

tance of the doctrine of protection will paralyze the democratic party. You can not say that Senator Culberson is an advocate of the doctrine of protection. His statement regarding his view on the duty on iron pipe will never be answered. You can not blame the man who steals \$5 and defend the man who sells his influence for \$25,000 or \$50,000." (Loud and continued applause.)

After he had finished speaking, Mr. Bryan had some difficulty in leaving the hall. The doors were blocked with people, and he barely got out in time to catch his train for north Texas.

The Houston (Texas) Chronicle on the day following the Houston speech, printed this editorial:

#### BRYAN'S HOUSTON SPEECH

The influence of William Jennings Bryan with the American people does not depend upon his powers of oratory, but upon his character. It is the man behind the speech that counts. The words and phrases that flow so readily from his lips appeal to his hearers because they come from his heart. Bryan is a great statesman, a democrat who believes in democracy with the faith and the zeal of the prophets of old. It may be that, like Moses, he will never lead his people into the Promised Land, but they can depend upon it that, under his guidance, they will never turn their faces toward the fleshpots of Egypt or any other abomination unto the Lord.

Bryan pointed out that he needed no invitation to come to Texas, and that he was coming again, and again and again. The enthusiasm of his audience showed he would always be welcome. "I have not lost any friends," he declared; "I simply brought some enemies out from under cover—that is all. I would rather have open enemies than secret ones. I have been in politics a good while and I have learned all the methods of fighting, and I would rather fight a man who comes at me face to face than to fight one who stabs me in the back at any opportunity." No Diogenes need go about with a lantern looking for the honest men to whom Bryan referred.

The speech was on the tariff. Bryan declared this to be the present paramount issue, although the central bank scheme may dwarf it in the future, and insisted that he would live to see the day when there will be no protectionist democrat in the state of Texas. That is true, and there will be none in the United States, since every protectionist democrat will have to either quit being a protectionist or quit being a democrat. A protectionist is naturally a republican.

Some of his illustrations make his points more vivid than heavy arguments. For instance, the pseudo democrats who want their share of the benefits of protection he illustrated by his horse-stealing story: "You know, my friends, when I hear a man saying that he is opposed to protection, opposed to the principle, but if we are going to have it he wants his share, it makes me think—well, I will use an illustration: Suppose you had some horse stealing in this neighborhood; finally the people were aroused about it and you had a public meeting—like this one for instance—and man after man got up and denounced horse stealing and said it was wrong and that something must be done to stop it. What would you think if one of your respectable citizens got up and said, 'I am in perfect sympathy with you; I believe horse stealing is wrong; I have no sympathy with it, and I am anxious to stop it; but I want it understood that if there is to be horse stealing I like a good saddle horse myself.'"

The accusation that he is disturbing democratic harmony he illustrated with the story of the little boy and the cat. "They say I am disturbing harmony in the democratic party. It is a mistake. I am not doing the disturbing. I heard of a little boy once whose mother heard the cat squalling, and she said: 'Johnny, stop pulling that cat's tail.' And he said: 'Ma, I am not pulling that cat's tail, I am just doing the holding; the cat's doing the pulling.'"

As to the binding effect of platforms, Bryan reiterated what he said at Dallas, that he would no more discuss the binding force of a platform with a democrat than he would discuss the Ten Commandments with a Christian.

Senator Bailey's position that his conscience, not the party platform, is binding was completely answered: "Sometimes it is said that a man ought to follow his own conscience. No man pays a higher regard to conscience than I do. I believe in that; but, my friends, I think a man's conscience ought to get to work before the election—not afterward. I do not want a man to have a conscience like a bear, that hibernates; and especially do I object to the hibernation during the campaign."

Let the officeholder who finds out that the platform is inconsistent with his conscience resign, and let no office-seeker run on any platform which he can not conscientiously and faithfully support. There is no answer to that.

For one man who is benefited by a tariff on lumber, Bryan pointed out, 100 Texans suffer; for one man who profits by a tariff on wool 1,000 Texans suffer. Nobody can make any money out of the tariff without putting his hand in some other man's pocket.

And the tariff breeds corruption in politics. Every Texan and every American citizen should heed these words of Bryan: "I have known from experience the corrupting influence of a protective tariff. As your candidate three times—not a candidate forced on you, but a candidate who you helped to nominate—as your candidate three times, I have felt the influence, the corrupting influence, of a protective tariff. There is not a campaign through which I have passed where I would not have been elected but for the corruptive influence of a protective tariff."

"I warn you against that. Fathers, are you interested in the prospect of your sons? I warn you that if protection becomes a policy of the democratic party in Texas then your lumber companies and your wool growers and your protected interests will furnish the money to nominate the man they want, and you will have here the protection that has cursed the other states of the Union."

Bryan's Houston speech was a great speech. It was a sound speech, truly democratic, an encouragement to those who have kept the faith. Among democrats Bryan is a good shepherd. He proposes to drive the goats from the sheepfold and slay the wolves.—Houston (Tex.) Chronicle.

