

The Plattsmouth Journal

Published Semi-Weekly at Plattsmouth, Nebraska

R. A. BATES, Publisher.

Entered at the Postoffice at Plattsmouth, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

\$1.50 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE

Wheeler received more votes in the state for senator than standpatters were willing to concede him before the primary.

The Democratic vote in the state is much larger than the Republican vote, which would appear that the Democrats were much more interested.

Had the impetuous Senator Gore paused to reflect he would have foreseen the rebuke that was sure to come for venturing to "vilify prominent Republicans."

Aldrich, (county optionist) has been nominated for governor on the Republican ticket. This is another slap in the face of Victor Rosewater. Evidently Vicky is getting it all round this year.

The primary law should be repealed at the next session of the legislature. It was adopted especially for the benefit of the country voters and they do not seem to take advantage of this manner of making nominations.

Secretary Hitchcock, like Senator Crane and Lloyd Grissom, has been delegated to find out what the west is saying about the administration. The west has made no secret of the matter. Has the administration tried the simple expedient of reading the papers?

The result of the primary demonstrates to a dead moral certainty that "Slippery Elmer" has a vast number of Republicans in Nebraska who are tired of his misrepresentation in the United States senate. The support of the postmasters and federal officeholders is all that saved his bacon, but there is another election yet to come in which he may not fare so well.

A DELUSIVE HARMONY.

Chairman McKinley of the Republican congressional committee has issued a program of harmony for his party. There is to be no more denunciation of insurgents. Where a progressive is nominated, the standpatters are to support him. Where a standpatter is nominated the progressives are to support him. Differences of opinion on matters of policy or principle are to count for nothing. Party discipline is to be the supreme issue.

Chairman McKinley looks no further than the campaign. He does not care to think what would happen if a Republican majority should find itself in congress, divided into two factions. Yet it is clear that in such there would be two years of wrangling and obstruction. The house would fall again under the domination of the speaker. The welfare of the people would be subordinated to the greed of private interests. There would be only a semblance of representative government. Plutocracy would rule all.

Chairman McKinley is wrong. No political party can dodge vital issues. A party that stands pat in Rhode Island cannot harmonize with one that marches in Kansas. There is no discipline nor leadership nor tact that can work the marvel of holding together the fat clam in the mud and the sinewy eagle on the wing. McKinley means well, but he suffers from mental myopia.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

WILL THIS HELP THE REPUBLICAN TICKET?

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune sends on from Beverly a letter which purports to express in an authoritative way ("I am authorized to say") the view of President Taft respecting the status of his party and the achievements and purposes of his administration.

The president much desires Republican success in the state and particularly the congressional elections next fall. Such success would of course be personally gratifying to him, but it is desired more especially to the end that the unfinished reform program of the administration may be completed. The most important work yet to be done relates to the trust question, and the correspondent says—is "authorized to say."

Before the congress elected in November shall meet, the supreme court will hand down its decisions in the Standard Oil and tobacco trust cases, and if the contention of the government be sustained, as the president believes, a vast reorganization of business will follow, and legislation must be provided to enable the government properly to grapple with the new conditions. If the government be beaten, then there will be a universal demand for the strengthening of the anti-trust law, or at least the provision of a remedy which will force huge combinations of capital to conduct business more in the interest of the people than is the case today.

And there follows reference to the president's federal incorporation bill submitted to congress at the last session and then laid temporarily on the shelf—a reference significant of the administration's belief that, whichever way the court's decision goes in the anti-trust cases, the country will be forced to accept some such enactment.

What especially arrests attention in the above "authorized" administration view is the apparently inconsequential manner with which a "vast reorganization of business" is contemplated. The president has before expressed the view that the anti-trust law did not need to be amended. The cases pending under that law, if decided for the government, will force a "vast reorganization of business," and the government hopes and expects they will be so decided. It therefore looks forward hopefully and expectantly to the enforcement of a "vast reorganization of business." And if this is not forced by the coming decisions, it will be forced by popular demand.

The average business man will not be apt to view very favorably the development of conditions forcing a "vast reorganization" of the business status. It sounds too much like revolution, and too little like evolution. He will therefore be apt to ask himself whether worse could happen through a Democratic congress than "vast reorganization"—than business revolution; and he will be apt to conclude that worse could not possibly happen. And this must be the conclusion of pretty much everybody else. How great, therefore, is the inducement here held out to draw business or other votes to the Republican congressional tickets?—Springfield Republican.

