Youth and Cupid

Oh, none so bright! Oh, none so bright!
Oh, none so bright as I!
If Cupid dares within my light,
Within my light to fly,
He'll singe his wings, and then for spite
Declare he's like to die!

I only laugh, laugh at his plight,
And unrelenting cry
"It serves you right! It serves you right!
And 'tis no use to sigh,
For though you singe your wings to-night,
Again you'll venture nigh."

—Florence Gertrude Ruthven.

Amabel's Love Affairs

BY ETHEL HOLMES

"It's from Cousin Fred," said Dora with conviction.

"Ye—es," said Amabel, slowly.

"I believe it's a proposal," said Lucy.

And Amabel said nothing.

"I knew he'd propose to you!" Lucy continued. "He fell in love with you straight away. And he's never been really in love with anybody before," she added.

"I can't think what to do!" sighed Amabel, gently.

"Aren't you going to accept him?" gasped both the girls at once.

"It's a little awkward," Amabel began.

"But he's ever so much nicer than anybody else!" Lucy interrupted her.

"And you have encouraged him, Amabel," said Dora.

"But there are the other two," said Amabel, uncertainly.

"What other two?" asked Lucy.

"The two I'm engaged to already."

"Engaged already!" gasped Lucy.

"To two men!" choked Dora.

"Yes, two of them," said Amabel, hopelessly.

"You see," she explained, "it was like this. I was staying with the Lawsons for some dances and Charlie Lawson proposed to me during the 'Blue Danube' waltz, and, somehow, I couldn't say no. Then I went to stay with the Gibbses and a Captain Harrison proposed to me one day when we went on a paper chase. We were simply miles from home, and it would have been so awkward to have said 'no' then. And now—oh, dear! what shall I do, girls?"

"Of course, you are really engaged to the man who asked you first," said Lucy.

"You're never going to accept Cousin Fred as well!" gasped Dora.

"He's much the nicest," Amabel assured her.

"Seriously, Amabel, you are engaged to the waltzing man," Lucy expostulated.

"Charlie Lawson," said Amabel, with a resigned sigh.

"And you must write to the other man saying you have made a mistake," Lucy continued, authoritatively.

"I'll write to Captain Harrison at once," said Amabel, obligingly. "I never did really like him."

"Of course!" both girls assented, indifferently.

"And this?" Amabel glanced at the note in her lap.

"Oh, of course, you must explain to Cousin Fred," Lucy remarked relentlessly.

"Should we explain for you?" Dora offered, kindly. "It might be awkward for you, and we could just hint"—

"No, thank you," said Amabel. "I'll do my own explaining. You see, they are my proposals."

"We will leave you to write your letters, then," said Lucy.

"He says he will come for his answer this evening," Amabel sighed.

"Poor, dear man! I'll write him a little note and just slip it into his

"I believe it's a proposal."

hand when he comes, and then run away, and he can read it, and go home quietly afterward."

So Amabel wrote two letters and posted one of them. The other was tightly screwed up in Amabel's hand when the front door bell rang in an agitated manner just after 6 o'clock.

It was very nearly dark, but there was a pleasing flicker of firelight. The door opened and a tall young man came hopefully into the room. Amabel shut her eyes, held her breath and extended her little white hand and the note. The hand was eagerly seized and kissed.

"Ye-es, all the important ones."

"Darling!" whispered a very glad young man; and the little paper fell unheeded to the floor.

Outside, at no great distance away, Dora and Lucy waited with hearts full of sympathy for poor Cousin Fred. The sympathy became a trifle uneasy as time went on, and no heavy, heartbroken tread was heard to descend the stairs and seek the front door.

Presently they ventured a little nearer within.

"Why, what is this little white thing on the floor," said Cousin Fred's voice in a curiously muffled tone.

"Oh, it's mine," said Amabel's voice. "I wrote it for you; it's a confession—please read it."

"Confession, you dear baby! What an idea! Stick it in the fire. I don't want to know all your little sins, you precious silly!"

"Oh, but I have been really very bad," said Amabel, in an ashamed voice. "Ever so bad; you've no idea; and you ought to know, really."

