

## WHY NOT "STAND BY ROOSEVELT?"

A hot fight is on in republican ranks in Chicago between Representative Mann, who seeks renomination and State Senator Parker, who hopes to win the congressional seat now held by Mr. Mann.

The Chicago Record-Herald charges that Mr. Mann voted for the famous "mileage grab" at a former session of congress; that he has been caught sending out to the voters some 40,000 campaign letters and copies of his speech free of postage; and that he belongs to that class of men who "develop a theory that the government exists for their benefit."

Mr. Mann's opponent, Mr. Parker, boldly charges that Mr. Mann has been "the active friend or the innocent instrument of the illegal combinations and trusts or greedy corporations which have lately sought legislation adverse to the public or resisted reasonable remedial and regulative legislation."

Parker asserts that Mann was really hostile to railway rate regulation and that in conjunction with Dalzell of Pennsylvania, and Senator Elkins, Mann put through the amendment to the interstate commerce law, providing that rich violators of the interstate commerce law should not be punished by imprisonment.

Mr. Mann does not waste his time in going into details as to his defense. Indeed, he does not waste energy in an effort to make any defense. He simply falls back upon the republican party's 1906 slogan, "Stand by Roosevelt," and presents the following letter:

"Oyster Bay, N. Y., July 14, 1906.—My Dear Mr. Mann: Unfortunately that pen has already been given to Senator Heyburn, the author of the pure food bill in the senate. Otherwise it would have been a real pleasure to give it to you, either for you to keep yourself or put in the Chicago Historical society, for I feel a very lively appreciation of the work for the public that you did, both in connection with securing the passage of the pure food bill and in connection with all matters for effectively furthering the work of the Panama canal. We are all of us under genuine obligations to you for the signal work you have accomplished in these regards. With all good wishes, believe me, sincerely yours. "THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

"Hon. James R. Mann, M. C., House of Representatives, Washington, D. C."

What matter though Mann was, at heart, opposed to railway rate legislation? What matter though he cast his vote in favor of the "mileage grab"? What matter though he used the mails for the distribution of campaign documents? What matter though as a member of congress he is the tool of corporations rather than the servant of the people?

Does he not bear the Roosevelt stamp of approval, and has it not been written by no less an authority than the president himself, that but for the vigilance of Senator Heyburn, Mann would be entitled to one of the famous "Roosevelt pens"? Why should any republican undertake to go behind the Roosevelt stamp?

With what reason does the editor of that fine old republican paper, the Chicago Record-Herald, question Mr. Mann's right to renomination? With what reason do other of Mr. Mann's personal and political enemies in Chicago raise objection to his renomination and present in support of their objections the proof of Mr. Mann's services to the special interests?

When Mr. Mann is renominated—and when other republican congressmen who have been just as faithful to the corporations as Mann has been are renominated—republican editors and republican orators will be pleading for the re-election of these republican congressmen, in order that we may "Stand by Roosevelt."

If it will be the part of patriotism to "Stand by Roosevelt" on election day by swallowing every little corporation tool who wins nomination at the hands of the republican party, then why not "Stand by Roosevelt" at the primaries in the support of one bearing the Roosevelt credentials?

## TRY OIL

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson has made public the regulations, under the new law, regarding inspection of meat products for interstate and foreign trade. The regulations are said to "cover the situation thoroughly." The Associated Press describes one feature in this way: "The provisions in regard to labeling carcasses which are found diseased, and which have been

condemned, are very complete. A system of tags, numbered in duplicate, with reports to the inspector in charge, who in turn reports to Washington, will make it impossible for any carcass which has once been tagged by a department employe to escape the vigilance of the inspectors. If such a carcass were spirited away the inspector would know the fact at once. Running through the regulations is a carefully prepared scheme which will effectually prevent the entrance into sausage, curing, canning and other chopped meat establishments of any carcasses which were not inspected and passed by federal inspectors at the time of slaughter. Whenever the proprietor of an establishment questions the action of an inspector in condemning any carcass or meat he may take an appeal to the inspector in charge, and from the inspector in charge, if he desires, to the chief of the bureau of animal industry, or to the secretary of agriculture, whose decision is final, so far as the department is concerned."

But why depend upon tags or "reports of the inspector in charge?" Why rest entirely upon "the vigilance of the inspector?" That Chicago inspector who, because of his practical method of treating condemned carcasses lost his job, gave a valuable hint; but the secretary of agriculture seems not to have profited by it. Whenever that particular inspector condemned a meat carcass, he injected into it a liberal quantity of kerosene. There was then no danger that the carcass would be used.

A little coal-oil would come nearer preventing the use of condemned carcasses than all the regulations that might be framed by the department of agriculture.

## MAYBE

The next governor of the state of New York will be a democrat. The next governor of New York will be the next president of the United States.—New York Sun.

No democrat will be elected governor of New York this year. The next president of the United States will not be a democrat.—New York World.

