VIEWS ON TOPICS OF INTEREST BY READERS OF THE TIMES

The Right of Suffrage—Double Taxation A Verified Prophecy—Improvements—Other Topics.

The Times takes pleasure in opening its columns to the discussion of subjects of interest to the public, and while the editor of The Times neither undertakes to endorse nor to refute the correctness of the views expressed, the paper cheerfully publishes communications from its friends and readers, especially when these communications are submitted over the signatures of the writers.

Owing to the facts that the space of the paper is limited, the news is steadily increasing in volume, and the number of communications is sometimes quite large, The Times will be obliged hereafter to limit the length of communications addressed to the editor and intended for publication to

800 Words.

Communications longer than that will stand much less chance of being published, and will not be accepted unless under peculiar circumstances. If written in

500 Words,

so much the better.

"The Right of Suffrage."

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—There is abundant food for reflection in an editorial of the New York Tribune which appeared about a week since on this subject. It candidly admitted, if not directly, by undeniable inference, that the extension of the right of suffrage to the negro after the war in his barbarous condition was wrong. Indeed, it went farther and stated that the Fifteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution was forced by the war, and while its repeal was impractical and impossible, it yet suggested that it would have been better if there had never been such an amendment, and it appealed to and called upon all good Republicans and Democrats, north and south, to unite together in framing a law which would place the ballot in the hands of competent and intelligent suffragans, evidently desiring to eliminate the corrupt and ignorant vote so far as may be practicable. Coming as that does from the paper which is the favored organ of the best class of Republicans in the North, who are gentlemen and good citizens, it should be met in a similar spirit by the people of the South. Our Constitutional Convention should eliminate the negro vote by all honorable means in its power. The time is ripe for it. The northern people (I mean the better class) will secretly be glad of it. They have learned a great deal about the negro since the war, and now that the largest and most inviting field for capital, the largest perhaps in the whole world, has been opened in the South, they wish to get rid of the well-nigh intolerable nuisance of negro voting, which, as long as it lasts, will always be a standing menace, not only to our property, but to our personal rights. No man should be allowed to vote in Virginia unless he pays taxes on at least two hundred dollars' worth of property, or unless he can read and write the English language, and in addition he must pay his capitation tax of not less than two dollars, and to enable the suffragans to vote this last named tax must be paid thirty days before the election.

Confederate soldiers and their lineal male descendants must be exempted from the operation of this law except the capitation tax. This lets in, that is the words: "Confederate soldiers and their lineal male descendants," nearly all the white men in Virginia. An enormous majority of the white people are the lineal descendants of Confederate soldiers. It might not be unwise as a set-off to this clause, to permit the descendants of the Virginia negroes who served in the Federal army during the war between the States of this Union to vote, and thus obviate any apparent unfairness. The number is very small, and yet, if it is done, it cannot be said that we have made any unjust or unfair class distinction. There need be no fear that the North will ever attempt to cut our representation down in Congress on this account. The fear of the great and growing power of the States west of the Mississippi River will prevent it. One more suggestion I have to make, and it is this: The Constitution must be submitted to the people for ratification, but no person must be allowed to vote on it unless he is a duly qualified voter under the new Constitution. To allow a man to vote on a constitution which deprives him of his own right of suffrage would be "superlative folly."

COUNTRY LAWYER.

Buckingham county, Va., July 12, 1901.

