THE HOUSTON DAILY POST.

BY THE

Houston Printing Company.

P. M. JOHNSTON, - - - - - - - - - PRESIDENT.
G. J. PALMER, - - - - - - - - VICE-PRESIDENT.

THE DAILY POST, 70 Columns. || THE SUNDAY POST, 168 to 224 Cols.
SEMI-WEEKLY POST, 112 Cols. per Week.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION,
1001, 1103, 1105, 1107, 1109 Franklin Avenue.

ENTERED AT THE POSTOFFICE AT HOUSTON, TEXAS, AS SECOND CLASS MATTER.

Subscription by Mail—in advance, Daily and Sunday Post, one year, $10.00; six months, $5.00; three months, $2.50; one month, $1.00.

THE SUNDAY POST, one year, $1.50.

THE SEMI-WEEKLY POST (Mondays and Thursdays) one year, $1.00; six months, 50 cents; three months, 25 cents.

Foreign Offices—Eastern business office 48 Tribune building, New York (The S. C. Beckwith Special Agency); Western 469 (The Rookery) Chicago, (The S. C. Beckwith Special Agency).

Traveling Agents—C. S. E. Holland, Traveling Auditor; E. R. Holland, R. B. Throop, Traveling Agents.

Telephone Numbers: | Editorial 497 | Business 176

The City.—The Post is delivered to any part of the city by carriers, per month, $1.00; three months $3.00; six months, $6.00; one year, $12.00. Mr. Theodore Bering has charge of the city circulation and collecting. Messrs. Theodore Bering, Chas. Lott and Burt Hull are the authorized collectors of all city bills (both advertising and subscription) and no money should be paid to any one other than those named, unless special written authority signed by the business manager is shown. All accounts of any size should be paid by check in favor of The Houston Printing Company.

Subscribers failing to receive The Post regularly will please notify the office promptly. Every paper is expected to be delivered not later than 6:30 o'clock a. m.

Under no circumstances will orders given by employes on the office be recognized and paid, or accepted in payment of accounts.

HOUSTON, SUNDAY, SEPT. 9, 1900.

24 PAGES TODAY.

THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST.

St. Louis is still finding that it is the unprotected citizens who have as great cause as the more immediate parties to the quarrel, to dread disputes between the employer and the employed in the realm of public utilities. Just recently it has been a cessation of street sprinkling that has annoyed the public because of a disagreement between a contractor and his drivers.

The grievance in this case is not a very heavy one, but it serves to again emphasize the "helplessness of the city," as the Post-Dispatch says, "when public business is transacted by private persons for private profit."

It is not always feasible to have the public utilities handled by the municipality, and many of our metropolitan facilities and comforts must come through private agencies. But it ought never to be possible for quarrels within the private company to deprive the public of needed service. Such conditions as are a deprivation to the public in the matter of public service can only come from neglect of the public interests in the original granting of franchises or making of contracts.

When the big street car strike was inconveniencing the people and creating riot and largely paralyzing business in St. Louis, The Post, more than once, suggested that such experiences emphasized the need and the propriety of a compulsory arbitration law with a compulsory receivership, or immediate court control and performance of the public service, whatever it might be, pending the arbitration. By such legislation or regulation not only would the property involved be protected during a strike and labor also continued in employment under a disinterested management, but the convenience and interests of the public would be subserved.

The Post does not lay this down as the specific remedy, but gives it merely as a general suggestion of the lines on which the State might and should deal with this very important subject.

These suggestions, or others in the same direction, become pertinent issues of the hour in Texas, not only because the public should be safeguarded in the premises, but also because the State democracy has declared in favor of a State board of arbitration or conciliation "with power to settle" disputes between capital and labor. As Texas was the first State to adopt a railroad commission law "with plenary powers," may we not hope that our legislature can likewise blaze the path to effective control of labor disputes—just alike to all parties concerned, including the public?

ENGLISH SPINNERS NEED COTTON.

Those English spinners who met and resolved not to buy American cotton during the month of September are what Artemus Ward once designated as "amoosin' cusses."

They evidently imagined that their action would cause consternation throughout this country and result in the price of cotton being considerably reduced.

How any set of business men who have examined into the situation could reach such an agreement as that stated, or hope to profit thereby, is one of the mysteries of the cotton trade.

There are today 510,000 bales of American cotton visible in the world. The amount taken by the trade last season was 11,022,000 bales. There will be needed for the remainder of this season, therefore, 10,500,000 bales to supply the world's demand.

