

THE CORVALLIS GAZETTE

Published Tuesdays and Fridays by the GAZETTE PUBLISHING Co., for \$2.00 per annum, or 25 per cent discount if cash is paid in advance.

ELECTIONS FOR 1908.

Closes for election Oct. 20. Presidential election Nov. 3.

Republican National Ticket.

FOR PRESIDENT
WILLIAM H. TAFT
of Ohio.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT
JAMES S. SHERMAN
of New York.

For Presidential Electors
J. D. LEE, of Multnomah County
F. J. MILLER, of Linn County
A. C. MARSTERS, of Douglass County
R. R. BUTLER, of Gilliam County

REPUBLICAN RALLY.

The citizens of Corvallis and Benton county will be addressed at the court house on Wednesday evening, October 28, by Hon. C. H. Fulton, U. S. Senator. This gentleman is a speaker of national reputation. All voters of whatever political faith, college students and ladies are invited to hear Senator Fulton speak.

COL. MILLER'S SPEECH.

Col. Robt. A. Miller expounded democratic doctrine at the courthouse on Thursday night and done himself great credit in the pleasing manner of his address.

He admitted he had often been greatly humiliated by his republican friends poking fun at him over the bank failures and general disarrangement of business interests during the last democratic administration and turned a very nice point by saying that when the republican panic came last fall "we simply declared a legal holiday."

He did not deem it necessary, for his purpose, to call the attention of his hearers to the entire four years of misery under that democratic administration, in which not only banks failed, but every business interest of the country was completely paralyzed, for he fully realized that the heart-strings of many men in the audience were still bleeding from wounds received.

He did not deem it wise to tell of the marvelous prosperity that has followed that democratic administration ever since the people buried them under an avalanche of votes; nor did he point to the wisdom, on the part of the republican President and congress, when confronted with the most peculiar condition that ever existed in governmental affairs, in declaring a legal holiday that the business men of the country might take a calm and dispassionate view of the situation; nor did he tell you that by this prompt action by the party in power every condition had been met and confidence fully restored.

He also failed to tell his audience that never, in the history of the country have our people been more prosperous and happy; nor did he add the further fact that the people will make a sad mistake if they should vote a change by electing Bryan.

While eulogizing Bryan as a citizen and orator he did not take pains to enlarge on his acrobatic feats on every public question in each succeeding campaign; nor how he could straddle the fence four years hence.

It was indeed funny to think Judge Lowell would object to Bryan's presidential aspirations on account of oratorical powers, when in fact, the Judge conceded this point as his principal qualification as a presidential candidate.

Mr. Bryan challenges Mr. Taft to take the people into his confidence. It isn't necessary. The people long ago took Mr. Taft into theirs.

LABOR'S MAGNA CHARTA.

The more labor studies the treatment which labor has received at the hands of William H. Taft, both on and off the bench, the more evident it becomes to every fair-minded worker that Judge Taft has not only been just and impartial in dealing with the interests of workingman, but that his decisions, followed as precedents by other courts, has been of inestimable value to labor in upholding the rights of railway workmen to leave their employment where they see fit, irrespective of the consent of the employer. It is well known that even in England, where labor possesses more rights than in any other country of Europe, a different rule prevails, and the crew of a train quitting without giving several days' notice can be prosecuted criminally. Some American railways sought to maintain a similar rule, but Judge Taft, in the Toledo and Ann Arbor railroad case, held that the relation of employees to railway companies is one of free contract, and is not analogous to that of seamen in the maritime service, who to a certain extent, surrender their liberty in their employment and are punishable for desertion. The employment, therefore, in the case of railway service, was terminable by either party. The court could not compel the enforcement of personal services as against either the employer or the employed, against the will of either.

It was this decision which prompted the head of one of the railway labor organizations, a few days ago, to write to Mr. Taft that at St. Louis in a subsequent railway controversy the railway employees had found "you had laid down there the Magna Charta upon which we could depend for the protection of our rights."