Double Taxation.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—In your Sunday's issue you discuss the question of double taxation, a question which will cause much vexation before it is through with, if taken up by our State Convention. You say that it is double taxation to tax a corporation for its real property, and also tax the bonds or the stock issued by that corporation. Let us begin at the foundation of the matter and see if that is so. When a corporation is formed, it is nothing, only an agreement, until the stock is taken, so that, let us suppose that four parties, having each $25,000 in bank, agree to form a corporation of $100,000. Now each of these $25,000 sums is liable for taxation while yet in the hands of the different parties, therefore when these parties take the stock the cash is paid into the corporation and the stock becomes subject to taxation in the hands of the parties who formerly had the cash. No corporation is formed without the intention of using the cash for which its bonds are sold for some purpose whereby a dividend can be made. Now, then, the $100,000 cash is expended as follows: $25,000 for real estates to be used for its business; $25,000 for machinery, $25,000 for material wherewith to carry on the corporation's specialty, whatever it may be, and $25,000 cash capital. Do you mean to say that these four sums, of $25,000 each, are not to be taxed, or that if they are taxed, then the bonds are not to be taxed? And you make the evidence of debt, as you call these bonds, apply to the wrong substance. These evidences of debt represent to the State the sums of $25,000, as when in the hands of the takers of the stock, and not as evidences of debt by the corporation, for the State looks to the corporation for what it stands owing for tax, and finds as follows: Real estate, $25,000; machinery, $25,000; material, $25,000; cash capital, $25,000. There can be no double taxation here, for only tangible substances are taxed; the bonds certainly being tangible substances, since they represent $100,000, which was once debtor to the State for taxes, and the owners of it could not be absolved from all liability simply because they had accepted therefor a bond which promises to pay face value and to participate in the dividends of the corporation into which they have entered. I shall not be so long in stating the case as regards a real estate loan not being liable for taxation, or its being double taxation to tax it. A owns a house and lot worth $2,000; B has $1,000; they each are liable for taxes in all $3,000. A borrows from B $1,000 and gives a deed of trust for $1,000 on his house and lot; what has A then?—$3,000. But $1,000 is an evidence of debt in the hands of B, who is liable to the State for the tax on it, for it represents the $1,000 which he once owned, now in A's hands. There is no double taxation there, nor could there be, unless A were to report this $1,000, which he ought not to do, and probably would have no chance of doing, because he probably paid it away the day he received it. Borrowed capital, if reported for taxation, would be double taxation, if borrowed on real estate, for then the valuation would be taxed; the evidence of debt be taxed, and the cash taxed, which, to illustrate, would be $2,000 real estate, $1,000 evidence of debt, and cash $1,000, making $4,000; when there was only $3,000 involved and on which taxes were claimable. If the owner, who owes money on his property, pays full tax, he does only what is required of him; but it causes him annoyance to think that the holder of the evidence of debt escapes paying because not known to the tax collector; and hence this idea that he is paying double taxes. The tax follows the substance.

EDWARD C. GODDIN.

Verified Prophecies.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Some time before Mr. Ingalls' retirement from the presidency of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway he made this statement: "Major Myers will some day see R., F. and P. engines running into the S. A. L.-C. & O. Depot. Major Myers will laugh when he sees this, but it will come to pass."

It will not be long before the Southern Railway will run train No. 33 over the R., F. & P. to Hermitage, thence by S. A. L. through Richmond to Manchester, where the Southern will again be used to Danville and the South.

The R., F. & P. will soon absorb the line now owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad from Quantico to Washington, making it one hundred and fourteen miles in length, the following large railroads retaining an equal amount of stock of the new "Washington and Richmond Railroad."

They are: The Pennsylvania, Baltimore and Ohio, Southern, Seaboard, Atlantic Coast Line, and possibly the Chesapeake and Ohio. Of course, the roads owning this stock will be expected to use this line whenever practicable.

Big improvements are being and have been made on the R., F. & P., such as new switch towers, signals, side tracks, etc. The motive power, consisting almost entirely of new up-to-date "Mogul" and "ten-wheel" locomotives, is being increased, showing that a great increase of business is expected in the near future.

Engines of new and heavier types have been bought so rapidly by this road that no less than two turn-tables have been discarded because they were too small and too light.

A bridge is to span the tracks of the Seaboard at Lombardy Street, thereby safe-guarding the public and obviating the necessity of trains reducing speed when passing this point. The railroads and city should get together and provide an overhead crossing at St. James, Second, and, if possible, Seventh Streets.

TURNER.

July 15, 1901.

Improvement.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Every one is, or seems to be, interested in the Constitutional Convention. The principal thought of the members is how to eliminate the vote of the negro without insulting the Constitution of the United States.

The secondary thought is about the result of the education given the negro. Not being a politician, I will not say anything regarding the suffrage question, but every member should vote for the purification of elections.

As to the improvement made by the negro, compare the condition of the negro thirty-six years ago to his condition at this present time; instead of eighty-five per cent. of them being ignorant, as it was then, you will find that, of all the negroes, seventy-five per cent. of them have taken advantage of the free school educational system. There are negro presidents of banks, negroes holding other offices of great prominence, and, if statistics are correct, there are negroes in every profession. It is said that there is not a line of railroad in the United States that a negro didn't help build. Education tends to elevate the human mind; ignorance degrades a being.

Give the negro more education, help him to make of himself a man in the noblest sense of the word. Remember that, though the negro is down-trodden and has not the rights of a citizen, there are among the colored race as noble men and women as can be found south of the invisible north pole.

Do not blame all of them for the actions of about one-fifth. I read with interest the article in your paper, of some days ago, commenting on the commencement exercises of the Richmond (colored) High and Normal Schools, which, as the writer said, reflected credit on the teachers, pupils and the race. By noting the ages of the graduates, you will find that two-thirds of them are not eighteen years of age; most of them are either sixteen or seventeen. This shows that the negroes, who had not the advantages of educational training, are taking care that their children shall receive an education, and consequently are sending them to school when they are quite young.

It is the duty of the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak. No true born Virginian would seek to oppress his fallen brother.

