

# THE CAPITAL JOURNAL

G. HOFER, Editor and Proprietor. R. M. HOFER, Manager

Independent Newspaper Devoted to American Principles and the Progress and Development of All Oregon



**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:**  
(variably in Advance)  
Daily, by Carrier, per year \$6.00 Per month .50c  
Daily, by Mail, per year 4.00 Per month .35c  
Weekly, by Mail, per year 1.00 Six months .50c

FULL LEASED WIRE TELEGRAPH REPORT

## THE RAILROAD SITUATION AT SALEM.

The announcement of the transfer of the Salem traction lines to the Welch system on May 1 is a very important matter to this city.

The close relations of the Southern Pacific company with the Welch system indicate that there may be a still greater merger on foot.

The traction lines of the Portland Railway, Light & Power company in this city are merged with the Portland, Eugene & Eastern.

The Southern Pacific and the P. E. & E. are occupying common tracks on Front street and are planning a union depot together.

This plan, if it is carried out, means that the Southern Pacific will have a down-town passenger station and trackage all over the city.

The location of the union station indicates the taking over of the Salem, Falls City & Western and a triple combination of tracks.

This will certainly be a great coup over the Hill system that has only one line of road through the city, with freight lines on Front street.

The location of these tracks and the development of these terminal properties are matters of the greatest importance to the city.

The whole matter should be well considered and the interests of the city carefully looked after when a plan so far-reaching is adopted.

The electrification of the West Side lines, with a new bridge across the Willamette above Oregon City, are also an assured fact.

With a line to Dayton and a new connection with Silverton by way of Fir station, east of this city, Salem will be in the center of a web.

It looks as if the Southern Pacific might have it in mind to make Salem the great interurban center of the Willamette valley.

The indications are that these railroads have transferred their activities to Salem, and that it will be, next to Portland, a railroad town.

The location of the new union station, the proper trackage facilities for handling trains in and out of the city are important matters.

While there should be nothing placed in the way of proper development of Salem as a railroad center municipal interests are first.

The building of a beautiful Capital City, with all the comforts and conveniences of a modern community are all important.

The city government, the manufacturing interests and the jobbing and business interests should be considered.

The progressive railroad representatives will be willing to confer with those in authority in all matters.

But just at present there is urgent need that all municipal welfare interests be not overlooked.

## THE TROUBLE WITH THE CLARION.

Some of the ministers of the city have objected to the tone of some of the stories in the Clarion, published by the Salem High School.

It is explained by Principal Kirk that the errors they objected to were merely typographical, and that hereafter that would be remedied.

There has been more than typographical errors in the Clarion, and the objections of the ministers are well grounded in several ways.

The Clarion hereafter is to be censored by the department of English, and that will probably give it better quality of product.

The same objection to the Clarion holds that applies to other so-called "student body activities," that should be abolished.

The time of the children is taken up with matters that are not conducive to proper development of the youth in an educational way.

The pages of the Clarion are the best proof of the poor quality of the English work done in the high school—composition and rhetoric.

Scarcely a page of it but contains errors in grammar, arrangement of sentences, and, what is worse, absence of literary taste.

Indeed, it needs censoring badly, and, as a publication, the editors are not to blame for the poor quality of the product that is furnished.

Bad language work and absence of literary quality is made up for by furnishing an opportunity to get money out of the student body.

The business man, on top of his high school taxes, is held up each month for advertising contributions on pain of not getting the business.

## THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

Following are the fields of education to be covered in an agricultural college:

- Scientific agriculture.
- Scientific horticulture.
- Scientific stock raising.
- Scientific dairying.

These four, and no more, would seem to be the proper field of an agricultural college.

It will be contended that the act of congress providing for agricultural colleges authorizes the present wide scope of activities.

If that is true the federal law should be amended and the state relieved of the ever-increasing load.

About all the higher technical and scientific education real farming requires is efficient men in one of the above four lines.

