FRSDW 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 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 of insincerity. The policies we have pursued are those which we earnestly held 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 of 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. They dare not openly condemn either act. They dare not in any intelligible or formal manner say that in either case wrong was done or error committed in the course of of action or in the choice of instruments for putting that action into effect. But what they dare not manifestly and openly do, they seek to use furtively and through special appeals. Some of our opponents complain because under the anti-trust and interstate commerce laws rebates were undertaken which have been successful; others, because suits were not undertaken which would be successful. The Democratic state convention in New York dealt with the anthracite coal strike by demanding in deliberate and formal indictment that the federal government should take possession of the coal fields; yet champions of that convention's course have declared openly 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 practical establishment of such ownership of the coal fields from continuing what might well have been an irremediable injustice. Such self-contradictory 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 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 either of the two possible ways to convey their views. They contend that their lukewarm attitude of partial acquiescence in what they have accomplished entitles them to be made the custodians of the great business and commercial interests which they have not honestly sought to help. Being unable to agree among themselves as to whether the gold standard is a curse or a blessing, and as to whether we should 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 its particular bent. The request of appeal to a majority judgment seems to be that if one man is in different ways convinced that two and two make four and another man is convinced that two and two make five, as it would be in the power of the majority to enact it. In other words, they ask that the people surrender themselves to the destruction of the principle of the merit in the tariff, saying in effect, which if honestly used forbid them from permitting the principle to obtain in even the smallest degree.

Every class of our people is benefited by the present tariff. During the last few years the merchant has seen the export trade of the country grow faster than ever in our previous history. The manufacturer could not keep his factory running if he had to fear the uncertain 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 the 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 have there been so many so productive of material benefit to the workingman and—even more during the seven years that have just passed.

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 city manufacturer. Long ago over-production would have checked the marvelous development of our national industries had not 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 has been embodied in all but one of the American tariff laws for the last forty years, has worked out results so beneficent, so even and widely spread, so advantageous alike to farmers and capitalists and workers, to commerce and trade of every kind, that the American people, if they show their usual practical business sense, will insist on a word of caution being added to that our great export and import trade should be well nigh exclusively in the hands of citizens.

Our opponents contend that the government is now administered extravagantly, and that whereas there was in 1892 a surplus of $9,000,000 the last year there was a deficit closed.

This deficit is imaginary, and is obtained by including in the ordinary current expenses of the year the fifty millions which was paid for the right of way to the Panama canal out of the accumulated surplus and in the treasury. Leaving the current or ordinary expenditures of the two years precisely the same, instead of nearly eighty millions for the year 1904 and only a little more than eight millions for the year that has closed, there would be this diminution of the unusual surplus we be brought about wholly by the abolition of the war taxes by the legislation between the Spanish war and 1900. The acts of March 2, 1901, and April 12, 1902, cut off all of the internal revenue taxes to an amount estimated at one hundred and fifty millions a year; in other words, the reduction of taxation has been considerably greater than the reduction in the annual expenditures which has come in the war with Spain. There has been no increase in the permanent peace time expenditures. As compared with the last year of trading in time of peace, the fiscal year that has just closed showed a relatively small increase in expenditures, including the canal payments already referred to, while the year preceding showed a relatively small decrease.

The expenditures of the nation have been managed in a spirit of economy in the remunerative sense, as from wise and honest expenditure which will be productive of good results. Here and there in the future every effort will be made to secure an economy as strict as is consistent with efficiency.

Our opponents have shown incompetence to the Philippine islands. Here also they are confronted by the fact that their irreconcilable antagonisms among themselves, their proved inability to agree among themselves, their lack of power, and their readiness, for the sake of momentary political expediency, to abandon the principles upon which they have insisted as essential, conspire to make them unfit for power. They have not intend in good faith to carry out the principles if they are given control of the government.

If our opponents came into power and set their faces toward giving to the people of the Philippines by giving them independence, and withdrawing American troops from the islands, the result would be the immediate relapse of the Filipinos themselves, and in its largest aspect would amount to an international crime. Anarchy would follow, and the most important results forces would be directed swiftly against the civil government established by against all forms of religious and education work introduced by Americans. Such action would inevitably ensue in the archipelago and just as inevitably the islands would become the prey of the first power that put its own selfish interest took up the task and had gravely 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 white men. We have opened before them a vista of orderly development and progress such as they had not in 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 the chance to own land; their property rights are safe; 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 industrial progress in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are now by act of congress guaranteed by the constitution of the American flag; and if the protection of the flag were withdrawn their rights would be overthrown. 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 them as entitled to no section, but to all good citizens, in whatever part of the land they may live, and whatever may be their occupation or worldly condition. We have striven both for righteousness and for national greatness; and we have faith to believe that our work will be upheld by all who feel love of country and trust in the uplifting of mankind. We say them it is precisely the construction and upholding of the tariff, and the defense of our business and industry that they are pledged. When our opponents last obtained power it was on a platform declaring a protective tariff "unconstitutionally" and the effort to put this declaration into practice was one of the causes of the general national prostration lasting from 1892 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, the opponents of protection commit themselves to the destruction of the protective principle in the tariff, saying in effect which if honestly used forbid them from permitting the principle to obtain