R. O. M.

Richmond, Va., July 11, 1901.

Constitutional Reforms.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—That was a wise admonition which the distinguished and sagacious John Randolph of Roanoke, in his mourning gown for the old Constitution, gave to the convention of '29-'30, when he said "all changes is not reform."

It would be hard to find any State paper so free from objection of any kind as the original Virginia Bill of Rights. An eminent Virginian has said of it, that as it originally was, it was well nigh perfection. It seems to have had almost the touch of divinity and of perpetuity also, for its noblest principles, so beautifully and forcefully expressed, have, in all material respects, withstood the shock of wars, both foreign and domestic, and of panics and of politics for 125 years. I believe it had, until the Underwood Convention, undergone no changes save that the convention of '51, inserted after the word "jury" in the 10th and 13th sections as now numbered, the words of "twelve men," and that the word "ancient," before "trial by jury," was stricken out. The Underwood Convention, however, did the one wise thing, of omitting the words "of twelve men," so as to about restore these sections in their original integrity. Then what necessity is there in view of the provisions of the United States Court for the 2d and 3d sections, or for the 19th, 20th, and 21st? And what is the objection to restoring the word "frugality," after "temperance," in the 17th section? It is not to be wondered at that the Underwood Convention objected to this word "frugality." Do the words added by the Underwood people to the 14th section materially affect its meaning? They may, to some small extent, but they are not objectionable, it is presumed, to anyone. With the changes suggested, we should have about our old Bill of Rights, with which I would hesitate to tamper for its sanctity and its tested adaptedness to the varying conditions of the Commonwealth through so long a period of its existence.

I observe the resolution of Richmond's broad-minded young statesman of exalted character, the Hon. John Garland Pollard, for the elimination of the word "Christian" from the Bill of Rights, in section eighteen. Now, I suppose this is suggested by an earnest desire that there should be a complete separation of church and State in our Constitution. If I could perceive that the word "Christian," as there employed, tended in the smallest degree in the opposite direction, or that it had any reference whatever to any religious faith or creed as contradistinguished from any other, I would say with all my heart, let it go; but it has no such significance. The language of the section is "that it is the mutual forbearance," etc. Surely no one would contend that as here used the word sets up any opposition between the faith of the Jew and of the Christian, or justifies the thought for one moment that it is a word of discriminating as between any differing faiths. It may be used with equal propriety by the Jew as by the Christian. It is simply an adjective, employed to qualify or characterize the forbearance intended as Christ-like, or, in other words, as in conformity with the "precepts and examples" of Christ. In our efforts to be careful in matters of this kind, let us be sure that we keep within the limitations of reason. Let us not run into extremes.

From the tone of the various resolutions offered in the convention, it is obvious that important changes will be made in our judiciary. I regret to see that the plans of some involve the abolition of our County Courts. I am satisfied that this would be a mistake, would be very objectionable to our people, and would, for many reasons, be unwise. The monthly assemblage of our people at their courthouses, from the early times, has become an established observance. I may say an institution in our State. Who can estimate the good that results from the people occasionally coming together and engaging in free and unreserved interchanges of thought and feeling upon social, economic and industrial questions and enterprises? Are not new hopes animated, new methods evolved and new ambitions excited thereby in every direction and in every pursuit of life? No, I would not abolish the County Court, but I would not have nearly one hundred judges to do what could be done better and with far less expense by twenty-five. At present the county judges get, on an average, say $300 per year. When the reduced amount of court business is considered, it is perfectly manifest that one could do the business of four counties and still have a considerable margin of time to devote to other things. Such a judge, well qualified for the duties of the office, if allowed to practice in courts other than his own, might be had, in the prevailing depression in the law practice, at a salary of say $800 per year. This would be a saving of $100 to a county, as compared with the present rates, or in the hundred counties of the State $10,000 per year. This is only proximately correct, as some of the smaller counties are at present thrown into districts, with but one judge. If this plan were adopted there would not only be a large saving of expense, but it would obviously result, not in an impairment, but in an improvement of the public service. The judges would be better lawyers, their salaries affording principal revenues, the duties of their offices would receive their principal attention, and they would thus become better and better qualified for their creditable discharge. Then, with such judges to look after the municipal affairs of the counties, and with plenty of time to do it, what necessity would there be for boards of supervisors? The judges could attend to everything that the supervisors now attend to, and, if proper men, they would do it better. The board of supervisors is an innovation upon our system, introduced by the Underwood Convention in an overweening desire to multiply offices and thus to enhance the chances of the adoption of their Constitution. If this office were dispersed with, by the best calculation I have been able to make, it would result in an additional saving of at least $15,000 more. This is $25,000 per year.

