

COLONEL TELLS WHY HE IS FOR HINMAN

It's to Beat Bosses of Both Old Parties—Connecticut Moose Wanted to Know.

DISCUSSES WAR IN SPEECH

But for Monroe Doctrine We Might Be Embroiled, He Declares—Sees Danger in Bryan Peace Treaties.

Special to The New York Times.

HARTFORD, Conn., Aug. 15.—Theodore Roosevelt opened his New England campaign at the Parsons Theatre tonight with a long address, much of which was devoted to an explanation to the Connecticut Progressives of his reason for endorsing Harvey D. Hinman, a Republican, for the Governorship of New York. The remarks on the New York situation were included in his speech by the Colonel after a conference with the Progressive leaders, in which it developed that there was a well-defined feeling in this State against fusion with the Republicans anywhere. The Colonel practically admitted as much in his opening remarks, in which he said that he had been asked, upon his arrival, how he had come to endorse Hinman, and also why the Progressives had not made a straight-out fight in the Mayoralty campaign of 1913 in New York.

There were about 2,000 Progressives in the theatre, and they gave the Colonel a hearty welcome. This was the only demonstration of the night. On his way to the theatre Col. Roosevelt's automobile passed through streets which were deserted except for the usual Saturday night shoppers and the crowds about the war bulletins. Few persons recognized him until he reached the stage door, and he was ushered into the building before the little gathering in front of the theatre had time to get together for a cheer.

The Progressives in the theatre were enthusiastic, however, and cheered wildly when some one shouted "Our next President." They were as ready to contribute to the cause as they were to cheer, and pledges for \$2,444 were collected. Another collection was taken to defray the expenses for the hall, and Col. Roosevelt tossed the first dollar into the hat himself.

The Colonel was in fine fettle, and while his voice was husky and bothered him at times, he made a vigorous and sustained attack upon his old enemies "the bosses." The rest of his address he devoted largely to the Progressive programme, with an extended reference to the European war.

The situation in Europe, he said, showed the futility of arbitration treaties such as he spoke of as now pending in the Senate. There are twenty of these treaties, and eighteen of them were ratified by the Senate a few days ago after the draft of that part of the Colonel's speech dealing with the war situation was completed.

"Within a fortnight," said Mr. Roosevelt, "we have had fresh proof of the worthlessness of treaties, of name signed to pieces of paper, unless backed by force, if passion or interest demands their violation."

Still Calls Barnes "Boss."

In his treatment of the New York situation Col. Roosevelt, despite the libel suit brought against him by William Barnes, continued his bitter attack upon the Republican State Chairman, and in one passage referred to him as "Boss Barnes."

"I have been asked," he said, "why I supported Mitchell, a Democrat, for Mayor in 1913, and why this year I am for Mr. Hinman, a Republican. Another question which has been asked is, 'Why do you think of fusion?'"

"Now, I want to explain how I feel. It is a foolish thing to make a fetish of fusion. If we should fuse with the bosses on an unworthy platform we would be guilty of treachery to our principles. The thing I most desire is to fuse with the rank and file of both parties to do what is just as much their interest as in ours—to destroy the bosses and clear the way to make social and industrial justice the chief end of our politics. That is the reason I am interested in politics."

"In New York State we had the chance to fuse on the one man who was brave enough to come out openly against the bosses. If in the Mayoralty fight New York we had run a separate ticket we would have given much satisfaction to Mr. Murphy. I feel that the same true this year."

"The boss system in New York has grown to its height in the last two years. And now the bosses are opposed to one another, the same mediaeval barons were opposed. Each would fight the other to get territory, but they would join forces if there was an insurrection of the serfs. I feel that we ought to get back of the man who represents the hope of the hard-working men of the State."

"You perhaps don't understand conditions in New York. The real reason why I take so deep an interest in politics is because I want to do what I can to put the Government behind a movement for the benefit of the average woman and the average man, and we must get behind Mr. Hinman, New York, because he has shown that he can be trusted, and if we do elect him the creature and candidate of one of the old machines will be elected."

The opening address at the State-wide rally of the Progressives was made by Flavel S. Luther, President of Trinit College, who is the Progressive candidate for United States Senator. Colonel paid a high tribute to Dr. Luther and added:

"In my State some of the college Presidents are looked upon as the little brothers of the rich. In the long run the little brothers of the rich type is of much use as a college President."

Accept Roosevelt as Leader.

The meeting was opened by Dr. Luther and a resolution in behalf of the State Committee was offered by Gutzon Blum, the sculptor, welcoming Col. Roosevelt to Connecticut. The resolution pledged the Progressives to Roosevelt leadership and ended:

"We honor you as we understand and we accept, trust and follow a great disinterested leadership."

The only other address of the evening was by Dr. George L. Perin, President of Franklin Square House, Boston, who was Dr. Perin who called for the contributions. Col. Roosevelt clapped hands and helped count the money. It poured in.

"I am glad," he said, "to see a visible and tangible sign of the fact that is in you."

