DESERET EVENING NEWS MONDAY SEPTEMBER 28 1908



As to Most of What is Said About Him Personally Does Not Deem an Answer Necessary - Platform Having Endorsed Administration Policies, No Need to Make Certain Declarations - Has Not Answered Governor Hughes' Charges, and in President's Opinion Has Done Well Not to Attempt To.

States

Washington, Sept. 27 .-- President | Roosevelt late tonight made reply to William J. Brvan's recent letter, in nich Mr. Bryan maintained that the Democratic party and platform were not getting a 'square deal" in the campaign. The president's reply deals particularly with Mr. Bryan's assertion that the administration has been neither sincere nor effective in the prosecution of trusts.

Mr. Roosevelt combats this charge with characteristic emphasis, and sets forth in detail what has been done under his direction towards curbing the tendency of capital to centralize with a view of destroying competition. The president's letter to Mr. Bryan follows:

LETTER TO MR. BRYAN.

Dear Sir: I have seen your letter Deal Sir, I have seen your letter published in this morning's papers. As to most of what you say about me personally I do not regard any inswer as necessary. When you say that I am unfair to your platform you reiterate certain opinions as to which I had nuoted, with my hearty approval, to Gov. Hughes in my first letter; and these, therefore, it is unnecessary to answer. You have not answered the Hughes speech, and in my judgment you do well not to make the attempt. You say that your platform declares in favor of vigorous enforcement of the law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and that the platform upon which Mr. Taft stands makes no such declaration. It was not nec-pesary. That platform approves the policies of this administration and promises to continue them; and here, as usual. I have only to compare your words with the deeds of the ad-ministration and of Mr. Taft. You merely promise in your platform that you intend to do just what this ad-ministration has actually done and is going. published in this morning's papers. As

DEEDS AND WORDS.

doing.

DEEDS AND WORDS. To show the difference between deeds and words I will compare your record of this administration with the record of one of your most promin-ent supporters at the moment, Mr. Olney, attorney-general under the last Democratic administration. While Mr. Olney was attorney-gen-eral no cases whatever were brought under the anti-trust law against com-binations of capital, the only new cases which he brought being directed against combinations of workingmen. During the entire administration the only cases brought against combina-During the entire administration the only cases brought against combina-tions of capital under the anti-trust act were four in number, two of which were unsuccessful, one of the other two being the case which was decided by Judge Taft in favor of the govern-ment

ment. Under this administration a mass of such cases have been brought, includ-ing the case against the Northern Se-curities company; against the beef packers; against the Federal Salt company; against the General Paper company; against the Otis and other slevator companies; against the Am-srican Tobacco company; against the Powder trust; against the Virginia-Carolina Chemical company; against be Standard Oli company, and others.

either straightforward or sincere? In a letter to the chairman of my campaign committee on Oct. 26, 1904, campaign committee on Oct. 26, 1904, I specifically approved of the condi-tions under which the national com-mittee was accepting contributions.say-ing that their acceptance was to be "with the explicit understanding that they were given and received with no thought of any more obligation on the part of the national committee or of the national administration than is im-plied in the statement that every man shall receive a square deal, no more and no less, and this I shall guarantee him in any event to the best of my

him in any event to the best of my bility." - * + If they subscribe for the purpose of

If they subscribe for the purpose of securing such national welfare and with no thought of personal favors to them, why, they are acting entirely proper. I continued: "In returning the money to them (any contributions) I wish it made clear that there is not the slightest personal feeling against them and they can count upon being treated exactly as fairly as if we had accepted the contribu-tions. They shall not suffer sin any way because we refused them, just as they would not have gained in any way if he had accepted them." No mem-ber of the national committee has ever directly or indirectly suggested to me that I should either do or leave un-done anything whatever because any-one had contributed or had failed to contribute BRYAN'S PROPOSAL,

BRYAN'S PROPOSAL.