Then, Mr. Editor, we have too many elections. I am glad to see that the convention appears to be impressed with this evil. Who can tell the mischief and the strifes that popular elections engender and foment? The public mind is brought to a state of irritation and turmoil as unfriendly as it can be to the peace of communities and the industrial occupations of our people. The exacerbations of heated campaigns are kept alive, old friendships are severed, old wounds reopened from year to year! I had almost said frequent elections were an unmixed evil; but they are not without some good. Perhaps $40,000 or $50,000 could be saved the State in a year or two by a prudent reduction in the number of elections.

I am for the viva voce plan of voting. I notice, with much interest, your objections to it. Like your discussions of every subject, they are forceful, conservative and well considered. I can see many disadvantages in it, as you say, but I think, upon the whole, the preponderance of good is on the side of the viva voce plan. I would be willing to follow the lead of the distinguished Dr. McIlwaine upon this, as upon almost any question upon which he had bestowed his mature and careful thought and investigation.

A. A. GRAY.

Palmyra, July 11, 1901.

The Election of Judges by the People.

Editor of the Times:

Sir,—Experience and observation are known to be the two greatest teachers in the world. Where both unite in establishing a fact, it generally becomes an axiom. It is true that in a large majority of the States of this Union the judges are elected by the people and a very superior class of officers is the result. There are, I admit, many eminent and able judges elected by the Legislature, but, I respectfully submit, that as a class they are not equal to those elected by the people. The principle of their election by the Legislature is radically wrong, because it will inevitably result in the election of partisan judges. There appears to be no way of preventing party politics from controlling the election. The result is that one single member of the Legislature will often have the power of naming a judge. It is a power that no one man ought to have or to exercise. Human nature among legislators is the same as among the people; the motives are the same; the field being smaller and more concentrated gives them greater power of harm and they are relieved in great part from the well-grounded fear of the discussion and criticism of their action with which a candidate before the people must always contend. This is a most important consideration. For the purpose of carrying out some particular object legislators will trade and swap votes, each member feeling that he is justified in so doing by satisfying his own constituents.

That this is often done, no intelligent man will deny. Indeed, it has become so common that it hardly excites any comment.

Having been a member of the Legislature of Virginia, I know this statement to be true. It has actually gone so far in Virginia that the county judges at the last election were, nearly all, named in advance by the representatives from the different counties, and there was no opposition to their edicts, except in a very few instances.

The action of the Legislature was almost purely nominal. It merely registered and put in force the edict of the representative. And the same general principle was measurably true as to the election of all other judges. It is worse in Virginia and perhaps in some southern States than elsewhere, because of the great predominance of one political party over the other.

Now, how different is an election of judges by the people! There every tub must stand upon its own bottom; every candidate has to receive the raking fire of all his critics and enemies; it is an ordeal which he cannot escape; his entire life, both public and private, is scrutinized and criticized with watchful care, and if there is anything radically wrong in his record he will probably never be elected. The lawyers know the supreme and commanding importance of electing good judges. As a class, they have tremendous power, which they may be relied on to exercise to the utmost for the public good in these elections, and the people also know the great importance of electing able, honorable and impartial judges, and past experience shows that they have exercised this power with great care.

Take the State of Virginia, for an example: Prior to the war between the States of this Union the late William Leigh was a candidate for the office of circuit judge before the people. He was known to be a gentleman of superb legal ability, able, honorable and impartial, but he was crabbed in a high degree and not popular. He was opposed by a gentleman of high character, who was very popular, but was not equal in his qualifications as a lawyer to his opponent, though in every was qualified to fill the position. What was the result? William Leigh was elected by a large majority, and made, perhaps, the very ablest judge who ever adorned the Virginia Bench.

He has indelibly impressed his memory upon the system of Virginia jurisprudence. At the same election, the Nestor of the Virginia bar, the late William J. Robertson, was elected by the people to the bench of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. His name has long since been enrolled in the temple of fame. His decisions are beacon lights for the guidance of all English-speaking lawyers.

The people elected the late Hunter H. Marshall, an eminent judge, as a successor to the late William Leigh. These are facts which cannot be controverted or denied. Experience in Virginia thus comes to our aid and incontestably proves that the people can safely be trusted to elect their own judges. It was the opinion of the late Judge E. C. Burks, one of the greatest judges who ever lived in or out of Virginia, that it was eminently proper and right that the judges should be elected by the people, and, as far as my observation goes, such is the opinion of the leading lawyers of Virginia. It must be remembered that in all human probability the present convention is likely to curtail the vote and give us a better and more select class of suffragans, with either a property or an educational qualification, to whom the election of the judges can safely be summitted. With all its advantages, our judicial system still contains many things which are blurs and blots upon its escutcheon. It is, on the whole, a splendid system, but there is necessity for reform in many branches of it. These reforms can be successfully accomplished, if the law is to be administered by the judges, who are elected by the people.