"Give me the terrible list, then," said Cousin Fred, severely. Dora and Lucy grasped each other's hands. Poor Cousin Fred!

"Are they all here?" he continued.

"Ye—es, that is, all the important ones," Amabel answered. Then the sleepy fire flickered upon suddenly, in joy of having something to burn.

"What a darling you are!" Cousin Fred began, but the rest of the remark, if there was any, was too smothered to reach any further than Amabel's little pink ears.

That evening Amabel wrote to Charlie Lawson.—The Bystander.

St. Paul Man Is Industrious.

Assistant Postmaster Patrick O'Brien of St. Paul is a man after Uncle Russell Sage's own heart. He has been employed in the St. Paul postoffice for thirty-one years and has just started on his first vacation. Though urged every year to take a rest, he has always refused. He was finally forced into it through a conspiracy on the part of Postmaster McGill and some of his coworkers. They told Mr. O'Brien he must take two weeks off and he started on a fishing trip on Tuesday. "It wouldn't surprise me to see him back at his desk before the end of the week," said the postmaster, "but we have the key to his desk and he can't get it until the two weeks are up."

Old Saying Rounded Out.

Senator Thomas C. Platt was approached some time ago by a friend who had lost a position in the federal service through the appointment of a new supervisor. The friend wanted the senator to intercede for him. He admitted that he had been discharged for an infraction of the rules, but he insisted that the matter was trivial and would have been overlooked by the new man's predecessor.

"Well," replied Senator Platt, you should have been careful. You know that a new broom sweeps clean."

"Yes," assented the other, gloomily, "but did you ever consider that it was devilish hard on the carpet?"—New York Times.

BEAR ROLLED ON BARREL.

Strenuous Exertions Necessary to Save Grizzly's Life.

Bumbo, a performing grizzly bear, now on exhibition in Luna park, had an awful experience yesterday. As soon as he finished his mid-afternoon performance, Bumbo left the ring over the lagoon and started to lumber across the bridge to his cage, underneath the dancing pavilion. When half way across the bridge Bumbo looked over the side into the limpid waters of the lagoon. Then he became dizzy and fell overboard.

Now Bumbo cannot swim, and when at last he was fished out he was almost dead. An ambulance from the Coney Island Emergency hospital was summoned, and when the doctor came he attended to Bumbo just as if he were a human being instead of a grizzly. After being rolled over barrels, and after the doctor had breathed his own breath into poor old Bumbo's nostrils, the grizzly came back to life.—New York Times.

Amazon Region No Good.

United States Consul Ayme at Para, Brazil, sounds a note of warning for the benefit of those who think there is a golden field for exploitation in the Amazon region of South America. "I despair," says Mr. Ayme, "of finding language strong enough to express the utter and absolute hopelessness of success that awaits any of those unhappy enough to attempt to make even a bare living on the banks of the mighty Amazon. I do not say that the acquisition of a fortune or a competence is difficult, doubtful or impossible; I say that such a miserable existence as would disgust a Digger Indian would be hardly obtainable by one man in 10,000 of such as are thinking of coming here. It may be that there are places in Brazil where colonists might do well, perhaps, but I do not know of any such places." The rubber trees, Mr. Ayme says, are widely separated and they can only be reached by forcing one's way through a thick-matted, almost impenetrable swamp forest which produces very little food for human beings.

Campanari Is Democratic.

Campanari, the singer, is thoroughly democratic. He tells with great amusement of one of the severest tests his democracy ever got.

"I had just arrived in a New England town," said he, "and was going to sing at a concert to be given that very evening, when word from a fellow-countryman was brought me at my hotel. It was an invitation to drive that afternoon. I sent down a pleased acceptance.

"At 4:30 o'clock my host was announced, and when I went to him I found him on his banana cart, which was nicely stacked with a load of the fruit, each banana looking as though it had been scrubbed and polished.

"It was a staggerer, but I did it, and had a delightful time, too. To be sure, I had a tussle trying to understand the patois hurled at me by my new friend, but for all that I learned a lot about bananas.