I treat each man and each corpora-tion with a view solely to whether he or it is acting rightly on a given oc-casion. Let me give you an example. I have proceeded against the corpora-tions of which Mr. E. H. Harirman is the head on certain points where I be-lleve they have violated the law. But when, in connection with the breaking of the Salton sea dam, one of the Har-riman corporations repaired the dam, I, last winter, did everything I could to have Congress reimburse Mr. Harri-man for so much of the obligation as I felt ought to come upon the United States. BRYAN'S PROPOSAL, These are the facts. Now for your proposal. You have yourself furnished its condemnation. You have guoted the subscriptions furnished to Gov. Hughes as a reason to distrust Gov. Hughes as a transfer of the subscription of you would be what the governor's attitude had been throughout his term. You quote the subscription of Mr. Harriman to my compaign, aithough you know wein that it does not interfere with any action taken by me as against Mr. Harriman, and ask if it would not have affected the campaign if known. Thereby you have furnished an excellent reason for refusing to meet your proposal, for you make it evident to adopt your proposal would give to every man who cared merely for partisan success the chance, by precisely the argument you have I would hold myself unfit to be presi-dent if, because I prosecuted Mr. Harri-man where I thought he had broken the law, I yet hesitated to do him justice where I thought the facts required that justice should be done him. In exactly the same way I have acted and shall act as regards the Steel corporation. NAMES THE OFFICIAL. You ask me to name a single official connected with a law-detying corpora-tion who has declared that he is sup-porting you, In a St. Louis paper which reaches me at the same time that the

merely for partisan success the chance, by precisely the argument you have now made, to create to more purpose the false impression that you are now seeking to create. Mr. Taft's reputation, Mr. Taft's acts on the bench and in the executive serv-ices show that he could not be swayed in any shape or way by any considera-tion save the public interest, and that the fact of any man contributing or failing to contribute would in any way influence his action any more than it has influenced my action or the action of Gov. Hughes. of Gov. Hughes.

PUBLICATION OF EXPENSES.

porting you, in a st. Louis paper which reaches me at the same time that the papers containing this published letter of yours I find a statement from Judge Henry S. Priest, attorney for the Waters-Pierce Oil company, the west-ern subsidiary or representative of the Standard Oil company, in which he an-nounces that he is for Bryan and states that Wall street believes that Bryan will be elected. In response to the question as to whether he could quote any of the Standard Oil magnates as feeling that way, he answered: "I did not say I saw any of the offi-clals of the Standard Oil company. I am giving you what I found was the drift oi opinion among well-posted poil-ticians as well as bankers. I guess Gov. Haskell is all right. They have not proved anything on him, have they?" PUBLICATION OF EXPENSES. I emphatically approve of the publi-cation of campaign expenses after the election, whether provided for by law or not. You have shown by this letter of yours that if the contirbutions to Mr. Hughes' campaign fund had been made public before election you and those who act with you would have striven to give the false impression that Mr. Hughes was unfit to be en-trusted with the position of governor; and you have shown by this letter of yours that if Mr. Harriman's contribu-tion to the campaign fund of 1904 (and incidentally I may mention that I am informed that this particular contribu-tion was not used for the national cam-paign, but in the New York state cam-paign) had been known before the elec-tion, you and your supporters would have endeavored to use the fact of its having been made as an insincere and unterthful arrument to show that I not proved anything on him, have they?" The newspaper clipping goes on to say that "Judge Priest was one of the lawyers who fought Atty.-Gen, Hadley in the state's ouster suit against the Waters-Pierce and Republic Oil com-paniss. His legal practise is connected with the big corporations and his firm is counsel for the United States Steel company and the Northern Securities interests in St. Louis. Judge Priest is credited with originating the phrase, "Bribery is a conventional offense," which he used in an argument at the trial of R. M. Snyder, the Kansas City millionaire, now dead. You say that the trust magnates know their own interests and are sup-porting Judge Taft. 'So far as their interests are simply interests of the business community, and especially of the wage workers. I believe they will support Judge Taft. So far as they have special interests which are to them more important than the general business welfare, I believe they will support you. I base this belief upon what happened in 1806. Your success then would, in my belief, have been a calamity for the country from the standpoint of the welfare of the busi-ness men, farmers and workingmen, just as, in my belief, your success now would be a calamity, both from the

having been made as an insincer and untruthful argument to show that I could not be trusted to deal out exact justice to Mr. Harriman. No stronger argument against your proposition has yet been advanced than this that you have unconsciously advanced.

GOV. HASKELL'S CASE.

I now come to the important part of your letter, your attitude toward Mr. Haskell, You state that Mr. Haskell has voluntarily resigned from the com-mittee. You speak highly of the public service which he has rendered, and proservice which he has rendered, and pro-test against any condemnation of him except such as may come in a court. Out of your own mouth you are con-demned. You thereby set up that stan-dard of "law honesty" which has been the bane of this people in endeavoring to get equity and fair dealing—as they should obtain among bigh minded mou his attorney filed dilatory motions, such as demurrers. pleading to the jurisdiction, etc. HE DARE NOT ANSWER.

tea, fine tea.