CAMM PATTESON.

Buckingham county, Va., July 18, 1901.

Temperance and Crime.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Will someone ask the Prohibition (political) party convention people why it is that the report from the State penitentiary to the Consitutional Convention, as to color, sex, habit and education of the convicts in the penitentiary shows such a large majority of abstinent prisoners over those of intemperate habits? the figures as published in The Times being 3,353 abstinents and only 960 intemperate, also outnumbering the moderate drinkers therein 489. This is astonishing and startling when we take into consideration that at least 75 per cent. of the population are moderate drinkers—men who take a drink a day, or a drink a week, etc. Surely then the abstinents are those who "taste not, touch not and handle not." What is there about total abstinence to provoke crime? I am astonished at the report.

CONSERVATIVE.

Claremont, Va., July 17, 1901.

To Cut Down Expenses.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Urge the convention, through your columns, to adopt the Torrens system—to abolish the office of county superintendent of public schools or reduce his pay 75 per cent., as it is clearly an office of pay without work—give county judges four counties with one-half of the pay that the four judges now get—combining the offices of sheriff and treasurer—and let neither sheriff nor clerk of county be eligible to office after the second term.

The State and county are both heavy losers by the present hold-over system.

DAVID SLEDD.

Powhatan Courthouse.

For Religious Liberty.

Editor The Times:

Sir,—Since the endorsement by the committee of Hon. John Garland Pollard's resolution, striking out the word "Christian" from section 18 of the Bill of Rights, there has sprung up from some of our fellow-citizens a decided opposition to the passage of this resolution by the convention. In order to make it plain to such why the resolution should go through, some reasons are given below, which, as being consistent with the principles of religious liberty, are incontrovertible.

Our government is supposed to recognize and guarantee the separation of Church and State; that the State is separated from all churches; that no church receives a preference from the State. When one church receives a preference from the State the State has recognized one church above another and has opened the road to religious despotism. Many of our friends can see no harm in some churches being joined to the State, but do they consider it safe to establish a precedent that may be used by religions which cannot be trusted? The history of the world teaches that it is unsafe to establish fundamental laws giving power to the dominant religion. Let our organic laws be so plain that they cannot be construed by any court in favor of any religion; let our laws be so made that the minds of the people may be so trained into the paths of religious freedom that no fanatical tyrant will ever attempt in this country to oppress the people with the claim that he is doing God's work.

Our State Constitution, in declaring in no uncertain words in favor of separation of Church and State, will be consistent with the National Constitution, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." If this law is to be construed to regulate the laws of the States, then Virginia must "make no law respecting the establishment of religion." Whether the word Christian in the Bill of Rights is used advisedly or legally, it would be sufficient for any court or legislature to declare in favor of any religion that assumed the name of Christian.

What is this document, the Bill of Rights? Is it an instrument giving special privileges to a class? But is it not a declaration that applies to all alike? To be such it should declare for the inherent, God-given rights of every one. Let it be a declaration of the rights of all; let it be consistent with the Golden Rule; let the sanctity of the human will be inviolate, and not violate the Christian tenet—"Whosoever will let him come."

Look at the incompatibility of the retention of "Christian" in the Bill of Rights. It causes one clause to contradict another in the same paragraph. In this section it says that "all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience." This is a charter of human rights, against which nothing should ever be allowed to oppose. It had not its origin in the brain of man, but it was dictated from the depths of the human soul. This declaration says: "All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion," etc. That includes the adherent of every religion in the State of Virginia. Now see how the following clause agrees with the one quoted: "And that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity towards each other." If "all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience," why enjoin upon them the practice of Christian forbearance, etc. Is there any difference between Christian forbearance, love and charity and the forbearance, love and charity of other religions? If there is no difference between Jewish forbearance, etc., and Christian forbearance, etc., why give one a standing above the other? If there is a difference between Christian forbearance, etc., and Jewish forbearance, etc., then the enjoining upon the Jew the practice of Christian forbearance is depriving him of his right to the "free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience." The Jew's conscience teaches him to practice Jewish forbearance, love and charity.

That the people of other religions receive injunctions for the practice of love and virtue, the following quotations from Mohammed and Buddha will show: Mohammed said:

"Every good act is charity. An exortation to your fellowmen to do virtuous deeds is equal to almsgiving."

"A man's true wealth hereafter is the good he does in this world to his fellowmen. When he dies people ask what property has he left? But the angels ask him: 'What good deeds hast thou sent before thee?'"

"Fidelity is the beacon which lights the way to heaven."

"Learning is of no value without work; precept of no avail without practice."