Think of such a condition and then ponder over the action of these spinners who are mad and disappointed because they are forced to pay 10 cents for American cotton. They are the same men who two years ago refused to pay more than 5 cents for Texas cotton, and who one year ago declared that 6 cents was too much for the staple. Because, forsooth, nature gave America bountiful crops and a supply of cotton slightly in excess of the world's immediate requirements these manufacturers two years ago named a price for the South's product that meant debt and poverty for thousands of farmers. Now, when for two seasons the yield has been greatly curtailed, and cotton is in smaller supply than any other great product in such universal demand, they propose to dictate the price again.

These are the men who twelve months ago declared that Neill knew all about it, that American farmers were all liars, and that cotton would be in plentiful supply.

Those Manchester and Lancashire manufacturers belong to that stubborn English crowd that refused to buy cotton all last season except when they were forced to, who kept predicting lower prices and who paid more and more for their purchases each month, finally ending the season with their warehouses bare of the staple needed to keep their mills running.

And now these great commercial rulers, sorely disappointed because another crop is below their expectations, cry out that there is a conspiracy in America to keep down the acreage, and that they will not pay the exorbitant prices charged, but will close their mills first.

Can such men imagine that their pronunciamento will frighten those who have cotton for sale? Don't they know that Liverpool speculators will buy every bale America can ship there this month? Do they really fail to realize that no matter how great the effort it will be barely possible for this country to supply cotton as fast as it is needed for the next thirty days?

The Lancashire district is not the only manufacturing point that is bare of cotton. The supply is short the world over, and what the final outcome will be is yet for Nature to decide. The cotton that Lancashire needs, the cotton that spinners everywhere are clamoring for, has not yet been picked, and may never be taken from the fields. The season has barely begun and several disasters might occur in the next two months that would destroy what even now promises to be only an average crop.

The only thing known at this time is that the American cotton crop will not be of sufficient size to give the world a comfortable supply. It may turn out so far below the trade's need as to bring about a veritable cotton famine before another season begins. Instead of falling 1 or 2 cents a pound as those English spinners expect, the price may advance that much.

MORE TALK ABOUT "GREATNESS."

The last issue of the Texas Farmer comments, with its usual severity and extravagance, on editorials of The Houston Post relating to the late Collis P. Huntington, and declares, among other things, that The Post indulged in "fulsome adulation" of the big railroad magnate and neglected to point out his moral weaknesses and character deficiencies.

This comment by the Farmer is a studied effort to misrepresent The Post and manufacture a little cheap prejudice. We say "studied," because The Post has not indulged in any "fulsome adulation" of Mr. Huntington, and the Farmer knows it, for it rarely fails to look over the editorial page of The Post.

It will be remembered that when Mr. Huntington died The Post argued that his great success indicated the possession of "many of the elements of greatness." The position was taken that while the world did not accord greatness to a "mere money-maker," and very properly refused so to do, Huntington's success had been accomplished in a manner to make him an exception to the rule; that he was a constructor, an inventor, a projector and founder of great enterprises, and not a mere stock gambler or railroad wrecker. To conceive and carry to successful fruition the building of a vast transcontinental railway, at the time it was projected, and over the natural obstacles and the then financial impediments in the way, was the work of a great constructive and executive intellect. Such achievements constituted another of the many examples of the acquisition of power and wealth and position by a poor American boy that might well encourage the youth of the land to hope for equal material success, however lowly the beginnings.

That was all The Post said. Anything inaccurate or fulsome about that? The moral character of the man who had just died was not discussed. No reference was made to other than his material accomplishment. No claim of true or moral greatness was made for Mr. Huntington. Nor is The Post in the habit of raking over the private character of the dead to find occasions for arousing popular prejudice or easing a diseased liver or a swollen spleen. We are accustomed to burying a man's faults with him, and whether Huntington was a good or a bad man, now that he is dead, we will leave to the ghoulish researches of the Farmer. But possibly it may facilitate matters to quote the salient portion of the Farmer's article. It says:

> To say a moneymaker is a truly great man, merely because he does make money, is not provable and will be indorsed only by sheedyites. To say Mr. Huntington was great merely because development and progress of a sort were incidental to his fortune-hunting, is illegical. No one can deny that Mr. Huntington possessed a great mind. But true greatness does not consist alone in great mentality. Paradoxical as it may seem, the greatest mentality may be the possession of the smallest of men from the standpoint of true greatness. The greater the mind the smaller the man if he be a political, social or moral prostitute. In discussing men like Mr. Huntington, dead or alive, a newspaper is itself a traitor to the public if it ignores their moral status, their motives, their real history. It is shameful that a great newspaper should hold up the life of a man like Mr. Huntington as a worthy example for the youth of the land. Such newspapers join the great army of sycophants who make of history and tombstones the two champion falsifiers of the world.

