the law?

In your letter, in which you mix up the prosecution of railroads and other legal corporations with the trusts which exist in defiance of law, you take occasion to contrast the record of the Roosevelt administration with the four preceding administrations. In the pamphlet which you send with your letter, it appears that Mr. Harrison prosecuted seven trusts under the Sherman anti-trust law; Mr. Cleveland, nine; Mr. McKinley, three, and the present administration, nineteen civil and twenty-five criminal cases. You include the cases against the beef and meat trusts where the government won these important suits. Has the meat trust gone out of business, and have the people obtained the relief from high prices which they had a right to expect and for which reason they demanded the prosecution of that trust? An examination of the twenty-five cases you say have been prosecuted criminally shows that in no single case has any violation of the law been followed by imprisonment.

Do you believe that the men who operate the trusts to their enrichment by systematic robbery, enjoyed by immunity from imprisonment, will ever be deterred by the methods so far employed by the department of justice? As long as the meat trust can pay a small fine and collect it an hundred times over the next day, by putting up the price of what it sells, when do you think that trust will quit charging prices that put necessary food out of the reach of the poor? The spectacle of a few of the predatory wealth, in convict garb—as the law contemplated—would do

WHERE HE STANDS



more in one week to break up the trust evil than all the prosecutions inaugurated.

By giving the comparison of the record of the Roosevelt administration in the matter of prosecutions as contrasted with the records of Cleveland, McKinley and Harrison you invite a comparison of the records of these administrations as to trusts. Carefully compiled statistics show that trusts were organized in the United States under the past four administrations as follows: Under Harrison, 25; under Cleveland (second term), 32; under McKinley, 127; and under Roosevelt, 103. Inasmuch as there are now 287 trusts in America it appears that there were twenty-three before Mr. Harrison became president and that 264 have been organized since 1888. If the department of justice has been as diligent as the interests of the people demand, would the number of trusts have multiplied so rapidly? Not only would the trusts doing business have been put out of business, but men would not have put money into new trusts if they had believed that the law against trusts and against persons guilty of combining would be vigorously enforced.

I submit that by the test of punishing lawbreakers and deterring others from violating the law—the eternal and true test—the execution of the anti-trust laws by the federal government is a failure; and that the existence and flourishing condition of the very trusts you have prosecuted convinces the people that the trusts are superior to law, or as Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton university, said last week:

"The most striking fact about the actual organization of modern society is that the most conspicuous, the most readily wielded, and the most formidable power is not the power of the government, but the power of capital. Men of our day in England and America have almost forgotten what it is to fear the government, but have found out what it is to fear the power of capital, to watch it with jealousy and suspicion, and trace to it the source of every open or hidden wrong."

I submit that the collection of fines from trusts aggregating a million dollars, if you had collected so much, which has not been done, would be no punishment worth the name of punishment to the 287 trusts with an aggregate capitalization of \$6,972,448,851.00. The fine process in trust prosecution is analogous to those fines imposed by a police justice upon persons keeping illegal resorts in towns. These fines often operate as a sliding scale of license tax—so may dollars whenever the aroused moral sense of the community will no longer be silent while the lawless dive debauches the people. What the people wish to know is this: How many trusts have you compelled to dissolve—in truth, and not merely to officially dissolve, and then continue to fix the price, as the dissolved paper trust has done? The meat trust paid a fine and soon put up the prices of all that men must eat by the prices of all that men must eat by some now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't sleight of hand that seems to escape further prosecution while continuing to levy a tax upon all the people. No prosecution of the trusts is effective that is not felt by the public in relieving them of trust imposition in what they buy. Your department says the paper trust was prosecuted and dissolved, but the publishers know that the mills in the trust have a combination now as injurious to them as before your prosecution. You say you have prosecuted the tobacco trust, but that

trust has put up the price of the manufactured product it sells and put down at will the price of the raw material. It buys from the farmer. You do not claim, I believe, to have even instituted proceedings against the steel trust, and only last year, in the teeth of the law, your department acquiesced in the complete monopoly of that giant of trusts when it took over the only large company able to compete with it in any line of production.