"Good deeds are the steps which take you to God."

"Love is the abnegation of self for another; divine love is the complete self-absorption in the service of God's creatures."

500 B. C. Buddha taught:

"Blessed is he who does no harm to his fellow-beings."

"Blessed is he who overcomes sin and is free from passion."

"To the highest bliss has he attained who has conquered all selfishness and vanity."

"Let a man overcome anger by love; let him overcome evil by good."

"Invent not evil reports, neither do ye repeat them. Carp not, but look for the good sides of your fellow-beings."

"Waste not the time with gossip, but speak to the purpose or keep silence."

"Covet not, nor envy, but rejoice at the fortunes of other people."

"Cleanse your heart of malice and cherish no hatred, not even against your enemies."

"The evil-doer suffers in this world, and he suffers in the next."

"Hatred cleanses by love."

"It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Yours for religious liberty for all,

KENT E. PEERY.

Longwood, Va., July 16, 1901.

No Comparison.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Some time ago a friend was discussing the merits of Cecil Rhodes and comparing him to Warren Hastings. I could not see any analogy in the careers of the two men. I thought the resemblance entirely fanciful, and in some respects odious and even slanderous to the memory of Hastings. There is no question about Rhodes being a very intelligent man and possessing great business capacity, since he is now rated as a millionaire. But it detracts even from the merits of his business success when we know that the English Government has been immediately at his back in all his efforts and transactions. So far, Cecil Rhodes has only shown himself to be a successful business agent and daring adventurer, backed by all the capital (treasure and men) of a once strong, rich nation. If England, with her 300,000 men should finally succeed in subduing the 30,000 Boers who have already destroyed all England's military prestige, then the reputation of Cecil Rhodes will be greatly enhanced and he may develop into something of a statesman and ruler.

The mental, the intellectual resemblance, and the administrative abilities of Cecil Rhodes and Warren Hastings are as different and in as great a contrast as their respective personal and physical appearance, the one being a stout, heavy-set man, with an ordinary face of fairly regular features, which are generally in repose, and as expressionless as any thinking man could possess; in fact, the general physique of this much-advertised person never attracts the special attention of strangers. The other was a man of small stature, with a neat, trim figure, intelligent features, penetrating dark eyes; a person of distinguished appearance, with the bearing of a ruler and leader of men; one could easily recognize the fearless man of great force and character. I am not a champion of Warren Hastings and all his questionable resources, neither am I unreasonably prejudiced against Cecil Rhodes and his various methods of business and State. I have always thought Hastings adopted extreme measures when he persuaded Asaf ud Dowlah Vizer of Oude to assist in robbing his mother and grandmother, the Begums of Oude. Twentieth century civilization forces me to this conclusion, all regardless of the ethics of the eighteenth century. If one is disposed to take high moral ground where there was plenty of ground and little morals, it was surely bad enough to rob the mother, and certainly worse to despoil the decrepid, wrinkled old grandmother, who may have been peacefully enjoying the sunset hours of a turbulent life. This was only one of the many bad, high-handed acts imputed to Hastings, which he continued in the Rohilla War. He doubtlessly thought the end (England's glory, conquests, etc.) fully justified the means. As a matter of fact and history, Lord Clive, his eminent predecessor, was a good and most successful soldier, but greatly inferior to Hastings in ability as a ruler, or as a man of great resources; Hastings was undeniably a great and wise ruler, a most ready manipulator of all the means at hand in furthering his objects, in advancing desired results. It is now an assured fact that he accomplished a great work in placing the British Empire in India, upon a secure and permanent basis. I think, after all, it was only right and just enough that his eight-years' trial resulted in his acquittal, and it is true his country acted very handsomely, very generously, toward him in the declining years of his most eventful life. Now, after the lapse of more than a hundred years, we must admit in the light of facts and history that Warren Hastings was a much greater man and wiser ruler than either Cecil Rhodes or his tricky colleague, the wily secretary of monocular vision. I must insist that between the two men and their careers there is no comparison.

C. A. R.

Richmond, Va., July 19, 1901.

Elimination of Christian.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—Your editorial of yesterday, regarding the elimination of the word "Christian" from the Bill of Rights, indicates the only excuse that may be offered for refusing to expunge from that article any expression which may be construed as a recognition of any form of religion. The fact that the overwhelming majority of our citizenship professes or inclines to the Christian religion is no reason at all for the State to become the patron of the particular system. The only consistent prerogative of the State, in the premises, is to exercise an impartial protectorate over all systems, to the end that every man may worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. If there was only one man in the Commonwealth affected by the recognition of a particular faith, the State's obligation to that man would not be discharged. To use the plea of "the majority," or "public sentiment," is only to contend that "might makes right," the gradual result of which is that the churches lose their power as spiritual institutions, while the State, stultified by formal and false pretensions of faith, weakens its capacity for the maintenance of public morals and civic righteousness.

