

CONSERVATION A FEDERAL TASK

Colonel Roosevelt Discusses the Problem Broadly and His Speech Is Received With the Wildest Cheers.

RECKLESS, UNCONTROLLED WASTE MUST BE STOPPED

"Much of What I Shall Say," He Said, "Will Be a Repetition of What Was Said by President Taft Here."

ST. PAUL, Sept. 6.—While the address of Theodore Roosevelt was the feature of the national conservation congress today, delegates were greatly interested in the appointment of committees.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech on conservation was received with the wildest applause. It was several minutes after he arose to speak before he could make himself heard, so persistently did the throng cheer him.

In his speech Colonel Roosevelt outlined his ideas as to conservation. Saying that the reckless and uncontrolled waste of the past must be stopped, he declared himself in favor of rigid steps to preserve the country's natural resources for the benefit of the whole people and to check the power of monopolistic corporations.

"Much that I have to say on the subject of conservation will be a repetition of what was so admirably said from this platform yesterday," said Colonel Roosevelt.

His compliment to the president was received with cheers.

Clifford Pinchot, who was absent when the president spoke yesterday, returned today and took part in the entertainment of Col. Roosevelt and standing room was at a premium.

This was Roosevelt day in the twin cities. Col. Roosevelt reached Minneapolis from Fargo at 7 o'clock and after breakfast was escorted to St. Paul.

Crowds of cheering men, women and children greeted the former president all along the route from Minneapolis to the state capitol here, where he was met by the original Roosevelt club and Spanish war veterans. Shortly after his arrival he proceeded to the auditorium to deliver an address before the conservation congress.

Mr. Roosevelt spoke in part as follows:

"America's reputation for efficiency stands deservedly high throughout the world. We are efficient probably to the full limit that any nation can attain by the methods hitherto used. There is great reason to be proud of our achievements, and yet so reason to believe that we cannot excel our past. Through a practically unrestrained individualism, we have reached a pitch of literally unexampled material prosperity; although the distribution of this prosperity leaves much to be desired from the standpoint of justice and fair dealing. But we have not only allowed the individual a free hand, which was in the main right; we have also allowed great corporations to act as though they were individuals, and to exercise the rights of individuals, in addition to using the vast combined power of high organization and enormous wealth for their own advantage. This development of corporate action, it is true, is doubtless in large part responsible for the gigantic development of our natural resources, but it is not less responsible for waste, destruction, and monopoly on an equally gigantic scale.

The method of recklessness and uncontrolled private use and waste has done for us all good it ever can, and it is time to put an end to it before it does all the evil it easily may. We have passed the time when heedless waste and destruction, and arrogant monopoly, are any longer permissible. Henceforth we must seek National efficiency by a new and a better way, by the way of the orderly development and use, coupled with the preservation, of our national resources, by making the most of what we have for the benefit of all of us, instead of leaving the sources of material prosperity open to indiscriminate exploitation. These are some of the reasons why it is wise that we should abandon the old point of view, and why conservation has become a patriotic duty.

Waterways. One of the greatest of the conservation problems is the wise and prompt development and use of the waterways of this nation. The Twin Cities, lying as they do at the headwaters of the Mississippi, are not upon the direct line of the proposed lakes to the Gulf deep waterway. Yet they are deeply interested in its prompt completion, as well as in the deepening and regulation of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Missouri and to the Gulf.

The project for a great trunk waterway, an arm of the sea, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, should not be abandoned. The Lakes to the Gulf Deep Waterway, and the development of the rivers which flow into it, should be pushed to completion vigorously and without delay. But we must recognize at the outset that there are certain conditions without which the people cannot hope to derive from it the benefits they have a right to expect.