Labor can always depend upon Mr. Taft for the protection of its rights, both because he is in sympathy with labor, and because it is his nature to do right by every citizen, and to see, as far as in his power lies, that no one is wronged.

The election of Mr. Taft to the Presidency will in itself be a Magna Charta upon which every American can depend for equitable, just and generous treatment by the chosen head of the government.

THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN.

In a business sense the young voters who have come forward since 1904 have more at stake than any other class in rendering a right decision. Their active lives are ahead. They have more years to live, and are now laying the foundations of their business careers. National policies and conditions are of the highest consequence to them. Perhaps they are farmers. If so, let them ask the older generation how farmers fared under the last Democratic administration. Let them take the market reports of to-day and compare them with the prices that prevailed when Mr. Bryan made his crusade for free silver and hurled defiance at President Cleveland because he stood by the gold standard. At the same time Bryan denounced the Republican party for its protectionist as well as sound money position. Perhaps the first voter is to engage in manufacturing or mining, as wage-earner or otherwise. Does he want his American rate of wages and the industry he chooses reasonably protected against foreign competition? If he does Mr. Bryan's leadership will take him in the opposite direction.—St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

The Tide of Prosperity.

The tide of prosperity may ebb and flow, but the great waves of industrial wealth will continue to grow in volume with ever-increasing comfort and happiness to our contented people, who will soon number 100,000,000. And because of our intelligent and skillful labor, made so because of good wages and good living, we shall make better fabrics and build stronger structures—that in spite of their higher cost in the beginning will be cheaper in the end and will be wanted by the people in every corner of the earth. So that we shall capture the markets of the world in greater volume without ever sacrificing our home market, the foundation of our national wealth and progress.—Hon. James S. Sherman.

Henry Gassaway Davis, who was defeated with Parker four years ago, is wiser as well as older. He says he sees no hope for the Democracy, and thinks Parker is again wasting valuable time in making speeches.—St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

JOURNEYING IN LAND OF DREAMS

Impracticable Democratic Proposition for Trust Control.

Convincing Exposition of Fallacy of Bryan's Panacea for Solving Problems of Modern Business.

(From Gov. Hughes' Youngstown speech.)

When we consider remedies that are proposed for the trusts, we find ourselves journeying in a land of dreams. Again the magician of 1896 waves his wand. At a stroke difficulties disappear and the complex problems of modern business are forgotten in the fascination of the simple panacea. And, as the free coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1 was to destroy the curse of gold, so the new found specific of equal perfection is to remove the curse of industrial oppression. The delusion of 1908 is comparable only to that of twelve years ago.

The first suggestion is that the law should prevent a duplication of directors among competing corporations. However advisable it may be to have independent directorates of competing corporations, it would seem still more important to have independent stockholders, for a majority of the stockholders of a corporation choose the directors. If a law were passed preventing the duplication of directors it would easily be evaded in the selection of men who would represent the same interests. The most ordinary experience shows that it is not necessary to serve on a board of directors in order to control its proceedings. Whatever the advantage of such a law as is proposed, it hardly rises to the dignity of a "remedy," or vindicates its title to a place in an imposing scheme of reform outlined in a national platform.

But the more important proposal is "that any manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce shall be required to take out a federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent of the product in which it deals." A license is permission, and the object of the remedy is not to regulate large businesses, but to destroy trusts. Hence the supposed efficiency of the plan is to be found in the prohibition of the control by any such corporation "of more than 50 per cent of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States." This is another delusion of ratio.

It might be interesting to inquire what is the meaning of "any product consumed in the United States." Does it refer to a class of commodities? And, if so, how shall the classes be defined? Or does it refer to each separate article of commerce? And, if so, what account does this proposal take of the skill and initiative of manufacturers who have built up a more or less exclusive trade in particular articles, often protected by trade-marks, although in most active competition with other articles designed for the same general purpose and seeking the same market? In a desire to correct the evils of business are we to place an embargo upon honest endeavor whose activities present none of the abuses requiring remedies? And, if not, what statutory definitions shall be found to be adequate and just if we lay down our prohibition in terms of volume or ratio of business and not in terms of right and wrong? If we adopt Mr. Bryan's proposal, to what period of production is the prohibition to apply? Is the excess for a day or for a month to be considered? Or is the average production for a year to be taken? And what system shall be devised by which suitable information may be furnished in the nature of danger signals along the routes of trade so that the manufacturer may know when he is about to exceed the prescribed ratio? He may justly be required to govern his own conduct, but how shall he be apprised of the conduct of others upon which is to depend his guilt or innocence?

