

Roberts for governor on the 9th. Gov. Peabody was nominated on the 9th by the Republicans for reelection as governor of Colorado.

President Roosevelt published his formal letter of acceptance as the Republican candidate for President (p. 356) on the 12th. It is a document of about 13,000 words, and in substance as follows:

The letter begins with an extended and lively challenge to the Democratic party to join issue with the Republicans, coupled with a criticism of their strictures upon Republican administrations. It proceeds from this to a declaration in favor of the gold standard "and a sound monetary system as matters of principle" and not of "momentary political expediency," and refers to the "record of the last seven years" to prove "that the party now in power can be trusted to take the additional action necessary to improve and strengthen our monetary system." Reference is then made to the record as a guarantee of the Republican party's policy with reference to the organization of labor and of capital and to the question of trusts. Regarding human rights, Mr. Roosevelt says: "This government is based upon the fundamental idea that each man, no matter what his occupation, his race, or his religious belief, is entitled to be treated on his worth as a man, and neither favored nor discriminated against because of any accident in his position. Even here at home there is painful difficulty in the effort to realize this ideal; and the attempt to secure from other nations acknowledgment of it sometimes encounters obstacles that are well nigh insuperable; for there are many nations which in the slow procession of the ages have not yet reached that point where the principles which Americans regard as axiomatic obtain any recognition whatever." Some remarks upon the civil service law follow, and these are succeeded by a discussion of the tariff question. On that subject he says it is impossible to compare the platform of the Democrats "with their other and later official utterances and not create doubt as to their sincerity." While the platform describes protection as robbery, yet prominent Democrats assert that if their party comes into power it will adopt the Republican policy as to the tariff, while "others seem anxious to prove that it is safe to give them power because their power would be only partial and therefore they would not be able to do mischief." Advancing to a discussion of the bearing of protection on prosperity Mr. Roosevelt says: "It is only 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 afterward 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." On the same general subject he adds: "From time to time schedules must undoubtedly be arranged 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." Mr. Roosevelt closes his extended discussion in behalf of the principle of protection with a favorable word for "including in some way the merchant marine within its benefits," though without specifying the way usually proposed, that of a ship subsidy. The army question is next taken up, and this is followed by an explanation of the treasury deficit. The next subject is the Philippine question, regarding which Mr. Roosevelt makes an argument too lengthy and closely linked to admit of fair condensation. Its spirit animates the closing paragraph: "This is as true now as four years ago. We did not take the Philippines at will, and we cannot put them aside at will. Any abandonment of the policy which we have steadily pursued in the Islands would be fraught with dishonor and disaster; and to such dishonor and disaster I do not believe the American people will consent."

Gov. Garvin's call for a special session of the legislature of Rhode Island (p. 54) has resulted in a refusal of the legislature to consider the subject matter of his call. He had directed their attention to three things neglected by them at the regular session, namely, (1) the constitutional initiative, which would allow 5,000 electors to propose specific amendments to the State constitution; (2) equal suffrage, which would confer upon registry voters in cities the right to vote in the election of city councils; (3) the veto power, which

would enable the governor to check hasty and vicious legislation. The legislature had buried these and other popular measures in committees, and with a mass of unfinished business before it had adjourned to a date succeeding the Fall elections. It was also because he believed that this adjournment had been taken to enable the present legislature to dispose of that business improperly after the election, and thereby obstruct the new legislature to be then elected, that Gov. Garvin called the special session. Upon assembling on the 13th, in accordance with this call, the legislature refused to consider the subject matter of the call, and, after passing a concurrent resolution condemning the governor for having ordered the special session, adjourned.

A new turn has occurred in the traction contest in Chicago (p. 357). On the 9th the Chicago Examiner made the following announcement:

A petition for a referendum on the Chicago City Railway ordinance must be made. Mayor Harrison has declared that such a petition is the only thing that will prevent the passage of the infamous street car franchise ordinance now pending in the council. The petition, therefore, should be made. It must be made. The Chicago Examiner and the Chicago American will undertake the herculean task, and ask the cooperation of the people of Chicago who believe in the rights of the people in their own streets and who believe in public honesty. An army of men must be had for the work. They must be such public spirited and patriotic citizens of Chicago as will volunteer their assistance and give their labor to help make this gigantic petition within the short space of time remaining for its completion.