In nearly every river city from St. Paul to the Gulf the water front is controlled by the railways. Nearly every artificial waterway in the United States, either directly or indirectly, is under the same control. It goes without saying that unless the people present their demands, the railways will attempt to take control of our waterways as fast as they are improved and completed; nor would I blame them if we, the people, are supine in the matter. We must see to it that adequate terminals are provided in every city and town on every improved waterway, terminals open under reasonable conditions to the use of every citizen, and rightly protected against monopoly; and we must compel the railways to co-operate with the waterways continuously, effectively, and under reasonable conditions. Unless we do so the railway lines will refuse to deliver freight to the boat lines, either openly or by imposing prohibitive conditions, and the waterways once improved will do comparatively little for the benefit of the people who pay the bill.

Adequate terminals properly controlled and open through lines by rail are two absolutely essential conditions to the usefulness of inland waterway development. I believe furthermore that the railways should be prohibited from owning, controlling, or carrying any interest in the boat lines on our rivers, unless under the strictest regulation and control of the inter-state commerce commission, so that the shippers' interests may be fully protected.

The National Forests. The people of the United States believe in the complete and rounded development of inland waterways for all the useful purposes they can be made to serve. They believe also in forest protection and forest extension. The right for our national interests in the west has been won. After a campaign in which the women of Minnesota did work which should secure to them the perpetual gratitude of their state, Minnesota won her national forest, and will keep it; but the fight to create the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests in the east is not yet over. The bill has passed the house, and will come before the senate for a vote next February. The people of the United States, regardless of party or section, should stand solidly behind it, and see that their representatives do likewise.

If any proof were needed that forest protection is a national duty, the recent destruction of forests in the west by fire would supply it. Even with the aid of the army added to that of the forest service the loss has been vast. Without either it would have been vastly greater.

But the forest service does more than protect the national forests against fire. It makes them practically and increasingly useful as well. During the last year for which I have the figures the national forests were used by 23,000 cattlemen with their flocks, 5000 cheepmen with their crews, and 45,000 miners. More than 5000 persons used them for other special industries. Nearly 34,000 settlers had the free use of wood. The total resident population of the national forests is about a quarter of a million, which is larger than the population of certain states. More than 700,000 acres of agricultural land have been patented or listed for patent within the forests, and the reports of the forest officers show that more than 400,000 people a year use the forests for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and similar purposes. All this is done, of course, without injury to the timber, which has a value of at least a thousand million dollars. Moreover, the national forests protect the water supply of a thousand cities, and more than 300 irrigation projects, not counting the power of water for these and other purposes by individual settlers. I think that hereafter we may safely disregard any statements that the national forests are withdrawn from settlement and use.

One of the most important conservation questions of the moment relates to the control of water power, monopoly in the public interest. There is apparent to the judicious observer a distinct tendency on the part of our opponents to cloud the issue by raising the question of state as against federal jurisdiction. We are ready to meet that issue if it is forced upon us, but there is no hope for the plain people in such conflicts of jurisdictions. The essential question is not one of half-splitting legal technicalities. It is simply this: Who can best regulate the special interests for the public good? Most of the predatory public good? Most of the predatory corporations are interstate, or have interstate affiliations. Therefore they are largely out of reach of effective state control, and fall of necessity under the federal jurisdiction. One of the prime objects of those among them that are grasping and greedy is to avoid any effective control either by state or nation; and they advocate at this time state control simply because they believe it to be the least effective. In the great fight of the people to drive the special interests from the dominion of our government, the nation is more effective than jurisdiction is more effective than that of any state. The most effective weapon against these great corporations, most of which are financed and owned on the Atlantic coast, will be federal laws and the federal executive. That is why I so strongly oppose the demand to turn these matters over to the states. It is fundamentally a demand against the interests of the plain people, of the interest of small men, against our children's and our children's interest in the children; and it is primarily in the interest of the great corporations which desire to escape all government control.

