

especially difficult conditions he has defeated them again. With the Evans-Guggenheim-Speer Demo-Republican bi-partisan machine set to crush him, he was re-elected by 25,000 majority. Nor is that all of it. The Big Business crowd was swept away by a plurality of over 20,000 for the other Citizen candidates, and a clean majority of 10,000 over all. Naturally the Denver news dispatches have been quiet about the results of this election. If it had gone the other way the din of it would echo yet. But the important thing is not the news of the victory, but the victory itself; and the most important phase of that is its further assurance that the people are capable of self-government when they have even so much as a poor chance to work at it.



### Roosevelt's Record on Trusts.

Clyde Tavenner, the Washington correspondent, makes an indictment of Roosevelt which he, in the event of his nomination, may not find it easy to evade. Mr. Tavenner invokes an "abundance of official data in the archives of the Department of Justice in Washington which shows beyond successful contradiction that Roosevelt is allied, and always has been, with the 'far-reaching Morgan interests,' the same interests which are now financing with a lavish hand his campaign for renomination." Admitting that Mr. Roosevelt, "past-master in politics that he is," may be able temporarily to fool the majority of the people into believing that he is really against the great industrial trusts, Mr. Tavenner is sure he will not be able to fool historians. "The data at the Department of Justice in Washington," continues Mr. Tavenner, "revealing his failure to bring criminal prosecution against George W. Perkins for organizing the illegal harvester trust, when considered with the sworn report of the Roosevelt campaign committee of New York showing how Perkins contributed thousands to return Mr. Roosevelt to the White House, forms a chain of evidence that will surely be commented upon by unprejudiced historians. History will have to state that during all the time he was in the White House, as well as when running for the third term, Mr. Roosevelt was in frequent conference with George W. Perkins, who might be accurately described as the official messenger of Wall Street. History must show that Perkins was the chief aide and co-schemer of J. P. Morgan, while the latter was, in the years between 1905 and 1911, throttling business in every direction. It was Perkins who, as Morgan's business partner, showed Morgan how to dominate the

boards of directors of all the great railroads, banks and trust companies, express, telegraph and telephone companies, steamship lines, insurance companies and all the great industrial trusts, to the end that Morgan now has a strangle hold on a corporate wealth of over thirty-five billion dollars, an amount equal to one-third of the total wealth of the nation. Mr. Roosevelt's biography will also relate that while he was president Burdette D. Townsend, one of his assistant attorney generals, investigated the Harvester trust, reported that it was a trust of the most vicious character, that it was holding up the farmers, that all the plans for its organization and manipulation had been conceived and executed by Roosevelt's friend, George W. Perkins, and that Mr. Roosevelt's answer to the recommendation of the investigator to prosecute the trust was an order to his attorney general not to start suit until he gave the word, which word was never given." These matters have been stated before and President Taft is their sponsor. without waiting for the historians? Historians are true or not, in fact and in sinister significance, without waiting for the historians. Historians couldn't repair the mischief Roosevelt might do, however foolish they might make the voters of next November look to posterity.



### "The Question Before the House."

When a Prohibitionist at Asbury Park asked Senator La Follette if he were a Prohibitionist, the questioner probably did not mean to be disorderly, but he was. Senator La Follette had just closed an address on the fighting issues of the pending Presidential campaign, of which Prohibition is not one nor likely to be. Prohibition was therefore on that occasion not germane to what parliamentarians call "the question before the house." It was a disorderly interruption. But Senator La Follette answered it straight from the shoulder, as is customary with him. Not being a Prohibitionist, he said so in one word of one syllable. But he added several words of well-merited rebuke. He said to his clerical questioner: "I don't think that was fair of you; that question has not entered into the discussions of the campaign, and is not an issue; but as you ask it and have my answer, I suggest that you put the question also to Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft when they come here." The advice was probably not taken. These out-of-order questions are almost always put to candidates who are already as far forward in the progressive fight as public opinion will tolerate; and it is not an unfair inference that as a rule the ques-