The patent laws confer a true monopoly in the exclusive right to manufacture and sell. Are these laws to be repealed because a "private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable?"

Bryan's Crude Reasoning.

An example of Mr. Bryan's reasoning is found in his statement that "when a corporation controls 50 per cent of the total product it supplies forty millions of people with that product." There are, of course, specialties which have a limited market and are used by a relatively small number of the people of the United States. More than 50 per cent, and indeed even as much as 100 per cent of the trade in such articles may be in the control of a particular corporation. This may, in fact, be relatively a small corporation. It may never have aspired to the unsavory renown of a "trust." But by prosecuting its particular line with fidelity and meeting satisfactorily a limited want; or by reason of some secret processes or advantage of experience, it may control the trade in a given article of commerce. Or, suppose a concern controls the whole trade in some useful byproduct which it has found it advantageous to make, is the trade to be prohibited?

The Democratic platform makes no

NO RETREAT



THE SENTINEL STANDS FIRMLY IN DEFENSE OF HIS FLAG.

—From the Baltimore American.

exceptions to cover such cases, and we have learned that it is equally "binding as to what it omits."

If we could imagine such a crude prohibition to be enacted into law, and to be regarded as valid, what would be the effect? Mr. Bryan, with his usual readiness, suggests that the concern may sell as much of its plants as are not needed to produce the amount allowed by law. He speaks as though every manufacturing concern had as many fully equipped units of production as would correspond to any given percentage of trade which it might be required to stop. Plants are not so easily dismembered. Reduction in output means reduction in work, reduction in the number of men employed and curtailment of the efficiency of a going concern. Let us suppose a concern which controls 80 per cent of a given product—that is to say, makes and sells \$8,000,000 in value out of a total trade in the product amounting to \$10,000,000. Is it to be compelled to reduce its output to \$2,000,000 because only \$2,000,000 in value are made by others? Then, if it could sell a part of its plant on Mr. Bryan's theory, what should it sell? Should it sell off enough to reduce its capacity to \$5,000,000, and allow three-fifths of its plant to remain idle until others developed a capacity for handling the other \$5,000,000? Should it assume that the total trade will increase and is not always to remain at \$10,000,000, and hence retain a larger portion of its plant in idleness? Or suppose a concern controls 100 per cent of the trade in some article, what plants shall it retain? It can produce nothing until others produce; but it may produce an amount equal to the production of others, and it hopes the trade will grow. What a vision of business uncertainty and confusion, of idle and impaired plants, of the ruin of workingmen whose lives have clustered around particular industries and who depend upon their continued efficiency, is presented by this fanciful remedy for the destruction of trusts!

Apart from this, if the dissolution were effected in the manner desired and portions of plants could be sold and were sold as suggested, to whom would the sale be made? Would it be necessarily to foes or to those ambitious to be competitors and anxious to take advantage of its plight?

This proposal in its utter disregard of the facts of business, in its substitution of the phantasies of the imagination for the realities of life, stamps the Democratic platform with the fatal stamp of 1896. The commerce and industry of this country, the interests of its wage earners and of its interdependent masses, who must rely upon the stability of business, cannot afford to give license to such vagaries.

In the solemnity with which this proposal has been declared, and the insistence with which it is advocated, we find an appropriate test of the capacity of our opponents to deal wisely with the problems of the day.

HOW TAFT WAS SOUGHT BY MCKINLEY.

The Manner in Which the Republican Candidate Was Called to a Larger Sphere of Action.