The Conservation Fight. One of the difficulties in putting into practice the conservation idea is that the field to which it applies is constantly growing in the public mind. It has been no slight task to

attempt to take control of our waterways as fast as they are improved and completed; nor would I blame them if we, the people, are supine in the matter. We must see to it that adequate terminals are provided in every city and town on every improved waterway, terminals open under reasonable conditions to the use of every citizen, and rightly protected against monopoly; and we must compel the railways to co-operate with the waterways continuously, effectively, and under reasonable conditions. Unless we do so the railway lines will refuse to deliver freight to the boat lines, either openly or by imposing prohibitive conditions, and the waterways once improved will do comparatively little for the benefit of the people who pay the bill.

Adequate terminals properly controlled and open through lines by rail are two absolutely essential conditions to the usefulness of inland waterway development. I believe furthermore that the railways should be prohibited from owning, controlling, or carrying any interest in the boat lines on our rivers, unless under the strictest regulation and control of the inter-state commerce commission, so that the shippers' interests may be fully protected.

The National Forests. The people of the United States believe in the complete and rounded development of inland waterways for all the useful purposes they can be made to serve. They believe also in forest protection and forest extension. The right for our national interests in the west has been won. After a campaign in which the women of Minnesota did work which should secure to them the perpetual gratitude of their state, Minnesota won her national forest, and will keep it; but the fight to create the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests in the east is not yet over. The bill has passed the house, and will come before the senate for a vote next February. The people of the United States, regardless of party or section, should stand solidly behind it, and see that their representatives do likewise.

If any proof were needed that forest protection is a national duty, the recent destruction of forests in the west by fire would supply it. Even with the aid of the army added to that of the forest service the loss has been vast. Without either it would have been vastly greater.

But the forest service does more than protect the national forests against fire. It makes them practically and increasingly useful as well. During the last year for which I have the figures the national forests were used by 23,000 cattlemen with their flocks, 5000 cheepmen with their crews, and 45,000 miners. More than 5000 persons used them for other special industries. Nearly 34,000 settlers had the free use of wood. The total resident population of the national forests is about a quarter of a million, which is larger than the population of certain states. More than 700,000 acres of agricultural land have been patented or listed for patent within the forests, and the reports of the forest officers show that more than 400,000 people a year use the forests for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and similar purposes. All this is done, of course, without injury to the timber, which has a value of at least a thousand million dollars. Moreover, the national forests protect the water supply of a thousand cities, and more than 300 irrigation projects, not counting the power of water for these and other purposes by individual settlers. I think that hereafter we may safely disregard any statements that the national forests are withdrawn from settlement and use.

One of the most important conservation questions of the moment relates to the control of water power, monopoly in the public interest. There is apparent to the judicious observer a distinct tendency on the part of our opponents to cloud the issue by raising the question of state as against federal jurisdiction. We are ready to meet that issue if it is forced upon us, but there is no hope for the plain people in such conflicts of jurisdictions. The essential question is not one of half-splitting legal technicalities. It is simply this: Who can best regulate the special interests for the public good? Most of the predatory public good? Most of the predatory corporations are interstate, or have interstate affiliations. Therefore they are largely out of reach of effective state control, and fall of necessity under the federal jurisdiction. One of the prime objects of those among them that are grasping and greedy is to avoid any effective control either by state or nation; and they advocate at this time state control simply because they believe it to be the least effective. In the great fight of the people to drive the special interests from the dominion of our government, the nation is more effective than jurisdiction is more effective than that of any state. The most effective weapon against these great corporations, most of which are financed and owned on the Atlantic coast, will be federal laws and the federal executive. That is why I so strongly oppose the demand to turn these matters over to the states. It is fundamentally a demand against the interests of the plain people, of the interest of small men, against our children's and our children's interest in the children; and it is primarily in the interest of the great corporations which desire to escape all government control.

The Conservation Fight. One of the difficulties in putting into practice the conservation idea is that the field to which it applies is constantly growing in the public mind. It has been no slight task to

attempt to take control of our waterways as fast as they are improved and completed; nor would I blame them if we, the people, are supine in the matter. We must see to it that adequate terminals are provided in every city and town on every improved waterway, terminals open under reasonable conditions to the use of every citizen, and rightly protected against monopoly; and we must compel the railways to co-operate with the waterways continuously, effectively, and under reasonable conditions. Unless we do so the railway lines will refuse to deliver freight to the boat lines, either openly or by imposing prohibitive conditions, and the waterways once improved will do comparatively little for the benefit of the people who pay the bill.