Furthermore, it is a confession of weakness to appeal to popular reverence for the framers of this ancient document as a reason for inaction now, and to "play to the galleries" by confounding this proposition with the idea of this being a Christian nation (as if the changing this word would change the character of the State), is sentimentalism run in the ground.

Your contention, however, is that in this case the word "Christian" is used in abstract sense (as when we speak of "Spartan valor"). If this be true, why should any objection be offered to its elimination? If it be merely a figure, why not use some other adjective? The opposition to the proposed measure demurs, however, from your explanation and discloses the fact that there is a distinctly religious feature to the word in question. The fact that there is such opposition is all-sufficient reason for its elimination. Certainly those having other faiths will not be bound by this declaration, which simply means that the State, while disagreeing with them, will tolerate them, and religious tolerance is the first step towards religious intolerance. When the question of the appointment of a chaplain for the State penitentiary arose some months ago, the same plea was then made for the adoption of that measure as is now offered for the defeat of this.

Christianity has nothing to gain by any religio-State alliances, and governmental recognition needs but to be strengthened for this to be the ultimate result.

I agree with you that if this question had not been raised the character of the expression is such that no special significance would have been attached to it, but the nature of the opposition that has developed is such as to justify the wisdom of Mr. Pollard in bringing the matter to the attention of the convention and of the people.

LUTHER RICE CHRISTIE.

Windsor, Va., July 19, 1901.

Suggestions to the Convention.

Editor of The Times:

Sir,—The convention now assembled in Richmond is universally conceded to be a body of men of whom Virginia may well be proud. And when their work is accomplished it is to be hoped that this feeling of pride will be stronger still, and that their names may be handed down to posterity along with those of other immortals whose names are linked with that of duty well performed for State or country. To become immortal, however, their works must deserve immortality. By far the most important topic calling for a display of statesmanship is the suffrage question. On this it is to be hoped that they will rise to a higher plane than simply to regard themselves as sent to "disfranchise the nigger." No one is more proud than the writer of his Anglo-Saxon lineage. No one glories more in the achievements of that race in the century just closed, nor entertains greater expectations of what it will attain to in that just commenced. Its destined predominance in the world is his firmest conviction. But feeling thus, persuades him that the cry of "nigger equality," "nigger domination," are but empty bugaboos. Ethnologically considered, the Hindoo ranks much above the negro. The Hindoos in India in population are to the Englishmen in the proportion of 500 to one, and to the population of the British Isles as seven to one. But that one five-hundredth rules the land! What prospect then is there for the negro to assist himself as a separate entity against or on an equality with the all-conquering Anglo-Saxon in a land, too, where he is in a minority? But the immense superiority of the white, both in natural endowment and in acquired position, makes it all the more the object of the highest statesmanship to give the negro fair play. Granted that his general enfranchisement was a great mistake, and that it devolves on this convention to remedy, as far as possible, the bad effects of that measure. But to descend from generals to particulars, the negro has been given the franchise, and with all our pride and partiality of race, any of us will admit that some negroes are the superiors, better citizens, and in every way more entitled to the franchise than some white men of our acquaintance. Do not, then, close the door to merit, nor be too afraid to close it to some extent to demerit! The white man certainly does not require to have the negro handicapped in the race.

To our convention, then, I would suggest for the suffrage:

1. Make payment of poll-tax at least a sine qua non.

2. Establish an alternative property or educational qualification high enough to make the suffrage something of a distinction, but within easy reach of any worthy aspirant, not merely something for which the only requisites are twenty-one years of age and a white skin.

3. Admit to suffrage all who have fought for country or State, but let their sons and their grandsons stand on their own merits.

Having drawn the line, if the worthy negro reaches it, let him enjoy the privileges his merits have gained. To any white man who falls short, if he be worthy, it will be an incentive to acquire the necessary qualifications; if not, he is not deserving.

As for the grandfather clause, such subterfuges are wholly unworthy of serious statesmen. They would seem to find a fitting place in "Pinafore." "So say his sisters and his cousins and his aunts," but the practical statesman who aspires to a place among the immortals had better give them a wide berth. Away with such absurdities!

As the convention is nine-tenths Democratic, the Democracy will have to shoulder the praise or blame that attaches to its completed work.

Shall it be said of that party which claims to be par excellence the party of the Constitution that it sent a convention of its most select members to Richmond, with the avowed object of "beating" the Constitution, and that they accomplished their purpose by such an un-Democratic, un-American proceeding as the establishment of a party of hereditary privilege? WALTER J. BRODIE.

Viola, Va., July 18, 1901.

