demand for Government ownership of coal mines which has been made. If the great coal interest is so entrenched that it can violate with impunity a principle supposed to be written into the Federal statutes, the need for Government ownership becomes exigent and imperative."

It is for the new Administration "to act upon the proofs the Taft Administration has made ready." So the Boston *Advertiser* remarks, and the Springfield *Republican* is moved to note "the new Attorney-General's special qualifications for prosecuting the coal-roads":

"He has for years made a special study of the anthracite industry, and he has had charge of the Government's suits against the alleged combination since Attorney-General Bonaparte's day. . . . He will now have the best of opportunities to go his own pace in proceedings against what is, in effect, a coal monopoly—and one of the most brazen in existence."

---

From the *Literary Digest*, January 18th, 1913:

The New York *Tribune* calls attention to the fact that not only has the nation had an available but unused weapon against corners ever since the enactment of the Anti-Trust Law, but that "likewise in nearly every State of the Union the old common law prohibitions which in ancient times would have stopped any attempt to corner the food of an English village were still a part of the law." And the New York *American* regards the Patten case as "chiefly interesting as a demonstration of the inadequacy of modern law in dealing with the ancient crime of forestalling." It remarks somewhat cynically:

"If Patten had worked his corner like a lone bandit, without a confidant or confederate, the Sherman Act—which relates only to *combinations* in restraint of trade—would, of course, be inapplicable.