"Oh, one can always learn," added the singer, laughing. "It is well not to be too exclusive."—Kansas City Journal.

Soldiers' Time of Suffering.

Capt. Curtis, who has written a popular story of Indian fighting, says in response to a boy's inquiry that he never was captured, but on one occasion, when besieged by redskins in a fort, he realized what he had read about wives having asked their husbands not to let them fall into the hands of savages. "In that siege," he says, "when it was exceedingly doubtful that we should survive and all depended upon the swift arrival of a rescuing party, Mrs. Curtis asked me to make such a promise—to save one bullet for her should we be captured. Relief did not come for forty-eight hours and during that awful time I suffered indescribable distress in trying to contrive some way of concealing wife and child from a relentless and merciless foe."

To-Day.

Waste not, dear Love, the swift, glad hours,
But passionate kisses take and give;
To-day enfolds us—it is ours,
To-morrow, Love, we may not live.

To-morrow life may sleep in dust,
Or sadden like a mateless dove;
And then, too late, a tear-stained trust,
To warm the cold, still lips of love.

So cloud no pleasure of to-day,
To-morrow, Love, no pleasure knows;
Love blossoms in a flower-like way,
Go, pluck it, as one plucks the rose.

All worthless unto us the years—
The years that pause not on the wing;
They will not dry regretful tears,
The ruined past they cannot bring.

But e'er, dear Love, all virgin-white,
To-day yet fronts us breast to breast;
And if, day-wise, love fades in night,
Come, kiss, and leave to fate the rest.

—Charles Lusted.

Condensing Is Hard Work.

Champ Clark said that before he began to write his notification speech he counted the words in Speaker Cannon's speech notifying President Roosevelt. Cannon's speech contained 1,686 words. "I concluded that I would not be as long-winded as Uncle Joe," said Clark, "so I wrote 1,686 words, and, honestly, it was the hardest work I ever did in my life. A correspondent of the London Times once sent to that paper a letter five columns long and a note to the editor, saying: 'I send you a long letter today because I did not have time to write a short one.' I now understand the note of the Times' correspondent."

Bonus for Coolies.

The Chinese government is to receive £300 a thousand for all the Chinese coolies shipped to the South African mines.

PRESIDENT WRITES LETTER.

Policy of the Republican Party Defended by Its Leader.

Says Democrats Are Lacking in Settled Convictions.

National Welfare Demands Continuance of Party in Power.

Long Document Addressed to Speaker Cannon Deals Exhaustively With the Great Questions Before the Country—Public Duties Ably Performed by Republicans—Democrats Not Worthy to Be Placed in Charge.

Oyster Bay, Sept. 12—President Roosevelt this morning issued his letter accepting the nomination for the Presidency tendered him by the Republican National Convention. In part the document is as follows:

Oyster Bay N. Y.,
September 12, 1904.

Hon. J. G. Cannon, Chairman of the Notification Committee:

My Dear Sir: I accept the nomination for the presidency tendered me by the Republican National Convention, and cordially approve the platform adopted by it.

The principles which we profess are those in which we believe with heart and soul and strength. Men may differ from us; but they cannot accuse us of shiftiness or insincerity. The policies we have pursued are those which we earnestly hold as essential to the national welfare and repute. Our actions speak even louder than our words for the faith that is in us. We base our appeal upon what we have done and are doing, upon our record of administration and legislation during the last seven years, in which we have had complete control of the government. We intend in the future to carry on the government in the same way that we have carried it on in the past.