#### CONGRESSMAN HITCHCOCK DEMANDS INVESTIGATION

In a speech delivered in the house, Congressman Hitchcock of Nebraska attacked the administration of the land office and urged the necessity of appointing a special committee to investigate what he called "the notorious land frauds of recent years." The following report of Mr. Hitchcock's speech is taken from the Associated Press:

Mr. Hitchcock expressed confidence in the charges recently made by L. R. Glavis, the discharged chief of the field division of the land office, and declared that his discharge came because of zeal in protecting the government against frauds.

"I pity the helpless subordinate," said Mr. Hitchcock, "who is forced to choose between holding his own position in silence and endangering it by open protest against frauds entrenched in power backed by influence. Hundreds of them are probably to be found in the public service today. They fear to speak or protest. Congress should protect these men; when charges are made it should investigate. The case of Glavis has been well and simply told by himself. In a magazine soon after he was discharged, he wrote a history of the case, the reading of which carries conviction. It shows that whether the land office was presided over by Ballinger, with Dennett as his assistant, or later Dennett as commissioner with Ballinger outside as attorney for the claimants, or later still, with Ballinger returned to power as secretary of the interior, it was manipulated to assist land thieves in their depredations on the valuable coal lands of Alaska."

Alaska is the treasure house of the United States, Mr. Hitchcock insisted. Already, he said, large copper deposits have been seized by the Guggenheim company, with the government hardly receiving a mess of pottage for the great heritage. Glavis risked and lost his reputation, declared the speaker, because he attempted to protect the timber and coal lands remaining. The recent controversy, said Mr. Hitchcock, had possibly revealed a condition of lawlessness and favoritism in the land office which is amazing. This revelation indicates that the real seat of the public land frauds is in the land office itself, rather than outside, he declared. The only way to reach the evil is by congressional investigation. To appropriate money for the land office to use in guarding against fraud is folly if the land office itself is in the hands of the Philistines.

"Rumors are even now current about the misuse of the \$1,000,000 appropriated last year to protect the public lands. I hear of thousands of dollars expended out of this fund for expen-

sive furniture, of salaries of favorites that have been doubled. I hear of a great increase in clerical help, of subordinates who are complacent and who 'stand in,' receiving more pay than their superiors. I speak of these only as rumors, but we have some substantial facts, some direct and specific charges, some evidence already before the country. The case of Glavis is fresh in the public mind. After seven years' faithful service in various capacities he was without a hearing summarily discharged. Had he been charged with fraud, had he been helping the land wolves in their raids, had he been guilty of neglect? Quite the contrary. He was discharged because he had shown too much zeal in protecting the government against frauds. It was the old story, a poor, loyal subordinate trying to perform his duty in an office whose head was controlled by corruption."

Mr. Hitchcock reviewed the history of the Cunningham claim as it has previously been narrated by Glavis. At the time Ballinger was commissioner, Mr. Hitchcock boldly said, he refused to recognize Glavis in his repeated efforts to present a certification of the claims on the ground that they were fraudulent, but, on the other hand, hurried their approval over the protest of Glavis and before the investigation was complete. He revoked the order only after Glavis had wired and written other protests.

Ballinger was to retire in sixty days from the land office, continued Mr. Hitchcock. He did not retire in March, 1909. A few days before retiring, however, he appeared as land commissioner before the committee on public lands and urged the passage of the Cale bill, the effect of which would be to legalize the Cunningham claims to 5,000 acres. Shortly after leaving office he appeared before his successor, Dennett, as the paid attorney representing the Cunningham claim, a direct violation of the law, which prevents a former official of the department appearing as attorney within two years. A year later Mr. Ballinger is made secretary of the interior, with full jurisdiction over the land office. Again the pressure in behalf of the Cunningham claims. The Guggenheim company has powerful friends in high places. Glavis again resisted and when overruled by the land office appealed in desperation to the department of justice. The attorney general sustained Glavis and declared the Cunningham claims fraudulent and illegal. The 5,000 acres and 90,000,000 tons of coal are saved. What happens to the faithful employe who has defied his superiors and saved the property? He is dismissed from the public service.

Mr. Hitchcock in concluding took a rap at the committee on rules which now has his resolution to investigate. Although 90 per cent of the house wanted to investigate, he said there was no way to force the committee to report, except through the speaker.

"Confidential official information and copies of secret paper were freely given to the fraudulent claimants," declared Mr. Hitchcock, as he wound up his arraignment of the land office. "The Guggenheim company appears to have had full access to everything. Can the house get the same free access for an investigation?"

#### WAITING—EVER WAITING

The New York World is responsible for the statement that Mr. Taft O. K.'d the new \$800,000,000 copper combine. The World says:

"That decision, which practically ordered the oil trust to dissolve and held that all holding companies organized to restrain trade or competition were illegal, was a great shock to the promoters of the new concern. They decided to call a halt and send emissaries to Washington. Chief of these emissaries, it was said, was Charles F. Brooker, president of the American Brass company. Mr. Brooker is a politician as well as a business man and is a member of the republican national committee. According to reports in Wall Street he placed the situation before President Taft and practically obtained his promise that the administration would do nothing against the new combination if it was a 'good' trust and not a 'bad' one. One of the principal arguments made, it is said, was that the new organization would have a tendency to conserve the mineral resources of the country in that it would restrain over-production of copper. This, it is said, impressed the Washington authorities greatly."

And the Philadelphia North American is waiting—ever waiting—for Mr. Taft to give some proof of his devotion to popular government.