Adequate terminals properly controlled and open through lines by rail are two absolutely essential conditions to the usefulness of inland waterway development. I believe furthermore that the railways should be prohibited from owning, controlling, or carrying any interest in the boat lines on our rivers, unless under the strictest regulation and control of the inter-state commerce commission, so that the shippers' interests may be fully protected.

The National Forests. The people of the United States believe in the complete and rounded development of inland waterways for all the useful purposes they can be made to serve. They believe also in forest protection and forest extension. The right for our national interests in the west has been won. After a campaign in which the women of Minnesota did work which should secure to them the perpetual gratitude of their state, Minnesota won her national forest, and will keep it; but the fight to create the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests in the east is not yet over. The bill has passed the house, and will come before the senate for a vote next February. The people of the United States, regardless of party or section, should stand solidly behind it, and see that their representatives do likewise.

If any proof were needed that forest protection is a national duty, the recent destruction of forests in the west by fire would supply it. Even with the aid of the army added to that of the forest service the loss has been vast. Without either it would have been vastly greater.

But the forest service does more than protect the national forests against fire. It makes them practically and increasingly useful as well. During the last year for which I have the figures the national forests were used by 23,000 cattlemen with their flocks, 5000 cheepmen with their crews, and 45,000 miners. More than 5000 persons used them for other special industries. Nearly 34,000 settlers had the free use of wood. The total resident population of the national forests is about a quarter of a million, which is larger than the population of certain states. More than 700,000 acres of agricultural land have been patented or listed for patent within the forests, and the reports of the forest officers show that more than 400,000 people a year use the forests for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and similar purposes. All this is done, of course, without injury to the timber, which has a value of at least a thousand million dollars. Moreover, the national forests protect the water supply of a thousand cities, and more than 300 irrigation projects, not counting the power of water for these and other purposes by individual settlers. I think that hereafter we may safely disregard any statements that the national forests are withdrawn from settlement and use.

One of the most important conservation questions of the moment relates to the control of water power, monopoly in the public interest. There is apparent to the judicious observer a distinct tendency on the part of our opponents to cloud the issue by raising the question of state as against federal jurisdiction. We are ready to meet that issue if it is forced upon us, but there is no hope for the plain people in such conflicts of jurisdictions. The essential question is not one of half-splitting legal technicalities. It is simply this: Who can best regulate the special interests for the public good? Most of the predatory public good? Most of the predatory corporations are interstate, or have interstate affiliations. Therefore they are largely out of reach of effective state control, and fall of necessity under the federal jurisdiction. One of the prime objects of those among them that are grasping and greedy is to avoid any effective control either by state or nation; and they advocate at this time state control simply because they believe it to be the least effective. In the great fight of the people to drive the special interests from the dominion of our government, the nation is more effective than jurisdiction is more effective than that of any state. The most effective weapon against these great corporations, most of which are financed and owned on the Atlantic coast, will be federal laws and the federal executive. That is why I so strongly oppose the demand to turn these matters over to the states. It is fundamentally a demand against the interests of the plain people, of the interest of small men, against our children's and our children's interest in the children; and it is primarily in the interest of the great corporations which desire to escape all government control.

The Conservation Fight. One of the difficulties in putting into practice the conservation idea is that the field to which it applies is constantly growing in the public mind. It has been no slight task to

attempt to take control of our waterways as fast as they are improved and completed; nor would I blame them if we, the people, are supine in the matter. We must see to it that adequate terminals are provided in every city and town on every improved waterway, terminals open under reasonable conditions to the use of every citizen, and rightly protected against monopoly; and we must compel the railways to co-operate with the waterways continuously, effectively, and under reasonable conditions. Unless we do so the railway lines will refuse to deliver freight to the boat lines, either openly or by imposing prohibitive conditions, and the waterways once improved will do comparatively little for the benefit of the people who pay the bill.