If your department in seven years has prosecuted nineteen civil and twenty-five criminal cases, in which no trust official has been jailed and no trust robbing the people has been compelled to take its grasp from the throat of free competition while 223 new trusts have been born during the McKinley and Roosevelt Republican administrations, how long at this rate of progress will it take the Republican administration to stop the extortion of 287 trusts that fatten by taxing the people? That is the question that the voters are propounding and it is a question which the department of justice should answer.

I am, sir—
Yours very respectfully,
[Signed]
JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Chairman Press Bureau.

TRUSTS ARE NOT HURT

But Business in Other Lines Has Been Seriously Affected by the Panic That Still Hurts.

Mr. Taft says that the panic is about over and that conditions have almost reached normal. That does not correspond with the view of the Chicago board of education that 15,000 children go to school hungry, partly because their fathers cannot get employment and because of the increase in the cost of living.

The Saturday Evening Post, of recent date, contains more statistics showing that, according to the reports of the New York savings banks, the number of accounts opened for the year ending July 1 was 73,000 less than for the year before, while the number of accounts closed was 48,000 greater than the year before. The amount deposited was \$25,000,000 less and the amount withdrawn \$41,000,000 more. This shows a large shrinkage in the savings of the people of that state. And now comes a New York wholesaler with the statement that on July 22 the firm addressed a letter to the wholesale grocers, biscuit bakers and confectioners of the United States, asking for figures showing trade conditions at that time compared with six months before. The following are the statements for the eastern states: "staple groceries, 30 per cent. less in the eastern states, 11 per cent. less in the southern states and 9 per cent. in the middle west."

"Sales of groceries classed among the luxuries, 16 per cent. less in the eastern states, 18 per cent. less in the southern states and 15 per cent. less in the western states. The falling off in biscuit and baker's articles and in confectioners' trade shows substantial loss of the same per cent."

To show how the trusts can escape from the evils that afflict others, Mr. Bryan recently called attention to the fact that a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal shows that the International Harvester company made larger net profits last year than in any preceding year, and the directors of the International Harvester company are largely the same as the directors of the steel trust.

REPUBLICANS INCENSED

Longworth's Speech at Rock Island, Ill., Arouses Wrath.

No utterance of the campaign has attracted more attention than the prediction of Congressman Nicholas Longworth, the president's son-in-law, who, in a speech at Rock Island, Ill., declared that after eight years of Taft, it would be Roosevelt in the White House again. This utterance has caused Republican campaign managers no little annoyance. The Republican view of the incident is well set forth by the Chicago Inter Ocean, one of the leading Republican papers in the entire west. The Inter Ocean said:

"The Hon. Nicholas Longworth proposed to 10,000 American citizens in Rock Island on Friday that Mr. Taft should be made president of the United States for the next eight years and Mr. Roosevelt for the eight years following Mr. Taft's second term."

"As Mr. Longworth is President Roosevelt's son-in-law, his words are accepted usually as semi-official for the White House. This is the unfortunate feature of his utterance in the present instance."

"The American people are not looking for a lord protector. Even the most ardent admirers of Mr. Roosevelt would not care to make him another Diaz."

"With some eight years of the presidency behind him next March and with eight years of Mr. Taft before him, Mr. Roosevelt, according to his son-in-law's ideas, would be able to celebrate on March 4, 1925, nearly a quarter of a century of personal rule over this republic."

"Such a program is not one to be announced just now, incredible and impossible as it seems. Especially it is not one to be announced from the bosom of Mr. Roosevelt's family, good politics and good taste are both against such utterances."

"Aside from Mr. Longworth's plain assumption that Mr. Taft's two terms would not constitute even a substantial interregnum—with which no real friend of Mr. Taft can agree—such remarks regarding the institution of a Roosevelt dynasty are not only shocking but absolutely damaging to the Republican candidate and the Republican party."

Speaking of the Longworth incident, Mr. Josephus Daniels, chairman of the publicity bureau at Democratic headquarters, said:

"The people may take it in their heads in November to knock Mr. Longworth's nice family arrangement in the head by going outside the close corporation and family monopoly of the presidency. That would be sad for the son-in-law, but good for the country. The remark of Mr. Longworth shows that long tenures in office for one man makes those in power thankless to the government. If for no other reason than to teach the son-in-law and others near the throne that the republic, the voters will decide on a change in November."