Col. Roosevelt motored to Farmington, Conn., with his son Archie and daughter with his sister, the wife of Rear Admiral Cowles. As he was passing through Bridgeport, where the Republicans held their State convention, his automobile was held up for half an hour by a parade of that party. The Colonel was forced to watch a long line of marchers file by. There were a few who recognized him, they gave him a cheer.

"I was held up by the Republican Party," said the Colonel later, "but finally got ahead of it."

The Colonel was escorted to the train by Joseph W. Alsop, the Republican Chairman, and from Mr. Alsop received full information about the situation here. Herbert Knox Smith, Commissioner of Corporations in the Roosevelt Administration, is the candidate for Governor. In the Senatorial race Gov. Baldwin, Democrat, and Sen. Brandegee, Republican, oppose Luther.

"It seems very amusing," said Col. Roosevelt, "for you couldn't place a dot of tissue paper between the conviction of Baldwin and Brandegee, except, perhaps, on the tariff issue."

of Baldwin and Brandegee, except, perhaps, on the tariff issue."

It was in the latter part of the speech that Col. Roosevelt dealt with the situation of this country with respect to the war in Europe. He said:

Monroe Doctrine Justified.

Friends, I cannot at this time refrain from saying one word in connection with the great cataclysm which has engulfed all Europe in war. When the interests of the nation are at stake, in the face of foreign powers, we are all Americans and not party men, and our interest is in the welfare of America. We will hold up the arms of any man without any regard to his party so long as he will with wisdom and good faith subserve the national interests.

It seems to me that we should realize with the keenest gratitude how much we owe to the fact that by the steady application of the Monroe Doctrine this country has succeeded in preventing the colonization and growth on this continent of great military Old World powers. If it had not been for the existence of that doctrine and its support by this Government under Presidents of all shades of political belief, the great military nations of the Old World would unquestionably long ere this have possessed masses of territory in the Western Hemisphere. In such case nothing under heaven could have prevented our being involved in European struggles like the present.

We would also in such case be under the crushing burden of immense armaments in time of peace, a burden the bearing of which has grown more onerous year by year in Europe. Well-meaning and amiable, but shortsighted persons have from time to time protested against the Monroe Doctrine and said it was outworn. I wish these good persons would seriously consider the present contest and realize that if it had not been for the Monroe Doctrine in the past, and if the Monroe Doctrine were at this moment abandoned, the United States would in all probability have been drawn into the present dreadful struggle.

Africa, south of the equator, is now being drawn into the fight, although without any interest in it. We would have been drawn in in the same way if it had not been for the observance of the great principle which the Monroe Doctrine contains, the principle that this continent shall not be treated as a place for territorial aggrandizement by Old World powers.

The peace of the Western Hemisphere largely depends upon the preservation of this doctrine. It is for this reason that I feel that the arbitration treaties now pending in the Senate would, if adopted, be inimical to the interests of the United States and of peace in so far as they would have any effect whatever. I doubt if they would have much effect, because in the event of their attempted execution against the interests of this people, I do not believe that they would be executed.

Worthlessness of Treaties.

But surely it is not an honorable thing for this nation to enter into treaties which either could not or ought not to be kept. Such action argues badly for our sincerity and good faith. Under the proposed treaties, if, as a result of this war, Denmark or Holland should part with their islands in the West Indies to some great Old World power, or if at some future time Mexico should similarly part with Magdalena Bay to some Old World power, we would be solemnly bound to join in the creation of a commission which would investigate all the matters at hand before we could take any action in the matter, and this commission would include representatives of outside powers.

Within a fortnight we have had fresh proof of the worthlessness of treaties, of names signed to pieces of paper, unless backed by force, if passion or interest demands their violation. This fact has been demonstrated again and again within the last dozen years by almost every one of the great nations who are now engaged in this war or who stand with their armies partially mobilized and their fleets gathered because of the possibility of being drawn into it.

Within this fortnight, as within the preceding dozen years, we have again and again seen the most solemn treaties guaranteeing neutrality, or promising alliances, or agreeing to arbitration, or guaranteeing peace, or setting a time limit to the occupation of territory, violated in matter-of-course fashion and with utter indifference to what was promised. In no case have they been regarded unless there was some military force back of the treaty, some method of insuring by the exertion or the existence of power attention to the obligations of a treaty.

These proposed arbitration treaties of ours would not be worth the paper on which they were printed if it became to the interest of any great military power to violate them and if it thought it could violate them with impunity. We would have bound ourselves in such cases as I have illustrated to wait a year or so while a joint commission pursued its weary course of investigation, and during that time the Old World military power, if it desired to retain its new possessions, could make a Gibraltar of one of the West Indian islands, or of Magdalena Bay, or of any other point of territory which it acquired, and it could then defy us to turn it out save at the cost of a war which might be as dreadful as any now raging.