One afternoon early in 1900, when Judge William H. Taft was dictating a decision of the United States Court in the Federal Building in Cincinnati, a telegram was placed in his hands. He tore off the envelope and was surprised to find a telegram from President William McKinley, reading:

"I shall take it as a great favor if you will call on me some time next week."

Judge Taft guessed at the meaning of the summons and guessed wrong. He went to Washington and was shown into a room at the White House, where he met the President and Secretary Long of the Navy. Later, Elihu Root, the Secretary of War, came in. Then, to use Mr. Taft's own words:

"Mr. McKinley said that he wanted to send me to the Philippines to help in the work of establishing civil government as the army moved on. I thought of my place on the bench and hesitated. Besides, I believed and said we could get along without the Philippines. "But we have them and must take care of them," the President replied. "You are at the turning of the ways in your life," Mr. Root then observed. "The bench is the easy road. You can stay there and be comfortable. On the contrary, the Philippines will demand personal sacrifices and risks and much hard work, but you will have an opportunity of doing your country a very great service." I went home, and argued the matter for two weeks."

The telegram to Cincinnati opened the door of American history to William H. Taft and made him the Republican candidate for President of the United States.

Obligations of Civil War.

Money indebtedness is not the only obligation we incurred and assumed in the great civil war. There was a still greater debt, an everlasting obligation that could never be paid in full. But in the years that have followed, the Republican party has inaugurated and developed pension laws under which over three and one-half billion dollars have been paid to disabled veterans or to the survivors of those who gave their lives for their country and their flag. This pension system, a product of the policy of the Republican party, has no precedent in history and no equal in justice and generosity among the nations of the earth.—Hon. James S. Sherman.

Colonel Bryan laments the "discrimination that has been going on against the farmer" in electing so few tillers of the soil to Congress and the Senate. What troubles him chiefly, however, is the discrimination which the whole American nation exercises against a certain farmer of Lincoln, Neb., in declining to elect him to the White House.—New York Tribune.

TAFT COMES FROM GOOD STOCK.

Family Ranked Among the Plain People for Many Years.

The Tafts—those who at present are the Tafts—hail ancestrally from Uxbridge, Mass. They say that Tafts are so thick in Uxbridge that even a woman can't throw a stone without hitting one.

Some years ago—in 1874, to be exact—there was a Taft reunion in Uxbridge, to which descendants of the original Robert Taft came flocking from all parts of the country. One of the conspicuous features of the affair was a historical address by Alphonso Taft, father of the present Republican candidate. He traced the history of various branches of the family, and when he came to the one to which he and his children belonged he said:

"Our family have not embarked much upon national politics, except that they have shared in the battles of the country when national independence was to be won, and also when the Union was at stake. But brilliant political careers have not been characteristic of the Tafts in the past. It is not safe to say what may be in store for them. There is a tide in the affairs of men and also of families."

This is taken from the account of the reunion published at the time. Alphonso Taft would perhaps have been somewhat dazzled if he could have foreseen how quickly and brilliantly the family would proceed to "embark upon national politics." He himself started the turn of the tide which he predicted. It seems to be reaching its flood in the career of the son who that year was entering Yale.

As Alphonso Taft described his immediate ancestors one sees where his son got certain characteristics. Peter Taft (1715) was "a large, good-looking man of magnanimous disposition." He had four sons.

Aaron, the candidate's ancestor, was also so magnanimous that he lost money by indorsing a friend's notes; he was a man "of great intelligence and integrity." And then, going somewhat further back, there was Captain William Taft, who took Blarney Castle in the sixteenth century "by blarney quite as much as by military prowess." Good stock was Captain William from which to make a twentieth century Secretary of War William.

A Grand Record.

The Republican party is not only rich in men, but rich in practical and beneficial principles—it is rich too in its record, in promises performed and pledges fulfilled, and so we are for party and party principles first and will acquiesce in the choice of the majority, rallying around the standard bearer who will carry us again to victory.—Hon. James S. Sherman.

Mr. Bryan might make a hit in the Rocky Mountain States by proposing a federal guaranty of mining stock deposits.—Omaha Bee.