The Farmer admits all that The Post ever claimed, "that Mr. Huntington possessed a great mind." The animus of its references to The Post, therefore, in the further argument, which it addresses to an imagined position of The Post, is painfully apparent. Possibly it is the beastly weather that is at the bottom of the comment, or possibly it is merely a desire to jump viciously on a dead man for claptrap popular effect.

As a matter of fact, "true greatness" is rare. The most of it, in The Post's opinion, dies in the obscure walks of life. Mr. Huntington had simply a portion of that greatness which "the world" calls great. History is replete with instances of brilliant mentality, coupled with low morality. In fact, the man who has been great both in his moral character and mental development is the exception to the rule. Not too multiply illustrations from ancient or foreign history, we have our own intellectual giants who were moral dwarfs. The "Godlike Webster" as he was called, was a moral pervert; Poe was a horrible example; the "gallant Harry of the West" was not a model for the American youth. Andrew Johnson disgraced the Nation when he took the oath of office as president. And yet these men are in a way, and in the material and intellectual successes achieved, repeatedly pointed to as "inspirations" for the struggling poor boy.

The Post simply recognized world standards and refrained from any philosophical inferences or elaborate moral disquisitions in its current comment on a passing event, the death of Huntington. And at last and in spite of the acrimonious references to that comment by the Farmer, it appears that the Farmer agrees in our only conclusion, that "Mr. Huntington possessed a great mind!" The Farmer's editorial is but another illustration of the vast amount of ingenuity and of the real hard labor required to create "a man of straw" and then demolish it.

The Post has received the prospectus of the new monthly to be published at Austin by Mr. Louis J. Wortham and K. Lamity Bonner and to be entitled The Current Issue. The first number will appear about October 1. In the prospectus it is said that "The Current Issue is designed to be what its name implies," a journal devoted to the questions of present interest. "If it shall be crisp, virile, instructive, up-to-date, it will have met the hope and ambition of its promoters," say these promoters. And The Post can say, if it be not all of that it will simply be because Mr. Louis Wortham and Mr. K. Lamity Bonner fail to put into its columns the ability which they possess to such a marked degree. Mr. Wortham is a most graceful and vigorous writer, broad in his view of public issues, thoroughly up in current events, as well as grounded in the higher studies, and equipped with all the weapons of intellectual disputation. Mr. Bonner is keen and incisive, possessed of a fine vein of humor, drilled in literary work and fully in touch with men and things. It would be singular, indeed, if two such gentlemen striving to conduct an independent, high class journal devoted to the purely intellectual presentation of current issues, their causes and consequences, failed to fill a long felt want in the literary field of Texas, or to achieve a most notable success. The time is ripe for such a venture, the demand for such discussion widespread, and The Post predicts, as it desires, for The Current Issue an accomplishment worthy of its design and fully commensurate with the laudable ambition of its promoters.

At any rate the returns from Arkansaw don't show an irreparable breach in the democratic party of that State.

Notwithstanding our abandonment of the Monroe doctrine lately it is thought the powers will still allow the South Americans to fight it out in their numerous little family jars. If, however, Europe should feel like returning the compliment of our intermeddling in Asia there would be some sleepless nights ahead of Uncle Sam.

When Mr. Croker collects his big election debts it is presumed the hostile press up his way will stop asking him "where he got it."

One of the silliest and most sensational republican campaign stories in the East is the report that in the event of Mr. Bryan's election Altgeld is to be appointed to the Federal supreme court. Now, candidly, isn't a crowd hard up for campaign material that will resort to such methods?

However Houston may have grown since 1896 it is just now at a point where the right kind of effort will soon make a giant of it.

We are told from Washington that our government is evidently contemplating a new move of some kind in the Chinese matter. When a man moves up a blind alley until he encounters the frowning wall, a new move would seem to be the proper thing under the circumstances.

The barbarous conduct of the powers in China ought to be enough to demonstrate to the Boxers that they are ridiculously outclassed.

Portland, Me., a kind of side port with the bleak New England fields and woods back of it, shows a greater percentage of increase of population than Galveston with fertile Texas and the great West behind it. There's a screw loose somewhere.