Adequate terminals properly controlled and open through lines by rail are two absolutely essential conditions to the usefulness of inland waterway development. I believe furthermore that the railways should be prohibited from owning, controlling, or carrying any interest in the boat lines on our rivers, unless under the strictest regulation and control of the inter-state commerce commission, so that the shippers' interests may be fully protected.

The National Forests. The people of the United States believe in the complete and rounded development of inland waterways for all the useful purposes they can be made to serve. They believe also in forest protection and forest extension. The right for our national interests in the west has been won. After a campaign in which the women of Minnesota did work which should secure to them the perpetual gratitude of their state, Minnesota won her national forest, and will keep it; but the fight to create the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests in the east is not yet over. The bill has passed the house, and will come before the senate for a vote next February. The people of the United States, regardless of party or section, should stand solidly behind it, and see that their representatives do likewise.

If any proof were needed that forest protection is a national duty, the recent destruction of forests in the west by fire would supply it. Even with the aid of the army added to that of the forest service the loss has been vast. Without either it would have been vastly greater.

But the forest service does more than protect the national forests against fire. It makes them practically and increasingly useful as well. During the last year for which I have the figures the national forests were used by 23,000 cattlemen with their flocks, 5000 cheepmen with their crews, and 45,000 miners. More than 5000 persons used them for other special industries. Nearly 34,000 settlers had the free use of wood. The total resident population of the national forests is about a quarter of a million, which is larger than the population of certain states. More than 700,000 acres of agricultural land have been patented or listed for patent within the forests, and the reports of the forest officers show that more than 400,000 people a year use the forests for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and similar purposes. All this is done, of course, without injury to the timber, which has a value of at least a thousand million dollars. Moreover, the national forests protect the water supply of a thousand cities, and more than 300 irrigation projects, not counting the power of water for these and other purposes by individual settlers. I think that hereafter we may safely disregard any statements that the national forests are withdrawn from settlement and use.

One of the most important conservation questions of the moment relates to the control of water power, monopoly in the public interest. There is apparent to the judicious observer a distinct tendency on the part of our opponents to cloud the issue by raising the question of state as against federal jurisdiction. We are ready to meet that issue if it is forced upon us, but there is no hope for the plain people in such conflicts of jurisdictions. The essential question is not one of half-splitting legal technicalities. It is simply this: Who can best regulate the special interests for the public good? Most of the predatory public good? Most of the predatory corporations are interstate, or have interstate affiliations. Therefore they are largely out of reach of effective state control, and fall of necessity under the federal jurisdiction. One of the prime objects of those among them that are grasping and greedy is to avoid any effective control either by state or nation; and they advocate at this time state control simply because they believe it to be the least effective. In the great fight of the people to drive the special interests from the dominion of our government, the nation is more effective than jurisdiction is more effective than that of any state. The most effective weapon against these great corporations, most of which are financed and owned on the Atlantic coast, will be federal laws and the federal executive. That is why I so strongly oppose the demand to turn these matters over to the states. It is fundamentally a demand against the interests of the plain people, of the interest of small men, against our children's and our children's interest in the children; and it is primarily in the interest of the great corporations which desire to escape all government control.

The Conservation Fight. One of the difficulties in putting into practice the conservation idea is that the field to which it applies is constantly growing in the public mind. It has been no slight task to

attempt to take control of our waterways as fast as they are improved and completed; nor would I blame them if we, the people, are supine in the matter. We must see to it that adequate terminals are provided in every city and town on every improved waterway, terminals open under reasonable conditions to the use of every citizen, and rightly protected against monopoly; and we must compel the railways to co-operate with the waterways continuously, effectively, and under reasonable conditions. Unless we do so the railway lines will refuse to deliver freight to the boat lines, either openly or by imposing prohibitive conditions, and the waterways once improved will do comparatively little for the benefit of the people who pay the bill.