WHY PAY MORE? WE SAVE YOU 25 PER CENT., GUARANTEE QUALITY, QUANTITY AND PROMPT DELIVERY.

S. ULLMANS' SON.

Arbuckle's or Lion Coffee ..... 11c lb
Small Smithfield Hams ..... 13c. lb
Best Granulated Sugar ..... 5¼c. lb
Pure Lard ..... 7½c. lb
Light Brown Sugar ..... 4½c lb
Bartlett Pears, large cans, 7c, or 4 for 25c
2 Pounds Best Cream Cheese for 25c
Congress Hall, Best Rye Whiskey, 75c bot
Quart Jars of Sweet Pickles 10c
Potted Ham and Tongue 4c
Snowflake Flour, $4.00 bbl. or, bag 25c
Extra Large Bar of Soap 2c
Mountain Roll Butter 15c
Large Bottles Root Beer 5c
Best City Meal 16c. per peck or 63c per bus.
Best Quality Oil Sardines 4c
Extra Large Potatoes, per peck 20c
Large Three String Broom 14c
Liberty Laundry Soap, 10 large bars for 25c
New Prunes ..... 4c lb
We are selling a regular 60c Tea for 40c. Try it.
Three Boxes Washing Powder for 5c
Large Bars Jefferson Soap ..... 13 for 25c
Large Bottles, 10c size, Tomato Catsup 5c
Large Cans Grated Pineapple 9c
Celuloid Starch ..... 4c pkg
Cuticura Toilet Soap ..... 25c doz
New Roe Herrings ..... 15c doz
Pure Blackberry Wine, per quart 10c
Fresh Bologna Sausage extra quality ..... 7c lb
Large Cans Boston Beans 9c
New Corn Starch, pound papers 4c
Plum, Peach, Grape, Tornado Plug Tobacco 8c
10 Bars Octagon Shape Soap for 25c
7 pounds Large Lump Starch for 25c
Quart Mason Jars ..... 55c doz
Large Bottles of Household Ammonia 5c
Coarse Meal, for feeding ..... 55 bus
Small California Hams ..... 9c. lb
3 Cakes Goose Floating Soap, for Toilet Use 5c
Good Hay ..... 85c hundred
Duffey's Malt Whiskey 85c
Sweet Mixed Pickles, per quart 10c
Try Our Silver King Flour ..... $4.20 or 27c bag
Try Our Jefferson Flour ..... $4.60 or 30c bag
Try Our 40c Mixed Tea—it's fine.
Extra Fine Tea Dust, per lb 25c
Good Mixed Tea ..... 25c lb
Good Green or Mixed Tea, per pound 30c
Large 4-String Broom 18c
½-gal Mason's Fruit Jars ..... 75c doz
Good Salt Pork, per pound 7½c
Fresh Soda Crackers and Ginger Snaps ..... 4c. lb

TWENTY DELIVERY WAGONS. SEVENTY-FIVE SALESMEN
EVERYTHING GUARANTEED.
COOL STORES. TWENTY ELECTRIC FANS.

S. ULLMANS' SON,

DOWN TOWN STORES, 1820-1822 E. Main. Old 'Phone 316. New 'Phone 509.
UP TOWN STORES, 506 E. Marshall. Old and New 'Phone 34.
MANCHESTER STORE, 1212-1214 Hull Street, Old 'Phone 1342.
New Price List Mailed on Application.

Let's Go to Kaufmann's.

You can get just what you want for the children in those nobby Blouse Wash Suits at the reduced price.

STRIKES! STRIKES ARE IN ORDER and we don't blame you for striking or kicking when you are offered a small bottle of pain cure for twenty-five cents when you can buy a large bottle of Dr. David's Pain Cure for 25 cents anywhere. It cures Cramps, Colic, Cholera-Morbus, Diarrhoea, Flux, Summer Complaint and Loose Bowels. It is fine for All Pains, Toothache, Earache, Backache, and Headache. Remember to get Dr. David's Pain Cure and take nothing else.

OWENS & MINOR DRUG CO.

ONLY $40 TO THE EXPOSITION AND NIAGARA FALLS.

Mrs. Anna F. Rahm and Miss Bettie Ellyson on August 20th, will run one of their excursions to Buffalo and Niagara Falls, for the benefit of the Retreat for the Sick. The cost of $40 includes all railroad fare, hotel bills and entrance to the Exposition; also three days at Buffalo and two days at Niagara.

CASTORIA.

Bears the Signature of Chas. H. Fletcher. The Kind You Have Always Bought

Wanted, every wage-earner buying meat, to send 5c (stamps) for booklet to raise Belgian Hares; no trouble. Royal Red Belgian Hare Co., Battle Creek, Mich.