The English spinners appear to be mad enough to cut their noses off to spite their faces. It's just as well to find "squeezing" a mutual affair occasionally.

Another war is brewing in South America between Chili on one side and Peru and Bolivia on the other. There's no baby nation on earth that needs a good spanking as badly as Chili, but, like most saucy children, it is likely to escape it.

Mr. Bryan needs West Virginia this year and a kind Providence sent him President Rogers of the Ohio River railroad. Who says there is no divinity that shapes our ends?

The retention of the Texas quarantine against San Francisco after a recent investigation would seem to indicate that San Francisco has lately been indulging some Shanghai methods with the outside public.

The coal barons can not expect to grind down labor in seasons of poor demand and not find trouble in the day of a coal famine. The miners do not often hold a winning hand, but they know how to play one.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller continues to have alarming trouble with his digestive organs, but he has not yet reached the point where he is offering his fortune for a poor man's appetite.

On the Wane.

Chicago Chronicle.

The idea is not entirely charitable, but the proceedings at Electric park Monday afternoon really indicate that Governor Roosevelt was brought to town to act as a foil for Mr. Bryan.

Colonel Roosevelt himself would probably characterize the proceeding as "playing horse" with him. At any rate, it is quite evident that the governor was regarded with some curiosity, but with small enthusiasm. The cheers and other evidences of approval were almost entirely bestowed upon Mr. Bryan.

The Electric park episode may be taken as foreshadowing a similar falling off in the interest which will be excited by Colonel Roosevelt at other places. It is a fate which not uncommonly overtakes military heroes, who discover suddenly that the public, which once followed them around with interest, has forgotten all about them.

It may be said, too, without injustice, that Governor Roosevelt's military renown had to be spread out mighty thin in order to make it last as long as it has lasted. The hero of a single battle, in which he bore a subordinate part, he could hardly hope to pose as a modern Mars when Admiral Dewey, the hero of a really great exploit, had been relegated to comparative obscurity. It was inevitable that the end of his vogue should come sooner or later. It seems to have arrived rather sooner than was to have been expected.

We shall probably hear less of Colonel Roosevelt from this time forward. The Electric park episode presages a desirable decrease of noise and strenuosity.

NOTES AND COMMENT.

Secretary Hardy, under the advice of Attorney General Smith, and who was under the control of Congressman Bailey, issued the Waters-Pierce Oil company a charter in the face of the fact that it did not pretend to comply with the law in the asking.

This is in line with statements going the rounds of many of the State papers, and in that brief paragraph is condensed a great deal of misinformation, as well as injustice to several honorable men. The statement that Attorney General Smith "under the control of Congressman Bailey" caused to be issued a charter to the Waters-Pierce Oil company "in face of the fact that it did not pretend to comply with the law in the asking," is untrue in every essential particular. The truth about it is, the suggestion made by Mr. Bailey was not adopted nor acted upon by Mr. Smith at all. Mr. Bailey, as he has already stated, at the request of a personal friend sought to use his influence to prevent what this friend seemed to think was a political persecution in Texas. Mr. Bailey simply said to Mr. Smith that it was his judgment that if these people would pay the penalties already incurred, purge themselves of illegal appurtenances, take the oath prescribed, and comply with the law in the future they ought to be allowed to pursue their business. Mr. Smith informed Mr. Bailey that this could not be done, citing the statute and court decision. Mr. Bailey, after examining the authorities cited, said to Mr. Smith that he (Smith) was right, and there the matter ended so far as Mr. Bailey was concerned. Mr. Pierce evidently took this view of the matter, too, because he had the old company judicially ended and a new corporation formed. When this new concern applied for admission into the State Mr. Bailey was in Washington and knew nothing whatsoever about the transaction until it was over and published in the newspapers. Hence it will be seen that Mr. Bailey had no part nor parcel in the matter of readmitting the Waters-Pierce Oil company into the State, a fact that will be verified by Attorney General Smith upon application or inquiry from any source. So much for that. Now just to the contrary of the statement that the corporation "did not pretend to comply with the law in the asking," it did all that it could in that direction. It surrendered its old charter, secured a new one, came as a new corporation, took the oath prescribed by the Texas anti-trust law and obligating itself to respect and obey the law in future. In advising the secretary of state in the matter of issuing the new permit, the attorney general was guided by what he believed to be the strict letter of the law, and in his speeches both at Galveston before the bar association and at Waco before the State convention, he answered fully and in detail, with legal opinions and court decisions, every rational objection which had been raised to his judicial procedure. He did not, of course, and can not, respond to simple appeals to the prejudices of the unthinking nor to that peculiar kind of hurrah argument used by certain men and newspapers; it would be beneath his dignity to do so, but in the interpretation of the law and the presentation of the legal facts in the case no one has yet controverted his position, nor indeed, has any one even pretended to do so. This has been the contention of The Post all along—regrettable as it may be, and is, that this monopolistic corporation should hold sway in Texas, yet the fact remains that the laws of the State are general and universal in their application and must be applied, not sentimentally, but in letter and spirit to all men alike. And The Post predicts, right here and now, that when all the facts get before the people, unaccompanied by prejudice or partisan zeal and hatred, and are understood by them certain honorable men who are now misunderstood by some and viciously traduced by others, will be acquitted of all wrong by a just public sentiment. Not only this, but as sure as day follows night there is deserved rebuke in store for some men and papers who have trifled with the people in the effort to scandalize both the State and some of its most honorable and trusted agents.