THE WEST IS REBUKED.

The New York Times, in an editorial that is really noteworthy for its ill-natured provincialism, reads the riot act to Kansas and Oklahoma. The Gotham paper cites the figures to prove the abounding and rapidly increasing prosperity of these two great western states, and asks, with a snarl, when they will have enough to be satisfied. And it demands that they learn to content themselves with running their own business, politically speaking, and leave the rest of the country alone.

It would be interesting if the New York Times would point out the laws on the federal statute books to which it objects which were put there by the votes of Oklahoma and Kansas.

It would be interesting if it would show the laws which are, or are alleged to be, "disturbing business," which were put there in the interest of any distinctively western industry,

or at any western state.

In the making of laws at Washington and in determining the manner and good faith of their enforcement, the voice of that little tract of country within a radius of five miles of the Times building has been more potent by far than has the voice of the people of any half-dozen western states.

The Kansas idea and the Oklahoma idea, as embodied in state government, have made for the prosperity of Kansas and Oklahoma. How can it be argued, then, that these same ideas might not make for real prosperity, equality of opportunity and a more nearly just distribution of wealth in the nation?

Why should New York grudge the west its fair share of national wealth and greatness? Why should it grudge the west that very small share which it has had in the determining of national policies?

The east has its tariffs. The east has its law-defying trusts. The east has its enormous appropriations for coast and internal improvements. The east is shrieking for its subsidies, for a central bank and for national incorporation. What has the west got? What is it asking for, even, in the way of special privilege or special favors?

The west is asking for nothing but its just rights: asking only for a square deal; asking that an end be made of government by a section of the country in the interest of a favored few who control that section and with it the government.

And because the west is taking this position the New York Times rises in indignation to rebuke it for its audacity!—World-Herald.

Shallenberger and Dahlman tied on their vote in Otoe county—113 vote each.

The Anti-Saloon league has not been heard from since the primaries. Don't the returns suit them?

Senator Aldrich's conscience seems to be as elastic as any of the International Rubber company's products.

Taft is destined to step down and out of the presidential chair as the poorest chief executive the country ever had.

Something just seemed to tell the New York reactionaries that Mr. Roosevelt did not contemplate making their kind of a speech.

Surely the stern New York standpatters might have found some less bitter and crushing method of rebuking Mr. Roosevelt than this!

If it is Dahlman, he will get the support of the Democrats of Nebraska, and it will be the same if Shallenberger is re-nominated. So there!

Evidently the vote for Dahlman in Lincoln is a demonstration that many Republicans in the capital city will cut the Republicans in the general election.

The sitting down so hard on Roosevelt in New York, is liable to cause a split in the Republican party of that state. That is the latest report from New York.

The Kansas election returns have convinced Speaker Cannon that actions not only speak louder than words, but sometimes they are positively deafening.

If the New York state committee can show that to stand with Roosevelt would be to stand against the administration, so much the worse for the administration.

The Republican vote in Otoe county was some larger than the Democratic vote. This was caused by Will Hayward's candidacy for congress and home pride.

President Taft's declaration in favor of two-months vacations is being enlarged upon, and numerous members of congress are confronted with two years vacations.

At this time it is impossible to say who has been nominated for representative on the Democratic ticket.

W. H. Puls of Mt. Pleasant precinct, and C. E. Metzger of Cedar Creek, seem to be in the lead. The returns will be canvassed today and the result printed in tomorrow evening's Journal.

The election returns come in very slowly and probably by tomorrow the general result in the state will be known to a certainty. So far but two standpatters have been nominated for congress—Kinkaid in the Sixth and Hayward in the First.

We are pleased to note that C. O. Lobeck has been nominated for congressman in the Omaha district by the Democrats. This is the proper caper, as Mr. Lobeck is one of the most popular men in Omaha, and a very able man.

The vote on governor and United States senator in the state was much larger than that of any other candidates. And, strange to say, the Democratic vote is nearly double that of the Republicans.

REVENUE, A TARIFF BLIND.

The laborious efforts of the defenders of the new tariff law to show that it is a good revenue producer accentuates the vital defects of the act. For when it is necessary to defend a protective measure on its revenue features, the implication is plain that it cannot be successfully defended as a protective measure.