New York Evening Post.—It has been shown that the Democratic committee got not a cent and that Mr. Roosevelt gave currency to a false charge. He admitted that Harriman raised \$200,000 for the Republican campaign fund in 1904. Then they were both "practical men" and were working together.

NOW IT IS KELLOGG

Another Republican Campaign Manager Allied to the Trusts—The Minnesota National Committeeman Attorney for the Steel Trust—Some Questions That Indicate Why the Republicans Need Not Be Expected to Suppress Trusts.

Every day there are new developments to show that the Republican party is in the control of the trusts. The head of the powder trust, under indictment, has been honored from the committee, but the house cleaning has just begun. During the week the Chicago Journal and other papers have shown that Acting Chairman Nagel, of the Republican national committee, was the attorney for the Standard Oil trust in the big suit Republican Attorney General Hadley, of Missouri, brought to drive that trust out of Missouri. The New York World has shown that the Republicans in New York refused to nominate George R. Sheldon as lieutenant governor of that state because his trust connections were so notorious that the people would not stand for him, and yet he is the treasurer of the Republican national committee. In Chicago, the assistant treasurer of the Republican committee is a member of the board of review. As such he passes upon tax assessments. A few weeks ago he scandalized the country by sending letters to corporations, upon whose assessments for taxation he must pass, asking them to contribute to the Republican campaign fund. Nearly all the "advisory committee" has close trust affiliations, and were appointed to "fry the fat" out of the trusts.

And now, by way of Seattle, come questions disclosing the fact that Frank B. Kellogg, the member of the national Republican executive committee from Minnesota, who, as a member of the platform committee in the convention that nominated Taft, is said to have drafted the evasive labor plank in the Taft platform, is so related to the steel trust as to disqualify him to represent the people in the contest between the trusts and the people. The Seattle Times, after showing that the trust magnates control the Republican party, adds another dark chapter to trust domination of that party in the following questions prepared by a citizen of Seattle:

"Was not Frank B. Kellogg, the attorney whom President Roosevelt appointed to fight the Standard Oil company, the general counsel of the Oliver Mining company of Minnesota for a period of ten years? But the Oliver Mining company of Minnesota is only another name for Standard Oil."

"Is not Kellogg even now the general counsel for the United States Steel company of Minnesota? Is he not paid a very large salary by that corporation, and been so paid for many years? And yet the United States Steel company of Minnesota is absolutely owned by the Standard Oil."

"When the Merritt Bros., of Duluth, were obliged to sue John D. Rockefeller to obtain their rights in a mining deal located on the Mesaba range in Minnesota—was not Frank B. Kellogg the attorney for the oil king? Not only that, but did not Kellogg carry the case to the circuit court of appeals and secure the reversal of a judgment for about one million dollars?"

"Do not the Rockefellers and their associates control the Great Western Railroad company, running from Chicago to St. Paul and Kansas City? But is not Kellogg the attorney for that road?"

"Assuming that these questions must be answered in the affirmative, how can the department of justice employ Mr. Kellogg to prosecute the Standard Oil company in behalf of the people and still allow him to act for the Standard Oil company in the cases mentioned?"

"Is not Kellogg also the trusted adviser of Judge Taft? If so, what will Judge Taft likely do, if he should succeed to the presidency, so far as enforcing the law against Standard Oil?"

"The truth is—and everybody knows it—that the Standard Oil trust owes its power and wealth to favoring legislation and immunity granted by the Republican party, and that the trusts for a generation have 'put up' for the Republican campaign fund. They will do so again this year, and they are too smart to put their money in a concern without getting value received. Taft does not promise to take the tariff off of trust controlled articles or to put the officers of trusts in jail. Why? The trust magnates own the inner circle that, under Aldrich and Cannon, controls legislation, and when they pay for legislation and for freedom from prosecution they know they get what they pay for."

SILLY AND UNTRUTHFUL ORGAN.

The Indianapolis Star (Republican state organ) says:

In an address at Terre Haute Marshall criticized the ministers of Indiana for trying to bring about the enactment of a recently local option law. He accused them of "beating a brass drum" for the Republicans. At Washington, Bedford and other places Marshall repeated the charges against the ministers.