+++

Winshoro, Texas, September 3, 1900.—Editor Times-Herald: Replying to your comments on my communication of August 19, I beg to state that Mr. Bailey is the nominee of the democrats of this district and as such has my unqualified support under the present conditions. I have never said that I believe him guilty of what some charge him with in the Waters-Pierce oil permit business. In fact, I believe his statement of his connection with the affair to be true. The qualifications I made in my statement of the matter applied to future developments regarding his connection with it and not to the case as it exists. As an honest man, Mr. Bailey would ask no man's vote should it develop that he was in the least culpable in this affair. In fact, he rather insisted on going to the bottom of the business at Waco. * * *

T. N. Napier.

Mr. Napier is satisfied. Mr. Napier will vote his instructions. What took place in the convention which nominated Mr. Napier bore no relation to existing facts. The whole incident seems to have been for advertising purposes only. The Times-Herald was caught along with the other newspapers that put a high value on their space. The Napier incident is closed.—Waco Times-Herald.

Mr. Napier's explanation will be amply satisfactory to every fair-minded man, of course; but he made the mistake of not calculating in advance the displeasure of the great and only party disciplinarian at Waco. Democrats have got to be careful these days.

+++

Will The Houston Post please explain why it published early in May a communication from its Austin correspondent stating that a scheme was on foot to turn Bailey down by declaring in the State democratic convention in favor of expansion?—Cameron Herald.

Because it was a fact, and, being a fact, was a legitimate item of news.

+++

The Houston Post is the corporation organ of this State, and its correspondents are corporation henchmen. The Austin correspondent of The Post made it a special point to lobby at the regular session of the Twenty-sixth legislature in favor of senate bill No. 45, which allows a railroad to tear down a man's home, to invade with its track a man's pasture or farm before the amount of damages have been agreed upon and settled. When it comes to an issue between the corporation and the citizen, place The Post against the citizen every time.—Cameron Herald.

If the correspondent of The Post lobbied for the bill referred to, or any other bill, it was and is unknown to the management of this paper. The correspondent can and no doubt will answer for himself. As to the general charge that The Post is the "corporation organ of this State," it is too puerile to require any specific denial on our part; but if the editor of the Cameron paper be honest in his statement along that line, let him inquire of the representatives of corporations in Texas. If he should decline this method, then let him make good his charge by pointing out something in the columns of The Post to justify his most uncalled for arraignment. That is the manly thing to do.

+++

Secretary of State Hardy says he means to see to it that the anti-trust laws of the State are rigidly enforced. That being the case, he should lose no time in canceling the Waters-Pierce Oil company's permit. That concern is doing business in open defiance to the laws on our statute books.—Belton Journal-Reporter.

In his speech at Waco Attorney General Smith said if any man knew or could discover that the Waters-Pierce Oil company is now doing business in defiance of the laws of Texas, and would so charge in an affidavit, that he (Smith) would prosecute the company and again drive it out of the State. Here is a chance for the Journal-Reporter.

+++

The Post is in receipt of a letter from Hon. R. W. Hudson of Pearsall, who was the author of the minority report—known as the Hogg amendments—incorporated in the democratic State platform, calling attention to an error in the platform as published in some of the State papers. Mr. Hudson says he has been away from home since the convention, which may account for his not having seen the correction already made by The Post. But in deference to Mr. Hudson's letter the correction is here made again. The minority report, as adopted, was as follows:

"Tenth—That the constitutional amendment to define and prevent insolvent corporations from doing business in this State; to prevent the use of corporate funds in politics, and to suppress the free pass system over the railways, as presented and discussed by J. S. Hogg, before the public recently, shall be submitted by the next legislature to the people for their action thereon."