HE DARE NOT ANSWER. "He dare not answer and deny the al-legations set up in our bill; such an answer would be a sworn lie and known to be by the large number of 'straw' men and 'dummies' he used in prefecting the fraud." For this peculiar act of the man whose bublic record you endorse you may rest assured that the interior department will endeavor to see that the courts do "justice" to him. When Mr. Haskell was in New York various judgments were filed against him. I will not at this moment discuss the charges of perjury and fraud made against him by Atty. Albert H. Walk-er, of New York, in connection with the suit decided by Judge Lacombe in March, 1902. But the records of the county clerk of New York county show that on Feb. 21, 1900, a jude-ment for damages and costs amount-ing to \$42,235,43, recovered in the supreme court of the county, was filed against Charles N. Haskell. On April 2, 1904, this judgment was re-turned on the sheriff's execution, satisfied to the extent of only \$22,80, and the remainder of it remains still unpaid. In this instance your proposal that unpaid.

MORAL OBTUSENESS. The national government, obeying both the law and the principles of sound morality, discriminated neither for nor against the Standard Oll com-pany, or its rival. Gov. Haskel, against the law and against every principle of honesty and fair dealing, discriminated in favor of the Standard Oll corpora-tion. Failure to see the distinction be-tween the two cases indicates moral rather than mental obtuseness. I believe in radical reforms and the movement for such reforms can be suc-cessful only if it frowns on the dema-gogue as it does on the corruptionst! If it shows itself as far removed from government by a mob as from govern-ment by a plutocracy. Of all corrup-tion the most far-reaching for evil is that which hides itself behind a mask of furious demagoguery, seeking to pander to the basest passions of man-kind. No better exemplification of this type of corruption could be found than in the case of Mr. Haskell: You have uttered no word of condem-nation of Haskellism as we thus see it. That you conscientionally sought to bring it about 1 do not believe. That the and the remainder of it remains still unpaid. In this instance your proposal that Mr Haskell be left to the court does not seem, to have produced thorough-going justice. Neithor shall I touch upon the various suits of all kinds against him for all kinds of reasons. Thus, it is reported in the press under date of September 19, 1908, that \$500 judgment had been obtained against Mr. Haskell by an attorney of Arkan-sas, who was employed by him "to lobby before the city council of Musk-ogee to get through a franchise. The fee was never paid. But the fran-chise was granted." Nor again shall I touch upon the facsimile published in the press of September 2 last, showing Mr. Haskell's having three years ago joined an organization to

years ago joined an organization the prevent union labor from entering the city in which he lived. Indeed, as re-gards this statement, I wish distinctly to acquit Mr. Haskell of being opposed on principle to either trade unions or corporations; for I wish to acquit him of being opposed on principle to any thing.

HASKELL AND STANDARD OIL.

HASKELL AND STANDARD OIL. Now, as to Gov. Haskell's connec-tion with the Standard Oil company in Oklahoma. Gov. Haskell advances the fact that the United States government permitted the Standard Oil company on the same terms as any and all other compaines to enjoy the legal privileges to which it was en-titled on the Indian reservations of Oklahoma, as his justification for hav-ing given it illegal privileges to which it was not entitled in the state of Oklahoma. Oklahoma.

It was not entitled in the state of Oklahoma. The excuse furnished the measure of Gov. Haskell's moral quality. The federal act of March 11, 1904, confer-red upon the secretary of the interior the right to grant permits for oll and gas pipe lines across Indian reserva-tions. Regulations to carry out the law were drawn up by the Indian of-fiee and approved by the secretary of the interior April 12, 1904. In compliance with the law and the regulations the department of the in-terior permitted the Standard Oll pipe line company (the Prairie Oll & Gas company and the various rival pipe line company, the Dense Port-land Cement company, and others (the Texas and Guif companes) all on the same terms and under the same condi-tions, the right-of-way across the In-dian reservations. dian reservations.

NO PRIVILEGE GRANTED

NO PRIVILEGE GRANTED No preference or privilege was granted to any company that was not also granted to all the others. Any oth-er action than that actually taken by the interior department would have been as grossly improper as the ac-tions of Gov. Haskell himself. The government stood neither for nor against any company; but it re-quired each to obey the law. Its ac-tion was precisely like the action which it took for instance in proceed-ing against the Standard Oil company in the rebate matter; it did not thus proceed because the Standard Oil company was involved but because



Our Ladies' Tailor-Made Department

Has never been in better condition, both in quality and quantity, than now. It is only one week until the State Fair, and every lady will want her New Suit or Coat by that time, and as you gain nothing by waiting, would advise early shopping.