The Examiner thereupon called for 2,504 volunteers pledged to secure 50 signatures each, and has ever since been urging on this work. Later in the day of the above announcement, the 9th, Mayor Harrison extended the time for holding back the proposed ordinance pending the filing of a referendum petition, from October 20th, the date named in his proclamation (p. 305), to November 15th. The Referendum League published informally on the 10th a refusal to prepare a petition "until the council has amended and mutilated to its heart's content the ordinance" in

question; because these changes would nullify their work in securing petitions by destroying the identity of the ordinance. The emergent petition put forth by the Examiner and the American is as follows:

To the Board of Election Commissioners, Chicago: We, the undersigned, registered voters of Chicago, respectfully petition that the following questions of public policy be submitted to the voters of the city of Chicago, at the regular election to be held in and for the said city of Chicago, on the first Tuesday in April, A. D. 1905:

(1) Shall the City Council pass the ordinance reported by the local transportation committee to the City Council on the 24th day of August, 1904, granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway Company?

(2) Shall the City Council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway Company?

(3) Shall the City Council pass any ordinance granting a franchise to any street railroad company?

The volunteer signature-solicitors began their work on the 14th.

NEWS NOTES.

—The annual convention of the American Bankers' Association, met at the Waldorf-Astoria hotel, New York, on the 14th.

—George H. Shibley, of Washington, who was nominated on the 31st for vice-president of the United States (p. 342) by the Continental party, declined the nomination on the 7th.

—At Lhasa on the 7th Col. Younghusband, head of the British expedition into Tibet (p. 296), secured a treaty, and was then reported as in readiness to return, the object of his mission having been thus accomplished.

—The Negro militia company of New Haven, Conn., were stoned at Manassas Junction, on the 12th, upon their return from the government mimic war maneuvers at Bull Run. Their assailants were members of a Texas regiment.

—Louis Deibler ("M. de Paris."), chief executioner of Paris from 1879 to 1896, died on the 8th. During 39 years' experience as an executioner he had guillotined 327 convicts. He came of a family of executioners and his son is now the chief executioner of Paris.

—On the 8th the petitions for the three public policy questions proposed by the Referendum League of Illinois to be voted upon at the coming election (p. 358), were filed with the Secretary of State at Springfield. The signatures to these petitions numbered 130,852.

—The packers' strike (p. 358) was

"called off" by President Donnelly on the 8th, under instructions from the national executive board of his organization, the following terms of settlement having been agreed upon:

Unions to call the strike off; packers to take back men as fast as needed; rate of wages of skilled men to remain same as before the strike; the above to cover all points affected by the strike.

—The National Afro-American Council, in session at St. Louis, issued an address on the 8th in which they said:

We view with alarm the rapid spread of race prejudice in this country. As a race we have striven to impress this nation with our sincere desire to be identified with its prosperity and to even share its failures, if failures must come. We wish to declare that the cry of social equality made by those who seek our humiliation, is without the least foundation, and those who make this argument know that it is a mere subterfuge.