Adequate terminals properly controlled and open through lines by rail are two absolutely essential conditions to the usefulness of inland waterway development. I believe furthermore that the railways should be prohibited from owning, controlling, or carrying any interest in the boat lines on our rivers, unless under the strictest regulation and control of the inter-state commerce commission, so that the shippers' interests may be fully protected.

The National Forests. The people of the United States believe in the complete and rounded development of inland waterways for all the useful purposes they can be made to serve. They believe also in forest protection and forest extension. The right for our national interests in the west has been won. After a campaign in which the women of Minnesota did work which should secure to them the perpetual gratitude of their state, Minnesota won her national forest, and will keep it; but the fight to create the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests in the east is not yet over. The bill has passed the house, and will come before the senate for a vote next February. The people of the United States, regardless of party or section, should stand solidly behind it, and see that their representatives do likewise.

If any proof were needed that forest protection is a national duty, the recent destruction of forests in the west by fire would supply it. Even with the aid of the army added to that of the forest service the loss has been vast. Without either it would have been vastly greater.

But the forest service does more than protect the national forests against fire. It makes them practically and increasingly useful as well. During the last year for which I have the figures the national forests were used by 23,000 cattlemen with their flocks, 5000 cheepmen with their crews, and 45,000 miners. More than 5000 persons used them for other special industries. Nearly 34,000 settlers had the free use of wood. The total resident population of the national forests is about a quarter of a million, which is larger than the population of certain states. More than 700,000 acres of agricultural land have been patented or listed for patent within the forests, and the reports of the forest officers show that more than 400,000 people a year use the forests for recreation, camping, hunting, fishing, and similar purposes. All this is done, of course, without injury to the timber, which has a value of at least a thousand million dollars. Moreover, the national forests protect the water supply of a thousand cities, and more than 300 irrigation projects, not counting the power of water for these and other purposes by individual settlers. I think that hereafter we may safely disregard any statements that the national forests are withdrawn from settlement and use.

JAPANESE GIVES AMERICA CREDIT

Prof. Fukushima, in Address at Central Church, Tells of Japan's Advancement.

ANNEXATION OF KOREA WAS FOR JAPAN'S PRESERVATION

Ninety-Three Per Cent of Japanese Children Are Found in the Public Schools.

One of the most interesting and instructive addresses on Japan ever heard of by an Asheville audience was delivered by Prof. F. Fukushima at Central Methodist church Sunday night. There was present a large congregation to hear this distinguished visitor to the city.

Mr. Fukushima is a teacher in Imperial Nobles college of Kobe, Japan, an dis traveling in this country to get what information and help he may that will be helpful in the prosecution of his work. He is a highly educated and cultured gentleman, speaks the English language fluently and has a fund of information about his own country which he imparts in a charming manner.

Mr. Fukushima spoke of the remarkable strides forward which his country had made during the past few years. It had simply gone forward by leaps and bounds, he declared. He said that much of the credit for Japan's advancement was due America for the part she had in it. He said: "Your country was the first to knock at the door of Japan. The first to introduce us to the other nations of the world, and our people are thankful to you for all you have done."

Mr. Fukushima spoke of the recent annexation of Korea and declared that it was not due to territorial grandeur as had been charged by some but altogether because it was deemed necessary for the preservation of Japan.

"Japan," said the speaker, "is the youngest and yet one of the oldest nations in the world. It dates back to 660 B. C. and yet practically all the progress it has made has occurred during the last 35 years, when Christianity came to our nation. Since then we have enjoyed liberty and freedom, as do the Americans and the English. With Christianity came education. We had not common school system until 35 years ago. Now 93 per cent of the children are in the public schools." He said that his people would rather remain poor and get an education than to become rich in ignorance. He stated that the children were taught obedience and cleanliness; that every child in the public schools was compelled to study English, German or French, and that 70 per cent of all the children in Japan were today studying the English language.