The New Gowns and Afternoon Dresses

Have decided changes in materials as well as styles, which is a decided innovation in Gown Art which show the graceful lines of the figure in the daintiest possible manner.

Waist, Neckwear and Hosiery Departments

Are full of the "Newest Dainties" in merchandise that can be had. STREET, PATTERN AND IMPORTED HATS.



计计型

TEA

the Standard Oil company, and others. In a number of these cases the gov-irnment has already succeeded by in-iunction and otherwise. Some of the cases are now pending. In hardly any important case against great law-breaking corporations has the govern-ment yet suffered final defeat. the Standard Oil company, and others

DEMOCRATIC RECORD.

ment yet suffered mind detext. DEMOCRATIC RECORD. As regards the suits to suppress every indistration there were no indictments gainst shippers for receiving rebates or secret rales. Under my administra-ion there have been 49 indictments for secret rebates, resulting in 18 con-ristions; and in only four cases have these indictments failed. The other 77 cases are still ending. Among the railroads which have been convicted ington & Quincy; the New York Cen-ral; the Chicago, Rock Island & Paci-e, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, while scores of cases are still pending against other leading railroads. Among the shippers that have been convicted the some of the greatest borinstance, the American Sugar com-pany, the aggregate fine actually paid being more than \$150,000; Swift & Co. the Armour Packing company. The Underly Packing company. The Standard Oil case is still pending that is a record of actual achievements and baside it mere promises are suppress the the suppress are suppress the t

STEEL TRUST CASE.

STEEL TRUST CASE. You state that the steel company, with my express consent, purchased one of its largest rivals and thus ob-tained control of over 50 per cent of the total output. This action of the steel company, which increased its share of the total output by only about 4 per cent, and in no way, altered the standing of the company under the law, may have been a violation of your plan, the absurdity of which has been exposed by Gov. Hughes, But there were no violations of the law. I was cognizant of the en-tire transaction. It was not entered into by the steel corporation of its own desire, but solely at the urgent request of the corporation purchased and of the big banks holding that corporation's securities, in order to enable them to prevent a crash, which would have unned the panic of last fall into a most widespread disaster. CONTROLLING PANIC.

CONTROLLING PANIC.

One of your supporters, the New list of contributions to your campaign list of contributions to your campaign fund of 1896, containing the names of individuals and corporations owning silver mines, who made contributions to the aggregate amount of \$288,000, one of these contributions being of \$159,000 and another of \$45,000, etc., etc. Now all the great financial magnates who then contributed to your campaign fund would have preferred business prosperity to business adversity, other things being equal; but they would rather have had the immense profit that would have accrued to them from

ness men, farmers and workingmen, just as, in my belief, your success now would be a calamity, both from the standpoint of business, and especially of the interests of the wage worker, and from the standpoint of morals.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF 1896.

that would have accrued to them from the free conage, of the 50 cent dollars than the smaller profit which would have accrued to them merely from the general industrial prosperity of the

county. Because of their interests and against the interests of the community-at-large these trust magnates then supported you. My belief is, and the statement of Judge Priest quoted above and the attitude of many men of large financial in tude of many men of large manchai h-terests warrants me in expressing the belief, that these trust magnates whose fear of being prosecuted under the law by Mr. Taft is greater than their fear of general business adversity under you, will support you, and not Mr. Taft

ABOUT CONTRIBUTIONS.

Taft.

ABOUT CONTRIBUTIONS. I come to what you have to say about contributions, and here you furnish your own answer. You state that it appears from the published statement of the contributions for Mr. Hughes' campaign for governor, two years ago, that various men of wealth, some of them connected with the corporations, whom you name to the number of nine, contributed from \$20,000 to \$500 aplece. You ask, "would the fact that these gentlemen contributed to his campaign fund strengthen or weaken his testi-mony against the reasonableness of our anti-trust remedy?" and later you con-tinue by asking, "Are you willing to say that any public interest was served in 1904 by concealing until after election the contributions made to the Repub-lican campaign committee by Mr. Har-riman and those collected by him from others?" Are you willing to say that the publication before election? You then propose to publish the names of con-tributions before election and ask us to do the same. The amounts you mention as contrib-

tributions before election and ask us to do the same. The amounts you mention as contrib-uted to Mr. Hughes are utterly trivial compared to the amounts I have al-ready mentioned as contributed to your campaign in 1896, but in my judgment the amount contributed has nothing whatever to do with the point at issue,

The property of the propert

should obtain among high-minded men -from great business corporations and from individuals like Mr. Haskell.