The country has no quarrel at this time with a tariff system that produces large revenues, provided, of course, that the duties producing the revenues be levied on luxuries and not on articles of common necessity or general use. And a tariff law that does not, at least, produce large revenues has no excuse whatever for existence, since there is no sound defense for the protective duties.

There are many equitable ways to produce revenues. The country needs never be at a loss for ways and means to operate the government. In whatever way these revenues are produced, whether by the tariff or other means, the people—the consumers or users—pay. The people do not object seriously to paying a revenue tariff, if it is properly distributed. What they do object to is the imposition of protective duties that are in many instances wholly prohibitive and, therefore, produce no revenues, but are maintained solely to enable the American manufacturer or producer to exact from American consumers excessive prices.

Paying legitimate taxes for revenues is one thing, and paying tribute is another. And the people are now learning the difference.—Kansas City Star, Rep.

WHERE TAFT BELONGS.

The Des Moines Register and Leader, an insurgent newspaper, indulges in the following interesting estimate of President Taft:

The president is naturally a progressive. He has simply entangled himself with old line political leadership. He has favored tariff reform—with Aldrich to direct it. He has favored railroad reform—with Elkins to direct it. He has favored conservation—with Ballinger to direct it. He has favored civil service reform—with Hitchcock to direct it.

This is very clear—and a part of it is obviously true. The only trouble is with the assumption, in the first instance, that Taft "is naturally a progressive."

The assumption is a mistaken one. Taft is naturally a conservative. That is why the effort to make him over into a progressive leader has failed so miserably. You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, the old saying goes—and you cannot make a progressive leader out of a man who was born and bred a conservative, whose surroundings have always been conservative, and whose interests and the interest of whose family and relatives are conservative.

One of President Taft's brothers is among the wealthiest men of the middle-west. Another is a successful trust lawyer in New York city. He is connected by marriage, too, with the Pittsburg plutocracy. It was Taft who chose Sherman, rather than Dolliver, to be his running mate. It

was Taft who made speeches in Oklahoma against the adoption of the constitution because it provided for direct legislation. It was Taft who helped shelve the income tax when it had a chance in congress. It was Taft who named a cabinet composed principally of trust lawyers. It is Taft who is swinging the full strength of his administration to defeat La Follette. It was Taft who dictated the standpat Ohio platform. It was Taft who discharged the Roosevelt men from the government employ and replaced them with anti-Roosevelt men. It was Taft who commended Aldrich, helped re-elect Cannon speaker and praised the Aldrich-Cannon tariff.

What warrant is there, in the face of these facts known of all men, to think Taft "naturally a progressive?"

Taft is no more naturally progressive than is the Republican party. The Republican party descends from Alexander Hamilton. So does Taft. The Republican party is naturally the champion and instrument of plutocracy and privilege. So is Taft. Insurgency, is naturally anti-Republican. Insurgency, such as populism was, is a breaking away from the Republican party on the part of men who, when they find their bearings, discover that they are at outs with the party, and that they have no proper place in it.

There is only one Hamiltonian party in this country, and that is the Republican party. There is only one great Jeffersonian party, and that is the Democratic party. Taft belongs in the Republican party, and so is "naturally" not a progressive, but a conservative.—World-Herald.

Commissioners Meet.

The regular session of the commissioners falling on election day, the meeting was postponed until on Thursday when a meeting was had. Commissioner Friedrich was absent and the business of the session was transacted by Mr. Jordan and Mr. Switzer. The bond of the county attorney, C. H. Taylor was approved. On petition of C. C. Buckwell and others asking the appointment of A. I. Bird as constable of Greenwood precinct, the appointment was made.

Will Move to Omaha.

From Friday's Daily.
O. M. Streight goes to Omaha tomorrow with Mrs. Streight to look for a residence, with the expectation of moving to the metropolis as soon as a house can be found. Mrs. Streight does not like the idea of living in this city, while her sons, Monte and Harold have their lay-over at Omaha. By moving to Omaha the boys can be at home much more than when the residence is maintained in this city.

Miss Bessie Dill has resigned her position in our schools to accept a position in the Glenwood, Ia., schools. We are sorry to lose Miss Dill for she is one of our best teachers. Glenwood is her former home; hence her desire to be near former friends and relatives.—Tekamah Journal. Miss Dill is a grand-daughter of our fellow-citizen, Andrew Dill.

