

Fixed up for Years to Come

Chicago, October 10.—Republican leaders have been thrown into consternation over the "break" which Representative Longworth, the president's son-in-law made in his speech at Rock Island, Ill., in which he outlined the Roosevelt dynasty. The democratic national committee has procured affidavits from persons who attended the republican meeting at Rock Island, and which prove conclusively that Mr. Longworth made the declaration attributed to him.

The following are the affidavits:

"State of Illinois, County of Rock Island.

"I, Roy A. Sears, city editor of the Rock Island Argus, on oath do state that I was present at the republican day exercises of the Rock Island exposition, October 2, 1908, and reported the addresses of Congressman James McKinney, chairman of the afternoon; Congressman Frank O. Lowden and Congressman Nicholas Longworth and others.

"I further state that I heard the remarks of Congressman Longworth's, relative to the suggestion made by the chairman, as to his (Longworth's) possible succession to the presidency of the United States. Congressman Longworth's remarks were substantially as follows:

"I must thank the chairman for launching my candidacy for an office to which I have not expired—I should say aspired. My chances for that office have expired." I had thought that a good ticket for the republicans for the next eight years would be William Howard Taft of Ohio; and for the eight years after that Theodore Roosevelt of New York; then for eight years after that my good friend here, James S. Sherman, also of New York. After that—but modesty prevents me from making any further suggestion. (Signed)

"ROY A. SEARS."

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of October, A. D. 1908.

JAMES A. REEDY,

(Seal.) Notary Public.

The Rock Island Union, the recognized republican newspaper of this city, in its issue of Saturday morning following the republican meeting, thus quoted Longworth in a general way: "I consider that Taft is good for the next eight years as president. After which I consider that we really ought to have eight years of Roosevelt; following this, I believe the country needs eight years of 'Sunny Jim,' after which—but modesty forbids my mentioning the matter further." The speeches were heard by five thousand people, and all, irrespective of politics, who have heard Longworth's denial, are thunder-struck.

The remarks in the first place created a sensation.

The denial has created a greater sensation.—Omaha World-Herald.

THE ROOSEVELT DYNASTY

At last the cat is out of the bag. Yesterday at Sterling, Ill., Congressman Longworth declared that Taft should be kept in the White House for eight years, and then Theodore Roosevelt should be elected again president of the United States.

For eight years, under direction of Mr. Taft, we are to have a continuation of the big stick, exorbitantly protective tariff, and ferocious attacks on corporations of all kinds, just according to the mood of Mr. Roosevelt. Eight years of Roosevelt-Taft, and then Roosevelt himself once more. Will the country stand for this?

The admission that Taft means Roosevelt, nothing less, nothing more, will drive thousands of anti-Roosevelt republicans to vote for Bryan. If Taft is defeated he can thank Mr. Roosevelt's son-in-law for having let the cat out of the bag.

They might stand for Theodore once more, but where is this sort of thing going to stop if it gets a good start?

There's Theodore, Jr., and there's Kermit and there's Archie and there's Quentin, and perhaps by that time the crown might be passed over to the Longworth branch of the royal family. The incautious statement of Congressman Longworth will carry more weight with the independent voter than the "Little Willie" and "Sunny Jim" inanities of Sherman.

It will no longer be necessary to defend "my administration," but Mr. Roosevelt must now defend the Taft administration and the Roosevelt administration of 1916-1920. The public is more vitally interested in the future Roosevelt administration than in the past. Will

it take chances of forty years of Roosevelt, or stop the whole scheme right where it is? The secret is out, and the remedy lies with the voters.—Chicago Daily Journal.

A LONG REIGN

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.

The proposition today is to elect Mr. Taft for one term, not to continue Mr. Roosevelt in power, behind and upon the throne, for sixteen years more.

Mr. Longworth is injuring the cause of Mr. Taft. The demand of the hour is an unhindered, undiverted and energetic campaign in Mr. Taft's behalf.

Mr. Longworth should have more sense.—Chicago Inter Ocean.

EMULATING CROMWELL

Mr. Roosevelt once wrote a history of Oliver Cromwell. Curiously enough, he made no comment on the great reformer's one fatal blunder—his attempt to name his own successor.—Salt Lake Herald.

