

**Those Visiting Financiers.** On another page will be found extracts from a letter written by Hon. Dudley G. Wooten in refutation of the slanders uttered against Texas laws by the eastern financiers who visited the state recently. The letter first appeared in the New Orleans Times-Democrat and was republished in the Houston Post. Texas has an excellent system of laws for the regulation of corporations, perhaps, the best in the Union, and Mr. Wooten makes an able defense of them.

**By What Authority?** A Washington dispatch says that the Platt amendment respecting Cuba is "the law of the land" and cannot be ignored or violated by the president in dealing with the would be republic to our south. The law of what land? The Supreme Court has already decided that Cuba is foreign territory, and in another case the Supreme Court has pointed out that a country can not be both foreign and domestic at the same time. By what authority then does congress seek to legislate for a foreign country?

**Who Would Haul Down The Flag?** The American flag has been hauled down in China. The young soldier who was the first to plant that flag upon the walls of Pekin was honored by an appointment by the President to be cadet at large to West Point. Immense sums of money were spent and considerable suffering was entailed in the effort to raise the flag in China, and yet after all this the flag has been hauled down.

We remember that not long ago a distinguished republican, in discussing the Philippine question, wanted to know who would haul down the flag, as though the hauling down of that flag meant dishonor. The hauling down of the flag in China did not in the least dishonor it, because there it was not the representative of rightfully and honestly acquired sovereignty. Neither will there be dishonor in hauling down the flag in the Philippines where it now represents government without the consent of the governed and taxation without representation.

**Not Willing to Redeem.** In a newspaper interview Director of the Mint, Roberts, referring to a proposition that the American silver dollar be substituted for the Mexican dollar now in general use in the Philippines, said: "There is considerable opposition to this proposition, as it is certain that any attempt to push the American dollar and redeem it in gold would precipitate commercial disturbances that might result in disaster."

How can this be true if we are on the single gold standard, and the single gold standard is the system in which the "intelligence of the world" has sublime confidence?

Can it be possible that the "enlightened financial system" of this administration and its politicians have so long and so loudly boasted as the best system for the American people, the one adopted by all "enlightened nations,"

is not the best system for the people of the Philippines whose "destiny" is placed in our custody?

**Washington's Advice.** George Washington warned his countrymen against love of power and proneness to abuse it. He warned them that to preserve our institutions was as necessary as to institute them. "If in the opinion of the people," said Washington, "the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates, but let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

The Justices of the Supreme Court who would overturn the constitution evidently do not believe that the preservation of American institutions is as essential as the establishment of those institutions. They imagine that "expediency" requires an amendment to the constitution of so grave a character as to wholly change our system of government, and they would amend the constitution by judicial interpretation.

Washington's warning on this point, as on others, was sound. In his day and generation Washington was a great man. But reference to his advice or reminder of his warnings in this day of imperialism may expose one to the charge of old-fogyism.

**Not Afraid of Silver.** A Georgia paper is responsible for the circulation of a story to the effect that Mr.

Bryan, when in the army, refused to accept two dollars and a half in silver as change, and demanded paper. The statement is not true, for he prefers to carry a few dollars in silver rather than in paper, but the fact that he or any one else does not care to carry many dollars in silver is no argument against silver. Because one prefers to carry one, two, three or four dollars in silver to a like value in paper is no reason why he should prefer twenty-five or fifty dollars in silver to a like value in paper. Neither gold nor silver is convenient to carry in large quantities; that is why silver certificates and gold certificates are issued. An advocate of the gold standard would rather carry a thousand dollar silver certificate than a thousand dollars in gold. More people carry and use silver every day than carry or use gold, and the most rabid gold bug would hardly refuse the payment of a debt because it was tendered in silver. The complaint which republicans make about the weight of silver recalls a story told on a Boston man who was arguing against the white metal. He said: "No one likes to carry silver, it is too heavy. Now suppose I gave my wife fifty dollars to go down town and buy something, say a spool of thread or any article of small value, and the clerk gave her back forty-nine dollars and the change in silver,

she wouldn't want to carry that much," and turning to his wife for confirmation he inquired "would you?" She replied with a good deal of feeling "Oh, my, if I could only get fifty dollars to spend I would be willing to carry the change in any kind of money." If any gold bug doubts the truth of this story let him try the experiment on his wife.

**Brown vs. Michigan.** Mr. Justice Brown who delivered the opinion in the Porto Rico case is a resident of Michigan. It will be interesting to take a glance at the constitution framed for the state of Michigan. This inspection will show that the opinions of the men who made Michigan's constitution differed materially from the opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Brown in the Porto Rico case.

In the preamble to this constitution, the men of Michigan said they believed "the time had arrived when our present political condition ought to cease and the right of self-government be asserted." Mr. Justice Brown evidently does not believe that the right of self-government is a right to be "asserted." It is a privilege to be bestowed, according to Mr. Justice Brown, by the men of one section upon the men of another section at the pleasure of the former.

"All political power is inherent in the people" said the men of Michigan. But Michigan's distinguished representative on the United States Supreme bench has not learned this lesson well.

"No men or set of men are entitled to exclusive or separate privileges" said the men of Michigan. How different is this from the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Brown in which he gives to one set of men exclusive and separate privileges over and above another set of men.

**More Silver In India.** The New York Engineering and Mining Journal points out that the British Board of Trade report for the period from January 1st to April 30, 1901 shows that London shipped to India and the Straits \$14,478,586 in silver. During the similar period in 1900 these shipments amounted to \$9,094,397—an increase of 59.2 per cent. The engineering and Mining Journal says:

"The increase in Indian shipments of silver was due almost entirely to the purchases which the India council was compelled to make to maintain the circulation of the rupee. The attempt to force gold coinage has been practically abandoned, and the coinage of a large amount in silver rupees was found necessary to maintain the circulation in India and avoid grave currency difficulties. The high price maintained for tin and the resulting large shipments of silver to the Straits also helped to increase the demand for silver."

According to Director of the Mint Roberts, the attempt to establish the single gold standard in the Philippines would result in "grave financial difficulties," and now we are told by this New York authority that the only way to avoid "grave currency difficulties" is to resort to silver coinage.

Can it be possible that after all the single gold standard is not infallible?