make the strike-breakers any more popular with the unions, and a boycott was instituted, and, as a result, the union men in one industry after another refused to work with the teamsters of the R. S. Brine Company. A week ago last Saturday the freight-handlers of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad joined in this boycott by refusing to go on the wagons of the R. S. Brine Company to help unload, and leaving their employment rather than do so. The strike of these freight-handlers served as a signal for sympathetic action from all sorts of unions, until by Tuesday nearly twenty thousand men were on strike—teamsters, longshoremen, expressmen, meat-handlers, wool and leather handlers, freight-handlers, and freight clerks—and the strike fever was extending among other grades of railroad employees, and among the employees in industries only indirectly served by the non-union workmen engaged to take the strikers' places. In still other industries men willing to work were unable to obtain materials or ship goods, and the business of the city was almost brought to a standstill.

❀

Governor Crane's Arbitration

At this crisis the Governor of the State, the Mayor of the city, the Secretary of the Arbitration Committee of the Civic Federation, and business men representing a great variety of organizations, set to work to effect a settlement. The outlook did not at first seem hopeful, for, as the strike was at first reported, the unions were demanding that the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad should discriminate between freight brought to it in union and in non-union wagons. Inasmuch as railroads are chartered to serve as common carriers, it was clear that the New Haven officials could not legally allow its employees to make any such discrimination. It soon developed, however, that the unions made no such demand. They simply demanded that the New Haven road should, like the Boston and Maine, confine itself to the impartial reception of freight delivered at its stations by union and non-union wagons, and not require its freight-handlers to go upon the wagons to assist in unloading them. The unions wished arbitration of the whole difficulty, but the officials of the New Haven road were less conciliatory, and unwilling to go further than to state that in the future the road might adopt the Boston and Maine rule. The situation was serious in the extreme, and the settlement secured was due chiefly to the attitude taken by Governor Crane and the unusual confidence which the workingmen of Boston repose in his ability and sincerity. Instead of seeking to avoid responsibility, Governor Crane assumed it, and told the representatives of the unions that if they would order their men back to work, he would bring all possible pressure to bear to secure an adequate remedy for the grievances of which they complained. The union officials, in the face of certain protest from many of their constituents, accepted the promise of future redress, declared the strike off, and thus avoided what was likely to be a long, losing strike, in which the losses of the victorious railroad and of the non-combatant public would have been only less serious than those of the strikers themselves. The men generally went back to work, and Governor Crane appealed to the public "to do its part," and to other employers of labor "to see that the men who went out are reinstated as far as possible."

❀

Not a Pro-Trust Decision

The decision of the United States Supreme Court last week against the constitutionality of an Illinois anti-trust act was not, as widely reported, a decision sustaining trusts. The case before the Court was that of two dealers in sewer-pipes who refused to pay for goods purchased of the Union Sewer Pipe Company, of Ohio, on the ground that the company had violated the Illinois anti-trust act, and therefore could not legally collect its claims within that State. The United States Supreme Court holds that this law is unconstitutional, not because of the severity of the penalty prescribed for its violation, but simply and solely because it discriminated between trusts in manufacturing products and trusts in agricultural products, thus denying manufacturers "the equal protection of the laws." The decision of the Court was written by Justice Harlan, who points out in a few

clear sentences that the Illinois act divides "people engaged in trade into classes, making criminals of those in one class who do certain forbidden things, while allowing another and favored class in the same trade to do the same thing." Justice McKenna alone of the Court dissented from this opinion, holding that the Illinois Legislature had a right to hold that combinations restraining trade in farm products and live stock were not hurtful to the public interest, while combinations in other lines of trade were hurtful. But such a distinction between live-stock combinations and sewer-pipe combinations does not appeal to the common sense of justice. It is true that there are some combinations which the law never seeks to prevent—combinations of banks to establish clearing-houses, of railroads to furnish through freight facilities, and nowadays of workmen to shorten hours or get better wages. But in all these cases the end which the combination has in view is regarded as promotive of the general welfare. No such claim can be made for a combination to prevent competition in any line of trade, and a statute allowing one class of citizens to make such combinations, and at the same time refuse to pay their debts to another class making them, violates the principle of equality in the laws.

❀

The Northern Securities Company

Last week at St. Paul, Minn., by direction of Mr. Knox, Attorney-General of the United States, a bill in equity was filed in the Circuit Court for the District of Minnesota, in the case of the United States, complainant, against the Northern Securities Company, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific Railway Companies, and others, defendants. The bill, which is both long and strong, seeks to test the legality of the merger of the above-named railways into what it terms the "holding corporation"—the Northern Securities Company. The action is brought under the Anti-Trust Law of 1890, and the complaint is that the merger is a combination or conspiracy in restraint of inter-State trade. The Northern Securities Company is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, the Great Northern Railway was organized under the laws of Minnesota, and the Northern Pacific under the laws of Wisconsin. The two last-named companies are common carriers, doing an inter-State business. Prior to the doing of the acts complained of, they owned and operated two separate, independent, parallel, and competing lines of railway, aggregating over fifty-five hundred miles in length. But Attorney-General Knox does not present his case alone on a violation of the Anti-Trust Law. He also declares that the Northern Securities Company, organized solely as the machinery of the merger, and having given no consideration, beyond its own certificates, for the stocks acquired, "was not organized in good faith to purchase and pay for the stock." This, to say the least, is an adroit and ingenious point. It anticipates the certain contention of the defendants, that to forbid purchases for honest investment by a stockholding corporation must, in the very nature of things, be followed by the prohibition of such purchases, under similar circumstances, by private individuals; in other words, if a citizen may buy and hold shares in one of two competing roads, or in both, cannot any other citizen, the Northern Securities Company, for example, do the same? But in this sense the Northern Securities Company is not a citizen. Our laws hold that corporations should not have all the rights of individuals.

❀

Chairman Knapp on Railroad Favoritism to Trusts

Chairman Knapp, of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, in an address before the People's Institute in New York City last week, went to the very verge of demanding government ownership of railroads, in order to put an end to discriminations in rates. He said:

> As I view this matter, the State has as much right to farm out the business of collecting its revenues or preserving the peace, and allow the parties intrusted with these duties to vary the rate of taxation according to their own interests or to sell personal protection to the highest bidder, as it has to permit the great function of public carriage to be the subject of especial bargains or secret dicker to be made unequal by favoritism or oppressive by extortion.
>
> No service which the Government undertakes can be more useful, and no duty which rests upon it is more imperative, than to secure