T. Frank Wiles arrived today to look after business matters and visit relatives for a few hours.

STATEMENT OF THE CONDITION OF THE PLATTSMOUTH LOAN AND BUILDING ASSOCIATION.

Of Plattsmouth, Nebraska, on the 30th day of June, 1910.

ASSETS:
First mortgage loans.....\$54,094 45
Stock loans.....2,527 70
Real estate.....889 17
Cash.....1,757 47
Delinquent interest, premiums, fines and dues.....430 00
Other assets.....170 00
Total.....\$60,879 63

LIABILITIES:
Capital stock paid up.....\$51,362 04
Reserve fund.....1,326 00
Undivided profits.....2,000 02
Matured stock.....9,200 54
Total.....\$63,889 63

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES for the year ending June 30, 1910.

RECEIPTS:
Dues.....12,021 00
Interest, premiums and fines.....5,367 22
Loans repaid.....20,809 84
Real estate sales.....368 84
Taxes repaid.....287 94
Bills payable.....2,000 00
Total.....\$42,775 89

EXPENDITURES:
Cash July 1, 1910.....\$ 1,035 58
Loans.....16,000 00
Expenses.....996 02
Stock redeemed.....30,245 62
Cash on hand.....1,757 47
Real estate.....91 71
Taxes and dues.....2,000 00
Bills payable.....2,000 00
Total.....\$42,775 89

Total.....\$42,775 89
STATE OF NEBRASKA, ss. J. T. M. PATTERSON, Clerk County, Cass County, Secretary of the above named Association, do solemnly swear that the foregoing statement of the condition of said association, is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

T. M. PATTERSON, Secretary.
Approved: W. J. WHITE, J. E. BARWICK, R. B. WINDHAM, Directors.
Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 12th day of August, 1910.
(SEAL) Notary Public.

LONGWORTH SAYS CANNON MUST GO

Ohio Congressman Issues Statement of His Position.

WILL NOT SUPPORT HIM AGAIN

Roosevelt's Son-in-Law Declares Speaker's Announcement That He Will Be a Candidate Makes Him an Issue in Congressional Election—Reflects President's Views.

Beverly, Mass., Aug. 19.—Reflecting the views of the administration, it is generally believed, Representative Nicholas Longworth of Ohio gave out a statement in which he says he will never support Speaker Cannon again



Photo by American Press Association.

REPRESENTATIVE LONGWORTH.

and that he does not believe that Cannon ever can be re-elected. This is regarded as the actual beginning of the real fight on Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Longworth's statement follows: "In view of Mr. Cannon's unequivocal declaration that he intends to be a candidate for speaker in the next house, I think it is incumbent on those of us who are candidates for membership in the next house, who have made up our minds on our course of action and have positive views on the subject, to state our position publicly.

"Had Mr. Cannon not made this announcement and had it remained doubtful whether he would be a candidate, it was my intention not to commit myself before election as to whom I should or should not support for speaker. But since Mr. Cannon has, in his speeches so far in the campaign and in his recent declaration made candidacy for the speakership an issue, I, for one, do not propose to dodge that issue.

"I shall oppose Mr. Cannon's election as speaker and I shall do so in the manner that I consider proper and effective in the settlement of controversies in my party, namely, in the Republican caucus. I made up my mind before the adjournment of the last session of congress that Mr. Cannon could not be re-elected speaker and my opinion has been strengthened since through correspondence and talks with my colleagues.

Cannon Be Re-elected.
"I am not referring to those who have openly opposed him in the past, but to those who like myself, have supported him.

"I am absolutely convinced if there is a full attendance at the Republican caucus that Mr. Cannon cannot be again elected speaker.

"I have a genuine affection for Mr. Cannon as a man and the highest respect for his splendid fighting qualities. I have supported him five times for the speakership, having voted four times for his election and once against his removal, but I cannot do so again.

"I repeat that I shall oppose the re-election of Mr. Cannon to the speakership and that I am firmly of the opinion that his re-election is impossible. I want it especially understood that I say this solely on my own responsibility and on the suggestion of no one else."

The fact that the statement was given out following the conference at the summer White House regarding plans for the coming congressional campaign is taken here as indicating that President Taft as well as Vice President Sherman is behind the movement to eliminate Mr. Cannon.