Apparently you disclaim even asking Mr. Haskell to retire from the position in which you placed him, so that he re-tires of his own free will and you utter no word of condemnation of his gross offenses against public decency and honesty. On the contrary, you strive to make it appear that his misconduct in reference to the Standard OU comparent is all of which he is accused; whereas, shameless though this particular act of

shameless though this particular act of his is, it is no worse than countless others in his career. I contrast your action in this case with that of Mr. Taft in reference to Senator Foraker. Mr. Taft's statement when the question of his nomination was at stake was that he would rather not accept it at the price of sacrific-ing principle by supporting Mr. Fora-ker for senator. You do not venture in so much as the slightest possible manner to censure Mr. Haskell for his manifested misdeeds, and you ask that he be held guiltless of them unless convicted in a court. You well know that as regards the worst of them no action in a court of law would lie. You say you were ignorant of Mr. Haskell's record. If so, it was wilful ignorance on your part.

or law would lie. Fou say you were ignorant of Mr. Haskell's record. If so, it was wilful ignorance on your part. I call your attneiton to a letter of Mr. T. L. Russell, editor of the Morn-ing Democrat of Ardmore, Okla., in which, writing to you on Sept. 24, 1908, he states: "If you were ignorant of such charges it is because you refused to read them when presented to you when you visited Oklahoma last fall in the interest of candidate Haskell. At that time I formally presented to you 10 typewritten pages of charges against Mr. Haskell, covering this operations in Ohio, New York, Arkan-sas, Texas and Oklahoma. The charges recently made by Mr. Hearst were all made by me at that time." WHAT COURTS HAVE DONE.

WHAT COURTS HAVE DONE.

Burnade by me at that time."
WHAT COURTS HAVE DONE.
Toy ask that we leave the courts for the court is here and the balance of the second with the second we have the courts so deal with him. As to others various the courts so deal with him. As the others various the courts so deal with him. As the others various the courts so deal with him. As the others various the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts so deal with him. As the others ware the courts are so the line ware so the there was satisfied the laying of the him and the the there was satisfied the laying of the him and there the there was satisfied that the ware satisfied that the ware satisfied that the ware satisfied the laying of the there was the did not done the honor of substate the would not tolerate any provide the would help was the stimated at the would not tolerate any provide the section for the drend the source of the single of the state of the source of the sou

proceed because the bandard but because company was involved but because rebates had been granted. It would have proceeded just as quickly against the rivals of the Standard Oll com-pany as against the Standard Oll company itself. Our only concern was to punish any guilty party. Our effort is to do equal justice to all and to exact equal justice

guilty party. Our entries to not state of the justice to all and to exact equal justice from all alike. We are no more to be swayed from this course by desire to punish a corporation than by desire to favor, no matter whether it is the Standard Oil or any other com-pany. The permit of the national gov-ernment as set forth in the telegram of the secretary of the interior to Gov. Haskell of April 23 last, was merely to cross or use the restricted allottments and tribal property of the Indiane; it had nothing to do with the question of compliance with the laws of the state of Oklahoma and con-ferred no privilege to cross territory in Oklahoma outside of these reserva-tions. tions

tions. Gov. Haskell refuses to permit any proceedings to be taken against the Standard Oli company, although this company declines to obey the law of Oklahoma. He claims that the Stan-dard Oli's rights were superior to the requirements of the Oklahoma constitu-tion, for which he was himself mainly responsible; he took the decision of this question away from the courts and, against the opinion of his attorney-gen-eral, he declared it in favor of the Standard Oli corporation. The attorney-general of Oklahoma has made the fol-lowing statement in this matter:

ATTY.-GEN. WEST'S STATEMENT.

"The president's statement as to the Frairic Oil & Gas company suit is less than the whole matter in its whole iniquity, because on the 28rd of April I had informed the governor that the action taken the Prairie company was illegal and should be enjoined and that I had an open injunction suit. At that time, April 23, the governor agreed with me as to the illegality of the action and anyroyed the bringing of the inand approved the bringing of the in-junction.