

Where Roosevelt Stands

Theodore Roosevelt is now recognized as the leader of republican insurgency. In a speech delivered August 31, at Osawattomie, Kan., Mr. Roosevelt characterized the issue of the day as "the struggle of free men to gain and hold the right of self-government as against the special interests, who twist the methods of free government into machinery for defeating the popular will." "The issue is joined and we must fight or fail," said he.

The Associated Press report says: The ex-president declared himself in favor of these principles:

- 1—Elimination of special interests from politics.
- 2—Complete and effective publicity of corporation affairs.
- 3—Passage of laws prohibiting the use of corporate funds directly or indirectly for political purposes.
- 4—Government supervision of the capitalization, not only of the public service corporations, but of all corporations doing an interstate business.
- 5—Personal responsibility of officers and directors of corporations that break the law.
- 6—Increase in the power of the federal bureau of corporations and the interstate commerce commission to control commercial industry more effectively.
- 7—Revision of the tariff, one schedule at a time, on the basis of information furnished by an expert tariff commission.
- 8—Graduated income tax and graduated inheritance tax.
- 9—Readjustment of the country's financial system in such a way as to prevent repetition of periodical financial panics.
- 10—Maintenance of an efficient army and navy large enough to insure for the nation the respect of other nations, as a guarantee of peace.
- 11—Use of national resources for the benefit of all the people.
- 12—Extension of the work of the department of agriculture of the national and state government and of agricultural colleges and experiment stations so as to take in all phases of life on the farm.
- 13—Regulation of the terms and conditions of labor by means of a comprehensive workman's compensation act; state and national laws to regulate labor and the work of women; enforcement of better sanitation conditions for workers, and extension of the use of safety appliances in industry and commerce, both within and between the states.
- 14—Clear division of authority between the national and the various state governments.
- 15—Direct primaries, associated with corrupt practices acts.
- 16—Publicity of campaign contributions, not only after election but before election as well.
- 17—Prompt removal of unfaithful or incompetent public servants.
- 18—Provisions against the performance of any service for interstate corporations or the reception of any compensation from such corporations by national officers.

While Colonel Roosevelt's address is regarded by many of those who heard it as carrying him further than before with the progressive movement the colonel coupled with his declaration a warning against the extremist, injecting an extemporaneous remark on the subject into his prepared speech.

"I do not want our people to follow men whose intentions are excellent but whose eyes are a little too wild to make it safe to trust them," he said.

Another sentence which Colonel Roosevelt put into his speech extemporaneously brought forth applause from the crowd. He said: "No man should make a promise before election that he does not intend to keep after election, and if he does not keep it, hunt him out."

The people gave his words an interpretation of their own and the burst of cheering which broke out when they heard them was one of the wildest of the day.

PRESIDENT TAFT'S LETTER

President Taft has addressed a letter to Chairman McKinley of the republican congressional committee, which is intended for campaign purposes. It is a defense of his administration and an appeal to standpatters and insurgents to lay aside their differences and work together to secure a republican congress.

He administers a deserved rebuke to those democratic senators and representatives in congress who repudiated the pledges of their plat-

form—rather inconsistent when he applauded Aldrich who repudiated the construction which the president placed upon the republican promise of revision.

The suggestion of further revision through separate bills is advanced very mildly as a sop to the insurgents. The language employed by the president indicates that he does not regard the matter as urgent and we are warranted in believing that the White House will not go into mourning if the suggestion is ignored.

But it would be awful, according to the letter, if the democrats were to win. They would attack the principle of protection and seek to reduce the tariff to a revenue basis, and what would the protected interests do then? Just think what consternation there would be at the fashionable summer resorts if the tariff barons were compelled to sell at home at as low a price as they ask abroad.

The president is very unfair in claiming credit for measures passed; he conceals the fact that the democrats and insurgents are responsible for the best parts of the laws enacted. He ought to have said that the laws would have been better if the democrats and insurgents had been able to get all they wanted.

In discussing the postal savings bank law he fails to mention the fact that its usefulness is lessened by clauses put in there to pave the way for a central bank.

The president shows his old antipathy toward labor in his reiterated criticism of the democratic platform on that subject.

The president is supposed to be the chief executive of the whole people and this bold descent from the position of the nation's head down to that of party chief might be resented if his predecessor had not accustomed the country to extreme partisanship.

The letter will convince even the casual observer that the president is scared and democrats find in it an admission that prospects are bright for victory for our party this fall.

JAPAN'S BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION

In annexing Korea—a thing which she has contemplated for about four hundred years, Japan says:

"Notwithstanding the earnest and laborious work of reforms in the administration of Korea, in which the governments of Japan have been engaged for more than four years since the conclusion of the agreement of 1905, the existing system of government in that country has not proved entirely equal to the duty of preserving public order and tranquility and, in addition, the spirit of suspicion and misgiving dominates the whole peninsula.