The acts of the Administration in connection with the war with Spain, the Isthmian canal and the upholding of the Monroe doctrine the President defends at length, and declares the party is prepared fully to accept the issue on these questions. He continues:

In addition to those acts of the administration which they venture to assail after misrepresenting them, there are others which they dare not overtly or officially attack, and yet which they covertly bring forward as reason for the overthrow of the party. In certain great centers and with certain great interests our opponents make every effort to show that the settlement of the anthracite coal strike by the individual act of the president and the successful suit against the Northern Securities Company—the merger suit—undertaken by the department of justice, were acts because of which the present administration should be thrown from power. Yet they dare not openly condemn either act. They dare not in any authoritative or formal manner say that in either case wrong was done or error committed in the method of action, or in the choice of instruments for putting that action into effect. But what they dare not manfully assert in open day, they seek to use furtively and through special agents. Some of our opponents complain because under the anti-trust and interstate commerce laws suits were undertaken which have been successful; others, because suits were not undertaken which would have been unsuccessful. The Democratic state convention in New York dealt with the anthracite coal strike by demanding in deliberate and formal fashion that the national government should take possession of the coal fields; yet champions of that convention's cause now condemn the fact that there was any action by the president at all—though they must know that it was only this action by the president which prevented the movement for national ownership of the coal fields from gaining what might well have been an irresistible impetus. Such mutually destructive criticisms furnish an adequate measure of the chance for coherent action or constructive legislation if our opponents should be given power.

So much for what our opponents openly or covertly advance in the way of an attack on the acts of the administration. When we come to consider the policies for which they profess to stand we are met with the difficulty always arising when statements of policy are so made that they can be interpreted in different ways. On some of the vital questions that have confronted the American people in the last decade our opponents take the position that silence is the best possible way to convey their views. They contend that their lukewarm attitude of partial acquiescence in what others have accomplished entitles them to be made the custodians of the financial honor and commercial interests which they have but recently sought to ruin. Being unable to agree among themselves as to whether the gold standard is a curse or a blessing, and as to whether we ought or ought not to have free and unlimited coinage of silver, they have apparently thought it expedient to avoid any committal on these subjects, and individually each to follow his particular bent. Their nearest approach to a majority judgment seems to be that it is now inexpedient to assert their convictions one way or the other, and that the establishment of the gold standard by the Republican party should not be disturbed unless there is an alteration in the relative quantity of production of silver and gold. Men who hold sincere convictions on vital questions can respect equally sincere men with whose views they radically differ; and men may confess a change of faith without compromising their honor or their self-respect. But it is difficult to respect an attitude of mind such as has been fairly described above; and where there is no respect there can be no trust. A policy with so slender a basis of principle would not stand the strain of a single year of business adversity.

We, on the contrary, believe in the gold standard as fixed by the usage and verdict of the business world, and in a sound monetary system as matters of principle; as matters not of monetary political expediency, but of permanent organic policy. In 1896 and again in 1900 far-sighted men, without regard to their party fealty in the past, joined to work against what they regarded as a debased monetary system. The policies which they championed have been steadfastly adhered to by the administration; and by the act of March 14, 1900, Congress established the single gold standard as the measure of our monetary value. This act received the support of every Republican in the house, and of very Republican except one in the senate. Of our opponents, eleven supported it in the house and two in the senate; and one hundred and fifty opposed it in the house and twenty-eight in the senate. The record of the last seven years proves that the party now in power can be trusted to take the additional action necessary to improve and strengthen our monetary system, and that our opponents cannot be so trusted. The fundamental fact is that in a popular government such as ours no policy is irrevocably settled by law unless the people keep in control of the government men who believe in that policy as a matter of deep-rooted conviction. Laws can always be revoked; it is the spirit and the purpose of those responsible for their enactment and administration which must be fixed and unchangeable. It is idle to say that the monetary standard of the nation is irrevocably fixed so long as the party which at the last election cast approximately forty-six per cent of the total vote, refuses to put in its platform any statement that the question is settled. A determination to remain silent cannot be accepted as equivalent to a recantation. Until our opponents as a party explicitly adopt the views which we hold and upon which we have acted and are acting, in the matter of a sound currency, the only real way to keep the question from becoming unsettled is to keep the Republican party in power.

As for what our opponents say in reference to capital and labor, individual or corporate, here again all we need by way of answer is to point to what we have actually done, and to say that if continued in power we shall continue to carry out the policy we have been pursuing, and to execute the laws as resolutely and fearlessly in the future as we have executed them in the past.