How many young men from the Agricultural college go to work on the above four lines of activity?

How many secure a professional education and never go back to the soil for an occupation?

It would be interesting to know.

The taxpayer should not be burdened to produce a professional and salaried class.

Too many now go to the Agricultural college only to get onto a salaried job, or to follow a professional career.

Why should the farmer be taxed to educate engineers, pharmacists and bookkeepers?

Why should all such professions be supplied at the expense of the general taxpayer?

The country has an over-stock of the professional and salaried class.

The country is shy on producers, and is taxed to the limit.

If a farmer can measure a field, is engineer enough to lay tile or drain a field, and can keep a record of the cost of a crop, or the income from a herd of stock, he can succeed in his occupation.

The Agricultural college needs weeding out of professionalism or it will become top-heavy with payroll and weak as a school for training producers.

# "BIG BUSINESS" CONTROLS TAFT, SAYS BRISTOW

### Standard Oil Got "What It Wanted."

Kansas Senator Forcefully Arraigns the Reactionary Candidate—Makes a Powerful Case Against the Taft Administration—Why Rockefeller Was Complacent as to Election of 1908.

Washington, April 18.—That the Taft administration has entered into an understanding with the great business combinations of the country and that the relations between those combinations and the administration now are harmonious and directed toward a common end is the profound belief of Senator Joseph L. Bristow of Kansas, one of the foremost leaders of the progressive movement in the United States.

"If you take for a text the speech delivered in Philadelphia not long ago by President Taft, in which he declared himself a progressive along with the rejoinder thereto delivered by Colonel Roosevelt at Louisville and attach to these speeches the reasonable knowledge of known facts and events, you cannot escape the conclusion at which I have arrived," said Senator Bristow in a talk on what might be called "the case against the Taft administration."

"Said Colonel Roosevelt:

Taft's "Progressivism."

"Four years ago the progressives supported Mr. Taft for president, and he was opposed by such representatives of special privileges as Mr. Penrose of Pennsylvania, Mr. Aldrich of Rhode Island and Mr. Gallinger of New Hampshire, as Messrs. Lorimer, Cannon and McKinley of Illinois, and he was opposed by practically all of the men of the stamp of Messrs. Guggenheimer and Evans of Colorado and Mr. Patrick Calhoun of San Francisco. These men were not progressives then, and they are not progressives now; but, unlike the president, they know who is a progressive and who is not. Their judgment in the matter is good. After three and a half years of association with and knowledge of the president and his followers are now the president's chief supporters, and they and the men who feel and act as they do in business and in politics give him the great bulk of his strength. The president says he is a progressive. These men know him well and have studied his actions for three years, and they regard him as being precisely the kind of progressive they approve.

"Study that extract from Colonel Roosevelt's speech, if you please. Get at its meaning. Why does the criminal on trial for his liberty or his ill gotten property seek to select a judge by asking a change of venue? Why does he discriminate so closely in the selection of the jury which is to try him? The law provides these expedients for him that he may get justice; but, being guilty, he does not resort to these expedients to secure justice, but to avoid it. When the great combinations which have piled up enormous aggregations of money by illegal and criminal means select and stand for a candidate for president they have a motive, a motive that it seems to me ought to be plain to all men.

John D. Was Informed.

"Let me next call your attention to the interview which John D. Rockefeller gave out at the Standard Oil offices in New York, Oct. 30, 1908, a few days before the election in which Mr. Taft first ran for the presidency. Mr. Rockefeller had not been near his offices for several years, and when he appeared there for the express purpose of making public in the most effective and far-reaching way this interview, Colonel Roosevelt and all the other progressives were of the opinion that it was done for the purpose of hurting Mr. Taft. But I have changed my mind about that since that time. I have become convinced that Mr. Rockefeller then had information about the complacency of Mr. Taft regarding 'Big Business' that the progressives did not have.