"In order to maintain peace and stability in Korea, to promote the prosperity and welfare of the Koreans, and at the same time to insure the safety and repose of the foreign residents, it has been made abundantly clear that fundamental changes in the actual regime of government are absolutely essential. The governments of Japan and Korea, being convinced of the urgent necessity of introducing reforms responsive to the requirements of the situation and of furnishing sufficient guarantee for the future have, with the approval of his majesty, the emperor of Japan and his majesty, the emperor of Korea, concluded with their respective plenipotentiaries a treaty providing for the complete annexation of Korea to the empire of Japan."

There may be a few slight verbal differences, but the excuse is in substance, the same that has been given by other strong nations when they have gobbled up weaker ones. It would have been shorter to say "We wanted Korea and took her," but to show that they understood the language of diplomacy the Japanese official issued a little circumlocution.

CRITICISING THE COURT

Does any one recall the indignation, real or feigned, with which the republican editors and republican leaders attacked the democratic platform in 1896 on the ground that it criticised the supreme court? How mild that criticism was, compared with the censure pronounced by Mr. Roosevelt at Denver! On another page will be found the text of the speech. After this the republicans will have to admit that the democrats were well within proper limit in what they said of the income tax decision.

TRY IT IN 1912

Yes, William Allen White, does quite well as a platform writer, but will he be allowed to write the next national platform of the republican party?

Practical Tariff Talks

One indictment against the new tariff law that would include a good many counts is that wherever it was possible to help out a trust at the expense of the common people it was done. Take the item of split peas, an article of general use on the tables of the poor. The duty on these under the Dingley law was 40 cents a bushel or \$1.40 per barrel the usual package. Under the Payne-Aldrich bill the duty is 45 cents a bushel or \$1.57½ a barrel. This, it will be readily seen, is a rather heavy tax. The increase was made in spite of the fact that the evidence was before congress that the manufacture of these goods is under the control of a trust, only three mills being in operation in this country. The American miller and the Canadian miller also have a compact by which an importer of split peas can not buy them in Canada unless he gives bond for export. If he says he wants to purchase them for sale in this country the Canadian miller frankly tells him that under his agreement with his American competitor he can not sell them to him. It would appear that the presentation of these facts ought to have secured a very material reduction, but instead this handful of manufacturers was given a grant to still higher tax the consumer.

Beans constitute another staple article of food on the tables of the poor. Not enough beans are raised in America at any time to supply the demand. When a crop fails here the importations invariably increase, showing the steadiness of the demand for them. Thus it is that when the consumer most needs beans and at a lower price he must pay more for them because of the duty. This duty is 45 cents a bushel. An effort was made to secure a reduction, but it failed. An effort was also made to secure at the hands of congress a reduction in the price of cattle. This price is now fixed in this country by the beef trust, the raiser having nothing to say about it. In Canada, and in Central and South America there is a surplus of cattle. The grade is not as good as those raised in the United States, and if the tariff were adjusted, it was argued, the poor folks with whom beefsteak is a rarity could get them oftener. This would not interfere with the rich, who demand the best and would still buy the high grade American animal. No change was made.

On one item in the food schedule at least there was a reduction. This was on cabbages. These formerly paid a duty of 3 cents a head. Under the new law the duty is 2 cents, or a little less than 30 per cent. Prior to 1890 the duty was a merely nominal one, 10 per cent. The McKinley bill fixed the duty at 3 cents a head, and this rate has since prevailed, except under the Wilson law, when they were admitted free of duty. Cabbage is another popular article of food among wageworkers. It is not only healthful, but it is cheap. Unless their taste runs to sauer kraut, however, the ordinary family can not get cabbages in winter. They are essentially a seasonable article. Thirty years ago some importers took to bringing in Danish cabbages. As the cabbage is grown so extensively in America it is not imported save to supply the winter interim, the time between the exhaustion of the northern crop and the coming of the southern crop. When the native supply gives out the foreign article has a chance, but the 3 cent charge practically barred these from the tables of the common people during the greater part of the winter. Congress was asked to put cabbages back on the 10 per cent list, it being argued that as the foreign supply could be available only during the winter season or when the native crop was short, nobody could be hurt. Instead, however, the duty was reduced from 42 per cent to almost 30.

Republican orators can point with pride, however, to the fact that congress restored canary seeds to the free list. Until 1897 it came in free, but although hemp, millet and rape, used for the same purpose, were on the free list, but the genuine canary seed was put on the 30 per cent schedule. In putting this back on the free list, however, congress sacrificed a revenue of \$25,000 a year, but there was no home-grown article to protect.

C. Q. D.