It will be noted that the platform says the Hogg amendments SHALL be submitted to the people. The error in publication occurred in this way: All of the other paragraphs in the platform began with "we favor," "we demand," "we recommend," etc., while this was simply "Tenth—That;" an attache of The Post in taking the platform out of the telegraphic reports and compiling it for a subsequent issue struck out "Tenth—That" and supplied "we favor," this being done to make it conform in style with the balance of the document. Now, if he had used the words "we demand," it is altogether probable that nothing would have been said about it, while really the words "we demand" would have been just as incorrect as "we favor," especially in view of the word "shall" which follows in the clause. The truth is, a great to do has been made over a small matter, a pretended important distinction without a material difference. For the party convention to say "we favor" or "we recommend" is just as much an accepted party instruction as it would be to say "we demand." To argue otherwise, is equivalent to urging a doubt as to what the party in convention meant in certain of its expressions. So far as The Post is concerned it had no intention of weakening the expression of the clause in question, and The Post favors submission of the amendments to the people.

WELLINGTON'S SPEECH AND ITS GOOD EFFECT.

(BY JOSEPH OML.)

Washington, September 5.—(Special to the Atlanta Constitution.)—Democratic leaders are jubilant over the success of the Bryan-Wellington meeting out at Cumberland yesterday, and the administration's politicians are correspondingly downcast. In both camps it is recognized that the bold position taken by the republican senators insures Maryland to the democratic column, and the democrats—perhaps the republicans also—believe the effect of yesterday's meeting will be far-reaching.

While it has been known for some time that Senator Wellington would not support McKinley, there has been considerable doubt whether he would come out openly for Bryan, or would content himself with remaining a more or less passive spectator upon the passing political show. Now, however, that he has come out openly and has shown his determination to fight for Bryan's election to the limit of his powers, there is no question that he may prove an important factor in shaping the final result not only in his own State, but in several others.

+++

It is no secret that some democrats felt a little doubtful about the position Wellington might take, and feared that the Cumberland meeting might develop something or other not altogether favorable. While they felt certain Wellington would not repudiate himself after the manner of Old Man Hoar, they were still a bit in doubt whether he might not say something that would hurt more than it would help. It was known that republican heelers would pack the meeting and endeavor to "break Wellington up," counting on arousing that gentleman's ire to a degree that would make him reckless in his speech, and more than one democrat here was afraid the result might be disastrous.

The meeting was packed, and such efforts were made, but they failed entirely. From a democratic standpoint, the Cumberland meeting was a great success. Senator Wellington's speech was one which the republicans will not attempt to answer, and the effect of the speech will be even more far-reaching than Senator Wellington's personal influence.

+++

This, however, will not be confined to Maryland. The senator's home is at Cumberland, in the western part of that State, and just across the line from the eastern part of West Virginia. The people of this section belong, in a sense, to one community. The Maryland senator is in close touch with his neighbors in West Virginia, and the influence of his example is going to be felt there.

But Wellington is not a mere politician, and his associates are not merely political. In the first place, he is one of the most successful business men and bankers in his section. His announcement for Bryan upon the paramount issue will have effect upon those business men whom the secretary of the treasury and the republican politicians generally are trying to scare with a silver bag. If a man with Senator Wellington's business interests; a man who, being in public life, has made a study of the subject, and who ought to be better informed than those who have not been on the inside; if such a man is satisfied that McKinley, and not Bryan, represents the revolutionary side, then will many other bankers and business men hesitate to follow the politicians and the calamity howlers of whom Secretary Gage is the chief.

+++

One other important thing about Wellington and his influence—dealing with it in its general sense, and not as restricted by State lines, Senator Wellington is of German extraction, and is one of the foremost men of the German Lutheran church in this country. The German Lutherans have in the past been republicans almost to a man; when the democratic ticket has got German voters in the past, they have come from the German Catholics, not the German Protestants. The senator has not only been prominent in church affairs, but he has been brought into more than ordinary intimate contact with the individual members of the church in Maryland, and out of it, through a lecture upon "Luther and His Times"—I believe that is the title—which he has delivered in many places for the benefit of the church. However much we may deprecate bringing the church into the discussion of political questions, we can not ignore the fact that this sort of relationship—bringing a public man, as it does, into the closest touch with many people—is bound to be a prominent factor in making up the sum total of his political influence; and when Mr. Henna's supporters cry out that the defection of Senator Wellington "means only one vote," they are not blind to the facts, but are simply misrepresenting them.