THEM'S AS AIN'T IDIOTS TURNS OFF THE TAP

The true remedy against our trusts is to seek out the cause of a trust and to remove that cause. This is a perfectly simple and natural remedy, and lies close at hand. It applies to public matters the same rule of wisdom which men apply in their own affairs as to health, business, and every private transaction in the world. If typhoid fever of some other epidemic is sweeping over your community and you find that it results from sewerage or some other physical cause, you will remove the cause and not rely solely upon the skill and remedies of medical practitioners. Some visitors who were being shown over a pauper lunatic asylum inquired of their guide what method was employed to discover when the inmates were sufficiently recovered to leave.

"Well," replied he, "you see, it's this way. We have a big trough of water and we turns on the tap. We leave it running, and tells 'em to bail out the water with pails until they've emptied the trough."

"How does that prove it?" asked one of the visitors.

"Well," said the guide, "them as ain't idiots turns off the tap."—From "The Tariff and the Trusts," by Franklin Pierce, published by MacMillan Company.

TRUSTS NOT RESTRAINED

Last Saturday, at Paris, Mo., Mr. Bryan read the following letter, which was handed him the day before at Joliet, Ill. It reads as follows:

"Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., February 11, 1903.—J. A. Heath, Esq., President Joliet Bale Tie Company, Joliet, Ill.—Sir: I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th inst., in which you complain of the American Steel & Wire company. In reply, I beg to say that the specific act to which you refer, the selling of their finished product for less than they charge for wire in the coil, which has resulted so injuriously to your business, is not restrainable under the federal anti-trust law. That fact may or may not be evidence of an attempt to monopolize or restrain interstate or foreign trade or commerce, to which that law applies, and the latter fact must be established before the former will be declared illegal. The circumstances alluded to would not of itself justify any action by this department, nor does the federal law afford you any remedy for the loss you have sustained.

Respectfully,

"J. K. RICHARDS,
Acting Attorney General."

Mr. Bryan then commented on it as follows:

"This letter is read to show that the present anti-trust law, as interpreted by the administration, does not protect the small competitors from the most common of all the methods employed by the trusts for destroying competition. It is customary for the trust to undersell a small rival in the rival's territory, and then, after driving the rival into a sale to the trust or into bankruptcy, the trust raises the price and collects from a helpless people the money spent in exterminating competition.

"This letter shows that a competitor complained to the department that the American Steel & Wire company—a part of the steel trust—was selling the finished product for less than it sold the raw material. The United States Steel company is not a benevolent institution; it does not sell below cost merely to accommodate the purchaser; and yet the acting attorney general replied to the injured party that the action of the United States Steel company was not restrainable, and that the fact might not be evidence even of an attempt to monopolize trade. The official did not seem to show any concern about this act of the steel trust; he did not ask for other evidence or intimate that he would make an investigation. He left the complainant to submit to the injustice without a word of sympathy or a word of hope.

"The republican leaders do not propose any new law to cure this evil and Mr. Taft specifically opposes a remedy proposed in the democratic platform for this very evil. The democratic platform proposes that corporations, after they reach a certain limit—when they reach twenty-five per cent of the total product—shall come under the supervision of the federal government and that after that they shall not be allowed to sell in one part of the country at one price and in another part of the country at another price. This is a remedy for the very thing that the Joliet manufacturer complained of, and yet the republican party not only proposes no remedy, but Mr. Taft denounces the only remedy proposed. The letter is proof of the inefficiency of the present law, and proof also of the unwillingness of the republican leaders to enact laws necessary for the protection of the public."

CHEERS FOR BRYAN AT A REPUBLICAN MEETING

Following is an Associated Press dispatch: Salt Lake City, October 12.—"Is this a republican or democratic meeting?" asked Senator Beveridge of Indiana of Senator Sutherland of Utah. They were on the stage of the Salt Lake theater in the presence of the largest political gathering of the campaign at which Senator Beveridge was the star orator. His question was the culmination of three interruptions, each of which marred the effect of the rally as a republican propaganda meeting. One interruption came when the senator mentioned the name of Bryan. There followed prolonged acclaim of the democratic candidate which all but eclipsed the applause accorded to Mr. Taft. At the mention of "free silver" men later the audience again gave vent to a great outburst of enthusiasm.

More than two dollars of every five raised by the federal government goes for the support of the army and navy. Representative Burton, in a speech in congress, said: "In no country has the increase in military expenses been so marked as in our own." The man who labors foots the bill!