The action of the attorney-general in enforcing the anti-trust and interstate commerce laws, and the action of the last congress in enlarging the scope of the interstate commerce law, and in creating the department of commerce and labor, with a bureau of corporations, have for the first time opened a chance for the national government to deal intelligently and adequately with the questions affecting society, whether for good or for evil, because of the accumulation of capital in great corporations, and because of the new relations caused thereby. The laws are now being administered with entire efficiency; and as, in their working, need is shown for amendment or addition to them—whether better to secure the proper publicity, or better to guarantee the rights of shippers, or in any other direction—this need will be met. It is now asserted "that the common law, as developed, affords a complete legal remedy against monopolies." But there is no common law of the United States. Its rules can be enforced only by the state courts and officers. No federal court or officer could take any action whatever under them. It was this fact, coupled with the inability of the states to control trusts and monopolies, which led to the passage of the federal statutes known as the Sherman anti-trust act and the interstate commerce act; and it is only through the exercise of the powers conferred by these acts, and by the statutes of the last congress supplementing them, that the national government acquires any jurisdiction over the subject. To say that action against trusts and monopolies should be limited to the application of the common law is equivalent to saying that the national government should take no action whatever to regulate them.

Undoubtedly, the multiplication of trusts and their increase in power has been largely due to the "failure of officials charged with the duty of enforcing the law to take the necessary procedure." Such stricture upon the failure of the officials of the national government to do their duty in this matter is certainly not wholly undeserved as far as the administration preceding President McKinley's is concerned; but it has no application at all to Republican administration. It is also undoubtedly true that what is most needed is "officials having both the disposition and the courage to enforce existing law." This is precisely the need that has been met by the consistent and steadily continued action of the department of justice under the present administration.

So far as the rights of the individual wage-worker and the individual capitalist are concerned, both as regards one another, as regards the public, and as regards organized capital and labor, the position of the administration has been so clear that there is no excuse for misrepresenting it, and no ground for opposing it unless misrepresented. Within the limits defined by the national constitution the national administration has sought to secure to each man the full enjoyment of his right to live his life and dispose of his property and his labor as he deems best, so long as he wrongs no one else. It has shown in effective fashion that in endeavoring to make good this guarantee, it treats all men, rich or poor, whatever their creed, their color, or their birthplace, as standing alike before the law. Under our form of government the sphere in which the nation as distinguished from the state can act is narrowly circumscribed; but within that sphere all that could be done has been done. All thinking men are aware of the restriction upon the power of action of the national government in such matters. Being ourselves mindful of them, we have been scrupulously careful on the one hand to be moderate in our promises, and on the other hand to keep these promises in letter and in spirit.

When we take up the great question of the tariff we are at once confronted by the doubt as to whether our opponents do or do not mean what they say. They say that "protection is robbery," and promise to carry themselves accordingly if they are given power. Yet prominent persons among them assert that they do not really mean this and that if they come into power they will adopt our policy as regards the tariff; while others seem anxious to prove that it is safe to give them partial power, because the power would be only partial, and therefore they would not be able to do mischief. The last is certainly a curious plea to advance on behalf of a party seeking to obtain control of the government.

At the outset it is worth while to say a word as to the attempt to identify the question of tariff revision or tariff reduction with a solution of the trust question. This is always a sign of desire to avoid any real effort to deal adequately with the trust question. In speaking on this point at Minneapolis, on April 4, 1903, I said:

"The question of tariff revision, speaking broadly, stands wholly apart from the question of dealing with the trusts. No change in tariff duties can have any substantial effect in solving the so-called trust problem. Certain great trusts or great corporations are wholly unaffected by the tariff. Almost all the others that are of any importance have as a matter of fact numbers of smaller American competitors; and of course a change in the tariff which would work injury to the large corporation would work not merely injury but destruction to its smaller competitors; and equally of course such a change would mean disaster to all the wage-workers connected with either the large or the small corporations. From the standpoint of those interested in the solution of the trust problem such a change would therefore merely mean that the trust was relieved of the competition of its weaker American competitors, and thrown only into competition with foreign competitors; and that the first effort to meet this new competition would be made by cutting down wages, and would therefore be primarily at the cost of labor. In the case of some of our greatest trusts such a change might confer upon them a positive benefit. Speaking broadly, it is evident that the changes in the tariff will affect the trust for weal or for woe simply as they affect the whole country. The tariff affects trusts only as it affects all other interests. It makes all these interests, large or small, profitable; and its benefits can be taken from the large only under penalty of taking them from the small also."