The Indianapolis Star is being operated by a receiver appointed by the United States court. Under these circumstances it might be expected to tell the truth about the public utterances of so honorable and high-minded a man as Thomas R. Marshall. But a small matter like the truth doesn't

TWO "PRACTICAL MEN"

"The Whiteness of the Pot and the Blackness of the Kettles."

From Theodore Roosevelt's letter of Oct. 4, 1904, to Edward H. Harriman.

Now, my dear sir, you and I are practical men, and you are on the ground and know the conditions better than I do. If you think there is any danger of your visit to me causing trouble or if you think there is nothing special I should be informed about, or no matter in which I could give you and, why, of course, give up the visit for the time being, and then a few weeks hence before I write my message, I shall get you to come down to discuss certain government matters not connected with the campaign. From Edward H. Harriman's confidential statement to Sidney Webster.

About a week before the election in the autumn of 1904, when it looked certain that the state ticket would go Democratic and was doubtful as to Roosevelt himself, as the president, sent me a request to go to Washington to confer upon the political conditions in New York state. I complied, and he told me he understood the campaign could not be successfully carried on without sufficient money and asked if I could help him in raising the necessary funds as the national committee under control of Chairman Cortelyou, had utterly failed of obtaining them, and there was a large amount due from them to the New York state committee. We talked over what could be done for Depew, and finally he agreed that if (and necessary) he would appoint him as ambassador to Paris.

With full belief that he, the president, would keep his agreement, I came back to New York, sent for Treasurer Bliss, who told me that I was their last hope and that they had exhausted every other resource. In his presence I called upon an intimate friend of Senator Depew, told him that it was necessary in order to carry New York state that \$200,000 should be raised at once, and if he would help I would subscribe \$50,000. After a few words over the telephone the gentleman said he would let me know, which he did probably in three or four hours, with the result that the whole amount, including my subscription, had been raised.

The checks were given to Treasurer Bliss, who took them to Chairman Cortelyou. If there were any among them of life insurance companies, or any other like organizations, of course Cortelyou must have informed the president. I do not know who the subscribers were, other than the friend of Depew, who was an individual. This amount enabled the New York state committee to continue its work, with the result that at least 50,000 votes were turned in the city of New York alone, making a difference of 100,000 votes in the general result.

DAWES FOR GUARANTEE

Comptroller of Currency Under McKinley Favored Insurance of Bank Deposits.

Charles G. Dawes was comptroller of the currency under Mr. McKinley. Since 1902 he has been president of the Central Trust company at Chicago. Writing in The Public, Louis F. Post calls attention to the fact that several years ago Mr. Dawes wrote a book entitled "The Banking System of the United States." The following is taken from Mr. Post's article:

In describing in that book the "present need of our national banking system," Mr. Dawes distinctly argues for the insurance idea that Bryan advocated in congress and upon which his campaign is now advancing in the west. Referring to a proposed law, advocated by Bryan in congress, which would have levied a tax upon national banks for the purpose of creating a fund for the insurance of deposits, Mr. Dawes wrote:

"National banking statistics show that a fund of the necessary amount would soon be created by a comparatively small tax upon each national bank."

"It must certainly be admitted that the establishment of such a fund would have a tendency to prevent the mad rushes of small and large depositors during times of panic, for money which they hoard away in safely deposit boxes or other hiding places."

"If the effect of such a law would be to render bank deposits more stable under all conditions, as in our judgment would be the case, no law could be of more value and importance to the debtor, or to the creditor, or to the community at large."

"Besides the great importance of the law, as related to the general prosperity of the country, it is meritorious as preventing the keen suffering in those localities where bank failures occur, and where the hard earned savings of the community, under our present laws, are often swept away. By such a law, losses are distributed as by insurance, the beneficial effects of which need no argument. To the passage of such a law in proper form, we trust the efforts of congress will be directed."

They are "all" for Taft. Who? Every trust magnate in America. "The ex knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib."

Mr. Roosevelt, says Mr. Woodruff, thinks the alleged finding of \$300,000 in the Democratic treasury " queer." But the good E. H. Harriman's gift of \$204,000 to the Republican campaign fund four years ago looked to the same eyes perfectly straight and normal.