—The Georgia court of inquiry appointed by Gov. Terrell to report upon the conduct of the militia in failing to protect Negro convicts from a mob at Statesboro (p. 329), has made a severe arraignment of the militia for its failure to perform its sworn duty, the officers having been shown to be in sympathy with the mob. In consequence, five out of six of the officers are to be tried by court martial on the 29th. The sixth, Lieut. McIntyre, is exonerated and praised for his efforts to defeat the mob, and several privates are commended for their individual efforts to uphold the law.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S LETTER.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Sept. 14.—Swearing that he has been true to the Constitution in all acts, hinting at a big stick for the South American Republics, with a sop to the Negro voters in the North by a covert threat that he will see to greater privileges for the Negro in the South, Mr. Roosevelt closes with a warning to the people that if they do not elect him they will soon regret it. Here is a sentence in his closing paragraph that for splendid egotism does Mr. Roosevelt infinite credit: "If, on the other hand, they (the Democrats) should come in and reverse any or all of our policies, by just so much would the nation as a whole be damaged." The big stick, the spurs, the six-shooters and the flannel shirt may be hidden now, but in the event of his election the Broncho Buster will again take the saddle. That is the keynote of Mr. Roosevelt's letter, and he cannot smother it.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem), Sept. 13.—Mr. Roosevelt contends that it would be an "injury" to the consumer if the "prosperity" of the trusts should be abated. As their "prosperity" means their profits, Mr. Roosevelt's contention is tantamount to a declaration that the consumer's prosperity depends upon the continuation of monopoly exactions. "If a tariff law is passed aimed at preventing the prosperity (profits) of some of our people," he says, "it is as certain as anything can be that our aim will be achieved only by cutting down the prosperity of all our people." This confused reasoning is met with at every hand. . . . It is an absurdity that the interests of the exploited and the exploiter are "identical," and that the welfare of the one depends upon the welfare of the other. The welfare of the exploiters, it is quite true, depends

upon the welfare of the exploited, but the real interests of the exploited require that they escape the exactions of the exploiter.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 13.—"We are content," says Mr. Roosevelt, "to rest our case before the American people upon the fact that to adherence to a lofty ideal we have added proved government efficiency. . . ." What, pray, is the lofty idea? Is the big stick lofty? Are we striving to attain a worthy government ideal in oppressing the Filipinos, in fomenting rebellion in Panama, in assisting in the dismemberment of South African republics, in fostering trusts that are crushing individuality, robbing the consumer for the benefit of the manufacturer, thus making the rich richer and the poor poorer, in fastening a crushing weight of indirect taxes upon the citizens? What of the promises respecting reciprocity treaties, and what party was responsible for the fulfillment of the promise made Cuba to give her trade concessions that would make the tilling of her fields profitable and save her from famine? If war and the things of war be a lofty ideal, if legislation for the trusts and other special interests be fulfilling a governmental ideal, then Mr. Roosevelt is right in saying that we have attained the ideal. But he is wrong in his conception of what constitutes a lofty ideal.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Sept. 12.—Mr. Roosevelt stands pat on the tariff. He takes back nothing he has previously put forth in the way of claiming credit for curbing the trusts and putting shackles on cunning. The big stick looms large behind the pacific utterances given forth regarding our foreign policy. And if the career of imperial conquest is ever to be abandoned the country must look elsewhere than to Theodore Roosevelt for promise of that end. That Mr. Roosevelt makes a telling point against the half-hearted "tariff reformers" must be admitted—and it is cheerfully admitted. They deserve the keen thrusts which he delivers. They haven't a leg to stand on and Mr. Roosevelt reveals the fact with cruel fidelity. And his reflections upon these apologetics for Democracy is all the more welcome because it will serve to draw the lines more clearly and to force the real issue, which is that of free trade or protection. Mere "tariff reform" is nonsense. It has nothing but a question of percentages behind it. It raises no moral question. It appeals to no sentiment that is worth considering. And it is so cowardly and so utterly lacking in real conviction that it is not strange that the American people have not listened very responsively to its appeals.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Sept. 12.—If Mr. Roosevelt is elected he intends to carry on the government in the same way that the government has been carried on during the past three years. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected the trusts will flourish and the trust magnates will continue to defy the law. If Mr. Roosevelt is elected, we shall have colonies; imperialism will be "irrevocably" established. If it is within the power of the Republican administration to so establish it, we shall have colonies, we shall deny the good old American doctrine of government with the consent of the governed; militarism will be a conspicuous feature; the arts of peace will be abandoned and the tricks of war will be taught to the youth of the land; government by the few will be preferred to government by the many; we shall continue to strive to be a world power, not by the force of our example, but by the power of our battleships and the strength of our armies. A careful reading of Mr. Roosevelt's letter of acceptance will, we think, show that in the event of his reelection, the American people may well prepare for four years more of plutocracy, four years more of trusts, four years more of extravagance, four years more of colonialism, four years