I hold that we should consistently adhere to the policy which has in the past prevented and will in the future prevent the opportunity and necessity for such wars. These proposed treaties bind us to submit questions affecting the national honor and the vital interest of the United States to the action of a joint commission. Of course, this means that we would have to submit the Monroe Doctrine itself to the action of a joint commission. To pass these treaties means the abnegation of sovereignty on our part and the abandonment of our position that Old World powers shall not territorially aggrandize themselves in the New World.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that the people of the United States would ever submit with tame acquiescence to an assault upon their national honor and vital interest, or that they would abandon the Monroe Doctrine. When such is the case it is mischievous folly to make a treaty binding us to do the very things that we would not do and that it would be criminal on our part to do.

Restates Progressive Policies.

In the first part of his address, in restating the policies of the Progressive Party, Col. Roosevelt said, in part:

We members of the Progressive Party are committed to the development of a homogeneous and balanced economic social programme. Mr. Murdock and other members of the House of Representatives and Senate who in Congress have so ably represented the Progressive Party and the people have shown an enlightened understanding of the need for this rounded and balanced programme. They have introduced the Murdock Trust bills, the Tariff Commission bill, and the bill for the creation of a Federal Employment Bureau as well as a bill for the abolition of child labor. The unwisdom of the opponents of the Progressives who dominate affairs in Washington has blocked these reforms and thereby has emphasized the need of our demand for a reform of political machinery, notably, the reform of the Presidential nominating system.

It is not true that we make any assault on property. It, of course, is true that we wish to be sure that great wealth is accumulated not only by laws, but in accordance with moral laws, and with the interests of the people as a whole. It is true that we believe that enormous fortunes, when transmitted to those who have not made them, should come under the operations of a sharply graduated inheritance tax, which I personally have always believed to be more important than the income tax, and far less open to objections. I do not believe that at present there is the slightest need of any income tax or inheritance tax on small or even moderate fortunes, but I do believe that there should be a heavily graded and heavy income tax and inheritance tax on very large fortunes.

We must strive to democratize industry. We must strive to make the tool user as far as possible a tool owner. We must strive to secure to the wage worker his full and proper share of the product which without his labor would not exist. The wage worker must do his share in securing the increase of efficiency, and therefore he must receive his full share of

the profit and benefit gained by such increase of efficiency. Our opponents at Washington, in both the old parties, have failed to show the slightest understanding of the real needs of the situation.

As regards our trust programme, I wish you would read the volume in which President Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin has outlined and advocated the two special points to which the Progressives have most strongly committed themselves: that is the need of accepting the principle of combination in modern business as inevitable and the need of controlling the resulting business combinations in effective fashion by administrative commissions. I do not believe that any real and ultimate good results from the effort merely to break up these combinations. I question very gravely whether very much good will be accomplished, for example, by the effort merely to break up the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railway any more than good was accomplished by the so-called dissolution of the Standard Oil Trust.

Effective administrative governmental control is what is necessary, and governmental control such as to prevent at the outset the wrongdoing that has marked the conduct of the two corporations I have mentioned in the past. This control cannot be exercised by law suits in any effective way; it must be exercised by administrative action. The administrative action should be taken through a commission, and this commission should give honest business men in advance information as to what they can and what they cannot do, so as to enable them to proceed in safety in their business operations.

Antiquated Tariff Making.

We were assured two years ago that the reduction of the tariff would mean a reduction in the cost of living and a solution of the trust question. The tariff has been reduced, and nevertheless the cost of living has not been reduced, although the ability of the average man to earn a living has been reduced, while it has not had the slightest effect whatever upon any of the trusts, except in certain industries to hurt the smaller competitors of the trusts. The trusts as trusts have nothing whatever to fear and have not in the slightest degree been hurt by the reduction of the tariff.

But I wish especially to warn these well-meaning citizens who, in their indignation over the present tariff law, wish to return to power the men responsible for its predecessor, the Payne-Aldrich tariff. I am making my appeal not merely to the Progressives, but to the honest, hard-working rank and file of both the old parties—the Republican and the Democratic alike—and to all good, hard-working citizens, and to all the plain people, no matter what their political affiliations may be.

You are indignant about the present tariff. You believe that it represents an improper theory of tariff making, and, moreover, the application of improper methods in the actual construction of the tariff by Congress. We Progressives agree with you, but we ask you to remember that it was the men who pushed through the Payne-Aldrich tariff who more than any others are responsible for the revulsion of feeling which resulted in the enactment of the present tariff. Exactly the same methods were employed in making each tariff. The difference was that in one case there was an improper and extreme leaning toward one side of the scale, and that the natural revulsion against this resulted, in the second case, in an improper and extreme leaning toward the other side.

The only way to get business quiet and stability is to adopt the Progressive principle of a non-partisan expert Tariff Commission, with full power; not a Tariff Board, not a make-believe commission, but a real and powerful administrative body of experts, who will consider not the special interests of each body of our fellow-citizens, but the interests of all of our fellow-citizens collectively.

Col. Roosevelt returned to Farmington after the meeting. He will motor to Newfane, Vt., tomorrow morning to visit George K. Cherrie, one of the naturalists who accompanied him on his South American explorations. Monday he will be in Boston.