There is little for me to add to this. It is but ten years since the last attempt was made, by means of lowering the tariff, to prevent some people from prospering too much. The attempt was entirely successful. The tariff law of that year was among the causes which in that year and for some time afterwards effectually prevented anybody from prospering too much, and labor from prospering at all. Undoubtedly it would be possible at the present time to prevent any of the trusts from remaining prosperous by the simple expedient of making such a sweeping change in the tariff as to paralyze the industries of the country. The trusts would cease to prosper; but their smaller competitors would be ruined, and the wage-workers would starve, while it would not pay the farmer to haul his produce to market. The evils connected with the trusts can be reached only by rational effort, step by step, along the lines taken by congress and the executive during the past three years. If a tariff law is passed under which the country prospers, as the country has prospered under the present tariff law, then all classes will share in the prosperity. If a tariff law is passed aimed at preventing the prosperity of some of our people, it is as certain as anything can be that this aim will be achieved only by cutting down the prosperity of all of our people.

From time to time schedules must undoubtedly be rearranged and readjusted to meet the shifting needs of the country; but this can with safety be done only by those who are committed to the cause of the protective system. To uproot and destroy that system would be to insure the prostration of business, the closing of factories, the impoverishment of the farmer, the ruin of the capitalist, and the starvation of the wage-worker. Yet, if protection is indeed "robbery," and if our opponents really believe what they say, then it is precisely to the destruction and uprooting of the tariff, and therefore of our business and industry, that they are pledged. When our opponents last obtained power it was on a platform declaring a protective tariff "unconstitutional;" and the effort to put this declaration into practice was one of the causes of the general national prostration lasting from 1893 to 1897. If a protective tariff is either "unconstitutional" or "robbery," then it is just as unconstitutional, just as much robbery, to revise it down, still leaving it protective, as it would be to enact it. In other words our opponents have committed themselves to the destruction of the protective principle in the tariff, using words which if honestly used forbid them from permitting this principle to obtain in even the smallest degree.

Every class of our people is benefited by the protective tariff. During the last few years the merchant has seen the export trade of this country grow faster than ever in our previous history. The manufacturer could not keep his factory running if it were not for the protective tariff. The wage-worker would do well to remember that if protection is "robbery," and is to be punished accordingly, he will be the first to pay the penalty; for either he will be turned adrift entirely, or his wages will be cut down to the starvation point. As conclusively shown by the bulletins of the bureau of labor, the purchasing power of the average wage received by the wage-worker has grown faster than the cost of living, and this in spite of the continual shortening of working hours. The accumulated savings of the workingmen of the country, as shown by the deposits in the savings banks, have increased by leaps and bounds. At no time in the history of this or any other country has there been an era so productive of material benefit alike to workingman and employer, as during the seven years that have just passed.

The farmer has benefited quite as much as the manufacturer, the merchant, and the wage-worker. The most welcome and impressive fact established by the last census is the wide and even distribution of wealth among all classes of our countrymen. The chief agencies in producing this distribution are shown by the census to be the development of manufactures, and the application of new inventions to universal use.

In the forty years ending in 1900 the total value of farm property increased twelve and a half billions of dollars; the farmer gaining even more during this period than the manufacturer. Long ago over-production would have checked the marvelous development of our national agriculture, but for the steadily increasing demand of American manufacturers for farm products required as raw materials for steadily expanding industries.

Conditions change and the laws must be modified from time to time to fit new exigencies. But the genuine underlying principle of protection, as it has been embodied in all but one of the American tariff laws for the last forty years, has worked out results so beneficent, so evenly and widely spread, so advantageous alike to farmers and capitalists and workingmen, to commerce and trade of every kind, that the American people, if they show their usual practical business sense, will insist that when these laws are modified they shall be modified with the utmost care and conservatism, and by the friends and not the enemies of the protective system. They cannot afford to trust the modification to those who treat protection and robbery as synonymous terms.