Which is interesting, apart from the radical difference of opinion expressed, because the republican prophet is predicting democratic success, while the democratic oracle guesses the republicans will win.—Sioux City (Iowa) Journal.

It is also interesting from the fact that when the Sun and the World were agreed they made the greatest mistake in the record of prophecy. The Sun and World insisted that if the democratic party would become reorganized in 1904 it would win, and if memory is not at fault the party received the worst drubbing ever administered to a political organization.

Maybe it don't make much difference what prediction either one of these great newspapers and poor public advisers make. Maybe New York will choose a governor not to the liking of either the World or the Sun, and maybe America will choose a president without waiting for the aid or consent of either J. Pierpont Morgan or Joseph Pulitzer.

## "THE SAME OLD STORY IN THE SAME OLD WAY"

In all the "trust busting" proceedings under the present administration—with two exceptions, that of the broker Thomas and his clerk at Kansas City—the corporation or the individual has escaped with a fine.

A complaint against the corporation itself seems to have been the preferred plan.

But when proceedings against an individual seemed necessary, the complaint has—with the exceptions referred to—been in such form as would preclude the necessity for a prison sentence.

In one instance the arrogant monopolists came very near the danger line. That was when the beef trust magnates were in the federal court at Chicago called to answer criminal indictments. But lo, and behold! it developed at the critical moment that Mr. Garfield, a distinguished representative of the administration, had taken the pains to give the defendants an "immunity bath"—and thereby they were spared the humiliation of serving a term in jail.

We have had from representatives of this administration, promises galore with respect to the "trust busting" program. The latest was a noisily given promise that the Standard Oil trust would be proceeded against, "not maliciously, of course, but vigorously."

The first move made in this "vigorous prose-

cedure"—after the delivery of the president's famous Standard Oil message to congress—was an inquiry at Cleveland, Ohio, by the federal grand jury. That grand jury returned no indictment against these people, and it developed that the jury had been drawn by a jury commissioner who had intimate personal and business relations with John D. Rockefeller. Perhaps this fact was not significant, although many people so regarded it.

Then it was announced that the government would begin proceedings against the oil trust at Chicago when "no mercy will be shown."

And now for the latest on this line. The Chicago Record-Herald prints in its issue of July 25, a dispatch from Cleveland, from which dispatch, the following is taken:

"Fines instead of imprisonment will be the punishment asked by the United States government for those found guilty of law-breaking in connection with the oil industry.

"It was learned on excellent authority today that the proceedings soon to be instituted in Chicago in connection with the federal inquiry will class the offenses as misdemeanors instead of felonies. Fine and imprisonment, or both, attend conviction on the latter charge, while a fine alone is the punishment for the former. This decision, it is learned on the same authority, will do away with any grand jury inquiry in Chicago. Instead the district attorney of Northern Illinois, if present plans are adhered to, will simply 'file information' in legal parlance, against the accused men or concerns. They will then be haled into court as in an ordinary civil case, and if the trial results in their conviction they will be fined within the limits prescribed by the statutes of the United States government. The decision thus to change the line of attack is of national import. The department of justice at Washington, it is learned, has decided results can best be obtained under this new plan. The infliction of heavy fines under the Elkins law or the general conspiracy statute, it is held, not only will satisfy the ends of justice, but at the same time have a salutary effect in curbing illegal discrimination and rate favoritism or trade oppression in the future. It is also believed that the results aimed at can be more speedily reached than if an attempt were made to put offenders behind prison walls. Considerable speculation was caused as to what effect the change in plans would have upon the personal movements of John D. Rockefeller. Inquiry in well-informed circles brought the reply that he personally was not considered in the prospective change. That he will be one of those against whom 'information' is brought is more than probable, but if he is convicted the fine assessed against him is likely still to leave him a comfortable bank account."

This is "the same old story in the same old way." Imprisonment, the only effective method of dealing with lawlessness, is avoided. "The infliction of heavy fines" will not only "satisfy the ends of justice," but will have "a salutary effect" in "curbing trade oppression in the future!" Also it is believed that "the results aimed at can be more speedily reached than if an attempt were made to put offenders behind prison walls!"

How much longer are the people to be treated to this campaign of buncumbe?

## NOT LAFOLLETTE

Senator Foraker, of Ohio, was recently talking about a politician whose erratic conduct had estranged him from his party.

"This man," said the senator, "was showing a visitor over his new house in Washington the other day. He exhibited the large drawing-room in white and gold, the spacious dining-room in mahogany, the vast ebony hall with its onyx pillars, and then he led his visitor into the littlest bit of a room off the hall—a mere cubby hole, containing nothing but a table and two chairs.

"Not very large, eh?" he said. "Small and cozy, isn't it? Here I entertain my political friends."

"Ah," said the visitor, "it will be large enough for that."

One republican newspaper reproducing the Foraker story says that it is plainly directed at Senator LaFollette. If that be true then it is a misfit. No hall in Washington would be large enough to serve as a reception room for the "political friends" of the Wisconsin senator.