+++

As to Maryland, the only question now is the size of the democratic majority. Senator Wellington's position is only one of several factors contributing to the change which has made the State safely democratic in the face of a 32,000 majority for McKinley in 1896. Since the last presidential campaign the democrats have elected their governor and a majority of the legislature, and have regained several seats in the National house. Conditions have grown steadily better. The democrats who went off to McKinley or Palmer in 1896 are almost all of them back in line; the independents who took the same track are now with Bryan, and the Baltimore Sun paper—as they call it through Maryland—is giving to democratic candidates hearty and loyal support.

+++

The former Senator Gorman, always the great individual power in the State, is taking active part in the campaign. He is the ablest politician in the democratic party, and the antipathy which was built up against him by the men who he had to disappoint, has been entirely swept away, leaving him where his power is as great as it ever was.

Every element affecting the Maryland situation is favorable to democracy. In my opinion, Bryan would have carried the State without Senator Wellington's aid. With it there can be no doubt, but as I have said, the Wellington conversion will have an effect not confined by State lines.

FOR THE EVERLASTING RIGHTS OF MAN.

(BY EDWARD M. SHEPARD.)

From the fall of 1898, when the Paris treaty first presented the new issue of imperialism, I have steadfastly, in season and out of season, and much of the time in a seemingly small minority, declared that issue to be paramount in the American politics of our time. I have urged the democratic party, overruling its own imperialistic minority, to plant itself squarely and aggressively upon this as its all dominant issue.

I clearly see how many others should differ from me. They consider our war for Philippine conquest and the proposal to hold brown and yellow men in the tropics and the Orient as subject races outside of our constitutional safeguards to be a mere incident of foreign policy, to involve no injurious violation of American principle or menace to the moral and material prosperity of our country. They consider imperialism a fanciful, not a real danger. Of course, they differ from anti-imperialists, for they can not understand their point of view. But I can not understand how any one who shares Senator Hoar's opinion—more strongly stated than I should state it—that the issue presented by the president's war of subjugation in the Philippines is more momentous than any with which our country has had to do since the landing of the Pilgrims, can fail to vote with regard to that question alone.

+++

The danger from the republican policy is enormously enhanced by the Chinese situation. There we are bound to use force for the protection of our ministers and our citizens and to inflict punishment for their injury. Our naval and military forces are rightly gathered at Tien Tsin or rightly advancing on Pekin, while they were never rightly in the Philippines outside of Manila. There is far greater temptation, far greater justification, for the annexation of rich Chinese territory in the temperate zone than for any campaign in Luzon, no less stupid and wasteful than it is wicked. It is of the first consequence to the future prosperity and righteousness of our land that the maintenance of American dignity and rights in China shall not be trusted to a president who deems it a serious maxim of his statecraft that where the American flag has been raised in any land in behalf of a cause it can not be hauled down when the cause is won.

The president has, no doubt, begun in China with virtues and conservative declarations such as were made at the beginning of our war to free Cuba. But his present declarations deserve no more credit than did his denunciation of "forcible annexation" as "criminal aggression," or his solemn assertion of our "plain duty" in Porto Rico. Our National safety requires in the White House a president who profoundly and persistently abhors the idea of forcible subjugation of foreign peoples or of government not based in the long run on the consent of the governed. I should vastly prefer a president inspired by that abhorrence, even if he were a less competent administrator than Mr. McKinley.

+++

The Kansas City convention has put great difficulties in the way of the support of its candidates by men who held opinions like mine, and who voted for McKinley in 1896. But the things in its platform to which I do not agree are not, for the present, material. It is right on the one present, practical, dominant question. When the Kansas City convention adopted a "paramount issue" it clearly permitted differences within the party on questions which were not paramount. No standard of "party regularity" now stands in the way of the support of the gold standard by democrats who believe in it, and who are now little, if any, less than a majority of the party.

In 1900 we have indeed a true battle for the precedence of the man over the dollar. When Mr. Bryan in his recent and fine appeal to the American people gives that title to the defense of democratic and industrial self government against the policy of conquest and blood, he is right, as he was not when he gave it to the battle for an inferior standard of value.