In closing what I have to say about the system of promoting American industry let me add a word of cordial agreement with the policy of in some way including within its benefits, by appropriate legislation, the American merchant marine. It is not creditable to us as a nation that our great export and import trade should be well nigh exclusively in the hands of foreigners.

Our opponents contend that the government is now administered extravagantly, and that whereas there was "a surplus of $80,000,000 in 1900" there is "a deficit of more than $40,000,000" in the year that has just closed.

This deficit is imaginary, and is obtained by including in the ordinary current expenses the sum of fifty millions, which was paid for the right of way of the Panama canal out of the accumulated surplus in the treasury. Comparing the current or ordinary expenditures for the two years, there was a surplus of nearly eighty millions for the year 1900, and of only a little more than eight millions for the year that has just closed. But this diminution of the annual surplus was brought about designedly by the abolition of the war taxes in the interval between the two dates. The acts of March 2, 1901, and April 12, 1902, cut down the internal revenue taxes to an amount estimated at one hundred and five millions a year. In other words, the reduction of taxation has been considerably greater than the reduction in the annual surplus. Since the close of the war with Spain there has been no substantial change in the rate of annual expenditures. As compared with the fiscal year ending in June, 1901, for example, the fiscal year that has just closed showed a relatively small increase in expenditure (excluding the canal payment already referred to), while the year previous showed a relatively small decrease.

The expenditures of the nation have been managed in a spirit of economy as far removed from waste as from niggardliness; and in the future every effort will be continued to secure an economy as strict as is consistent with efficiency.

Our opponents promise independence to the Philippine Islands. Here again we are confronted by the fact that their irreconcilable differences of opinion among themselves, their proved inability to create a constructive policy when in power, and their readiness, for the sake of momentary political expediency, to abandon the principles upon which they have insisted as essential, conspire to puzzle us as to whether they do or do not intend in good faith to carry out this promise if they are given control of the government.

If our opponents came into power and attempted to carry out their promises to the Filipinos by giving them independence, and withdrawing American control from the islands, the result would be a frightful calamity to the Filipinos themselves, and in its larger aspect would amount to an international crime. Anarchy would follow; and the most violent anarchic forces would be directed partly against the civil government, partly against all forms of religious and educational civilization. Bloody conflicts woud inevitably ensue in the archipelago, and just as inevitably the islands would become the prey of the first power which in its own selfish interest took up the task we had cravenly abandoned.

During the last five years more has been done for the material and moral well-being of the Filipinos than ever before since the islands first came within the ken of civilized man. We have opened before them a vista of orderly development in their own interest, and not a policy of exploitation. Every effort is being made to fit the islanders for self-government, and they have already in large measure received it, while for the first time in their history their personal rights and civil liberties have been guaranteed. They are being educated; they have been given schools; they have been given libraries; roads are being built for their use; their health is being cared for; they have been given courts in which they receive justice as absolute as it is in our power to guarantee. Their individual rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are now by act of congress jealously safeguarded under the American flag; and if the protection of the flag were withdrawn their rights would be lost, and the islands would be plunged back under some form of vicious tyranny.

The letter concludes:

Alike as lawmakers and as administrators of the law we have endeavored to do our duty in the interest of the people as a whole. We make our appeal to no class and to no section, but to all good citizens, in whatever part of the land they dwell, and whatever may be their occupation or worldly condition. We have striven both for civic righteousness and for national greatness; and we have faith to believe that our hands will be upheld by all who feel love of country and trust in the uplifting of mankind. We stand for enforcement of the law and for obedience to the law; our government is a government of orderly liberty equally alient to tyranny and to anarchy; and its foundation stone is the observance of the law, alike by the people and by the public servants. We hold ever before us as the all-important end of policy and administration the reign of peace at home and throughout the world; of peace, which comes only by doing justice.

Faithfully yours,
THEODORE ROOSEVELT.