"As one indication of this, I have been advised that not so very long before the Rockefeller interview the sugar trust approached Mr. Taft through Mr. Charles B. Warren of Michigan, the personal representative of the sugar trust in the beet sugar industry in Michigan, on matters vital to that lucrative combination. That the conference was eminently satisfactory to the sugar trust was immediately shown by the fact that Mr. Warren and his associates were for Taft and have been for him ever since. Indeed, on this point I have only to recall to you that Mr. Warren was accredited in the press reports of a few days ago with being the person who at midnight placed fifty busses from the Michigan beet sugar factories in the hall where the Michigan Republican state convention was to be held in order that the hall might be controlled in the interest of Mr. Taft and against Colonel Roosevelt the next day.

Oil Octopus In Touch.

"Now, if such a conference could make the sugar interests the devoted supporter of Mr. Taft the question naturally arises why something of the same kind might not have influenced Mr. Rockefeller. There are not the accurate data in regard to the Standard Oil company that there are relative to the meeting with the sugar trust, but there is some interesting collateral evidence tending to show that somewhere and somehow the oil octopus got in touch with the influence that controlled the then candidate for president. You will remember that after his election, but before his inauguration, Mr. Taft spent some little time at the Virginia Hot Springs. From that resort we received the first intimation ever emanating from any president of a purpose to establish the commerce court.

"I remember I was greatly surprised.

When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

## Spring Medicine

There is no other season when medicine is so much needed as in the spring. The blood is impure and impoverished—a condition indicated by pimples, boils and other eruptions on the face and body, by deficient vitality, loss of appetite, lack of strength.

The great spring medicine, according to the experience and testimony of thousands annually, is **Hood's Sarsaparilla**. It purifies and enriches the blood, cures eruptions, builds up the system. Get it today in usual liquid form or chocolate tablets known as Sarsapillas.

"I remember I was greatly surprised.

When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

"In this letter, written by Mr. Sibley, at Washington, on Feb. 26, 1905, to Mr. John D. Archibald of the Standard Oil company and read from the platform by Mr. Hearst at Memphis, Tenn., on Sept. 10, 1908, is found the following paragraph relative to a certain 'Senator B.' who is described as 'wholly and unalterably opposed' to President Roosevelt's policy regarding corporations:

"I remember I was greatly surprised. When President Roosevelt forced the rate bill through congress, restoring the interstate commerce commission to power in the enforcement of its rulings, tremendous efforts were made by Messrs. Aldrich, Gallinger and the rest of the reactionaries to include in the law a provision for a court review of the commission's decisions. The progressive tendency of the time was distinctly against any court review, for it was the courts which had emasculated the commission of its power under the old law. The people generally feared a repetition of this. They wanted to control the railroads. They wanted to obviate forever the possibility of a continuance of the processes by which such concerns as the Standard Oil company had used the common carriers to collect rebates on their own business and on that of their competitors at the same time. The reactionaries succeeded in getting a form of court review into the law, but not as free a one as they desired.

Trust and Commerce Court.

"Now, you will remember that W. R. Hearst during the campaign of 1908 read from the platform in different portions of the country letters that had been procured by some means from the files of the Standard Oil company. It was charged that the letters were stolen, but their authenticity was acknowledged. They were genuine letters, however procured. In reading them as they appeared in the papers I was one day not much surprised to learn that the idea of a separate court of review for interstate commerce commission decisions had emanated from the Standard Oil company. They were the first people to invent the idea of a commerce court. The proof of it was found in a letter written by Joseph Sibley of Pennsylvania, member of the house and confessed congressional lobbyist for the Standard Oil company. He was not the only lobbyist employed by that company we may believe, but he was one.

# The Chicago Store

## New Arrivals Just Received

The very latest in Suits, Coats, Millinery, Dress Goods, Silks, Shirt Waists, Silk Petticoats, Dress Trimmings, Hosiery, Gloves, and Fancy Neckwear. Come here and see the money we can save