To me it is as clear as the noonday that we are now on the eve of a true battle for the everlasting rights of the masses of men—the rights for which Washington and Franklin and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Cleveland have stood. During the latter part of the Eighteenth and the whole of the Nineteenth century the supreme and generally successful struggle has been for liberty and self government, whether in America or France or Germany or Italy.

+++

The dignity of the individual man and the assertion of his political rights have been the first of political curses. Statesmen, economists, philosophers, poets, all alike have glorified freedom. And its fruits have proved their wisdom. The policy has produced in our land the most wonderful prosperity ever known, so less the greatest end best assured fortunes for the very rich than the highest standard of income and comfort for the masses of men.

The amazing productiveness of American labor, out of which come alike the millions or thousands or hundreds of dollars, is the result above all of the dignity and freedom of the American workman, his respect for the rights of others and his assertion of his own. No policy of military order or glory or conquest has ever produced or come measurably near to producing this degree of wealth and well-being. American jealousy of individual rights and dislike of standing armies has made of us no less the richest than the freest of nations. We are in November to vote whether we shall reverse this policy. The folly of such a reversal is no less plain from the standpoint of the well-to-do, to whom a broad and steady base of order and security is the first good of government, than to the millions of citizens. Any distinction between classes and masses in our land is folly indeed. All Americans have as their prime interest the preservation of our ideal of democratic self government.

+++

I am not impressed with the talk of a panic following Mr. Bryan's election. If a panic be necessary to preserve our ideal of democratic self government I should say it was a small price to pay. But there will be no panic, unless it be manufactured by the fears and outcries of those who have no faith in the American people or in American liberty.

Pulling Down the Flag.

The McKinley administration has still to explain the alienation of American territory in the Porcupine district of Alaska to the British. This is the only instance of pulling down the American flag by Americans in the annals of the Republic. It constitutes a grave offense. It is treason. Even though Secretary Hay and the president have not the power to give away American territory, their attempt to do so, under cover of a "provisional" arrangement is none the less treason. It requires an explanation and the explanation has not been furnished.

No American citizen consented to this transfer. Lord Salisbury wanted it as a sop to throw to the Canadians. Lord Salisbury's wish is McKinley's law.

JUST ABOUT TEXANS.

Beaumont Journal.

Suggestion of John H. Kirby as successor to John H. Reagan on the railroad commission is indorsed by the Victoria Times, the leading democratic daily paper of Southwest Texas. It says: "The Beaumont Journal in a strong editorial nominates John H. Kirby of Houston to succeed Judge Reagan as chairman of the State railroad commission. Judge Kirby is one of the brightest and most progressive men in Texas and would make an ideal commissioner."

Denison Herald.

Louis Wortham and J. S. (Kalamity) Bonner will begin the publication of a monthly journal in Austin next month. These two men are well known to newspaper readers in Texas, and, than the latter named gentleman, there is no more pithy or entertaining writer in Texas or the South. Whatever may be the field of the coming journal, and whatever the scope of its work, the ability of the man at the head of it assures the fullest measure of success.

Floresville Chronicle.

G. W. McKnight of the El Campo Eagle received the democratic nomination at Wrightsboro for floater and will probably land in the house. He is a man of good sense and will no doubt be a good representative.

Denison Herald.

The republicans of this section of the State are booming Cecil A. Lyon of Sherman for chairman of the republican State executive committee. Mr. Lyon is a polished gentleman, a smooth, suave politician, a credit to his party and an eminently fit man for a leader of even a forlorn hope. The republicans would honor themselves by electing him. This is spoken not in a partisan or political sense, but as one speaks of one's neighbor, when one knows his neighbor's worth and merit.

Grand Saline Sun.

Editor R. E. Yantis, formerly of the Wills Point Van Zandter, moved to Athens this week, where he goes to assume the management of the Athens Review, recently purchased by him. The Sun regrets to lose Mr. Yantis as a citizen of Van Zandt, but takes pleasure in commending him to the good people of Athens and Henderson county as a gentleman in every way worthy of their esteem. He is a progressive citizen, a wide-awake newspaper man and a writer of force and ability. In the Review he has a good piece of newspaper property, and we shall expect him to reap a pecuniary reward therefrom worthy of his efforts and one which he in every way deserves.

Fort Worth Mail-Telegram.

Editor Sam McGary of the Beaumont Journal is the only man in Texas who has not been convinced that the Twentieth century has not yet been reached. Sam is too fast for a small town like Beaumont.