Speaking of the industrial development of Japan Mr. Fukushima said that 25 years ago his whole nation possessed but 20 miles of railway while today they had 5000 miles. There was then not a newspaper in Japan, now they had 745 while Tokyo alone had 16 dailies besides several magazines and other publications. He said that America was spending \$66,000,000 a year in Japan while his nation was spending fabulous sums in America for cotton, machinery, &c. The speaker said that his nation was pledged to the teaching of civility. His people believed in the universal brotherhood of man. He told of an incident that occurred during the late war with Russia. A mother, a widow, had three sons, all of whom went to the front. News came of the death of one who fell in one of the first battles, but friends of the widow marvelled because she gave no outward signs of distress on learning of his death. After came the news of the death of the second son with the same result. Then a message told of the death of the third and last son which occurred at the battle of Port Arthur. Then the mother broke down and wept bitterly because she said, "I have not another son to give to Japan."

The distinguished speaker closed his remarks with the statement that his nation was ripe for the gospel. "We need re-enforcements," he said, and urged the Christian churches of America to give all the help they could.

Few speakers from another country have been given so careful hearing as this city than Mr. Fukushima received last night. He presented his message in an intelligent and altogether pleasing manner, and his address will be remembered for many days to come.

While I was police commissioner New York became for a time rapidly virtuous," continued Colonel Roosevelt. "There are many of my fellow citizens of New York who ever since I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"What I care for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

"I never would have been president if it had not been for my experience in North Dakota," he said, referring to the remarks of President Creager. "I do not care a rap for is what the office does while he is in office. When I met some of those who were with me on the Dakota ranch in this city they remarked that they did not object to working with me because I did my share of the work."

HE WAS CALLED A LIAR; HE GOT MAD

Fanatic Insulted Col. Roosevelt on Speaker's Stand—Was Quickly Ejected.

PRESIDENT OF FARGO COLLEGE WOULD MAKE HIM "OUR KING"

North Dakota Claims Credit for Making Roosevelt President of United States.

Fargo, N. D., Sept. 6.—A man who fought his way to ex-President Roosevelt and called him a liar gave a bad scare to the crowd yesterday at a band park. Colonel Roosevelt seized the man and helped to eject him from the platform.

The colonel had just finished his Labor day address. A heavy rain storm drenched the people, but most of them sat through the afternoon in their wet clothes to hear him speak.

As Colonel Roosevelt spoke the last sentence the crowd cheered, and then there was a rush for the speaker's stand of thousands of people who sought to get near enough to see the speaker and shake his hand. Those on the platform pressed around the stand and in a moment it was enclosed with a surging, struggling mass of men and women. Others in the crowd jumped on the platform and added to the crush. It was a good natured, laughing crowd, and the colonel shook hands with everyone who could get near enough to him.

Wanted to Ask a Question. A small, poorly dressed man pushed his way through the mass of people until he could make himself heard by the colonel. He wore a battered hat and was unshaven.

"I have a question to ask you, Roosevelt," he shouted. He raised one arm over the heads of the people, waving it to attract the colonel's attention, and called out again and again that he wanted to ask a question. Colonel Roosevelt saw him and watched him closely. Fighting his way through the crowd he reached the speaker's stand. He mounted the steps and stopped when he reached the top. Standing about six feet from Colonel Roosevelt he called out a question to ask you, Roosevelt." The men and women on the stand grew silent. Colonel Roosevelt turned and faced him. Waving one arm, the man shouted:

"I want to know who is paying the expenses of this trip of yours about the country?"

The question angered Colonel Roosevelt, and his face showed it. He advanced a step toward his interrogator and gave his answer.

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

The question angered Colonel Roosevelt, and his face showed it. He advanced a step toward his interrogator and gave his answer.

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

The question angered Colonel Roosevelt, and his face showed it. He advanced a step toward his interrogator and gave his answer.

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of the editors."

"I consider that to be an impertinent question," he said. "However, I have no objection to telling you. He added, "that the expenses of the party are being paid by the magazine of which I am one of