ENOCH PRATT
BALTO.
FREE LIBRARY
Md.

AMERICAN UNION.

DENTON, MD., NOVEMBER 2, 1899.

GANS ANALYZES

Supplements News Interview By Strong Statement.

Reasons Why Independents Should Support The Republican Ticket—The Situation Examined From Both National And State Standpoints—Mr. Rayner's Favorite Argument Disposed Of—Would Vote For Some Democrats On Local Ticket.

To the Editor of the News:

I would like to add a few words to the interview published in the News of yesterday as to the reasons which impel me to vote for the Republican State ticket.

The issues of the pending campaign may be viewed from the standpoint of either national or State politics.

1. National.

As a rule I am in favor of separating State and national questions whenever that is practicable. Looking back, however, over the history of past campaigns, it is apparent that this has seldom been done in Maryland, and is often very difficult to do. Especially is this true when some great national conflict has taken place over such a fundamental matter as the money question. The Democratic party in this campaign has made no allusion in its platform to any national issue. In this it differs from the course of the party in every other State where an election is to be held this fall, and departs from its usual practice in this State. It is very evident that this omission is not due to the belief of the party leaders that State issues and national issues should, as a rule, be kept separate, but that they are simply making a virtue of necessity. They could not frame a plan on the money question; because on that issue the party is hopelessly divided.

If the fight here in Maryland could be carried on strictly on State issues, and if after it is over the nation at large would understand that Democratic success had nothing to do with Maryland's position on the money question, or any other national issue, then it would be perfectly right to confine the discussion to State issues. I think, however, that there is strong reason to believe that a Democratic victory this fall will not only be regarded as a rebuke to the McKinley Administration and all that it involves, but that the party leaders would so claim. This of itself furnishes sufficient reason for those who do not desire the cause of sound money to be weakened to vote for the Republican State ticket.

2. State.

But I believe a still stronger reason exists as to strictly State issues. I have known the politics of this State for some years, and I do not know of any State administration that will compare with the four years during which Governor Lowndes has been at the head of our affairs.

Everyone knows of the great public laws which have been passed during that time, and everyone ought to know of the most admirable administration of the State finances as shown in the dignified, masterly speech of Comptroller Goldsborough.

If the State administration has been for the last four years better beyond any comparison than previous administrations, why should the men who have made it so not be continued in office?

I have heard several reasons:

1. "We Must Redeem The State."

Redeem the State from what? From misgovernment? This has not been shown to the satisfaction of any impartial man. On the contrary, most of the Democratic speekers have been trying to show that though many essentially good things were done during Governor Lowndes' administration, the Democrats had a share in the good work.

2. "We Helped The Good Work Along."

The Senate was Democratic, they say, when the election law was passed, and therefore that party should have part of the credit for passing that measure, the greatest, most important that has been enacted so long as I have known Maryland politics.

It must be evident to all, since Mr. Bruce's graphic and powerful letter, that the Democratic party was not in favor of this measure. True, the Senate was Democratic, but its majority was made possible only by counting on the independent Democrats of that body, and it was the decided stand taken by those independent Democrats, who, by the way, are often called, in derision, Republicans, that controlled the vote in favor of the bill.

3. "The Best People Of The State Are Democrats."

This is the argument of Mr. Rayner. He contends that, taking the two parties, there will be found in the Democratic party a larger proportion of men who by character and intelligence are better fitted to control the affairs of the State. Let this be conceded. If it is true now, is there any time from 1867 down to the present when it was not equally true, and yet everybody concedes that there were many years between 1867 and 1896 in which we had very bad government? The argument, then, proves nothing.

The Republican party has been tried for four years and has redeemed its pledges; it promises now additional reforms in much more specific terms than the Democrats, and has the prestige which comes from having kept its ante-election promises. I do not see, therefore, why any fair man who voted for it in 1895 should not vote for it now.

As to the local ticket, the same reasons do not apply. If I voted in Baltimore there are many Democrats for whom I would cheerfully work and vote.

EDGAR H. GANS.

COMPTROLLER GOLDSBOROUGH

On The Improvement In State Finance

UNDER REPUBLICANS' RULE

Delivered At Westminster, Md., October 16.

"Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

"It has been asserted by the Democratic candidates that this campaign has nothing to do with national politics, but should be fought out and conducted solely upon State issues. While not admitting this to be true, I am willing to accept the challenge thus offered, and, therefore, will confine myself to a review of one branch of State affairs, and endeavor to show that a record for good government has been made that must command the admiration of thoughtful men of all parties, and which demonstrates that the pledges made in 1895 have been kept in spirit and in letter. Mr. Rayner, the candidate for Attorney General, states it will be well for me to explain to the people of the State by what inventive talent the rate of interest is reduced from 6 per cent. to 3 per cent. My reply is that, whatever reduction or saving of interest or resources of the State has been accomplished by this administration, it has been done by the simple rule of common honesty, close attention to business, a rigid accountability on the part of officials required to report to my office, and no favors shown to delinquents. The gentleman further adds that if the figures given in my letter of acceptance be closely followed one will see in a moment that in a few years from now, under Republican administration, we will have no taxes at all, and we will have a huge fund to distribute among the people of this State.' In answer to this, I most emphatically declare that this utterance of that distinguished gentleman approaches most closely the truth, for, indeed, I confidently affirm and assert that, should the Republican party be continued in power four more years, the entire debt of Maryland will be practically wiped out, and that there will be no State taxes save that levied for the support and maintenance of the public schools of the State, and I challenge a successful denial of this proposition.

"Ridicule Is Not Argument."

"When a candidate for public office, I care not how brilliant he may be in the art of discussion—and the brilliancy of the candidate for Attorney-General on the Democratic ticket is cheerfully admitted, for it is his just due—is confronted by the light of truth thrown upon the affairs of State, I take it for granted that the intelligent and well-thinking people of Maryland will not be hoodwinked by his glittering generalities and flights of oratory at the expense of the truth. Ridicule is not argument; neither is irony a fair and just answer to the truths plainly stated. Doubtless the gentleman does not so think, for it has been well said that the flight owl loots at the sunrevisited light, but not understanding that it comes from the sun, which blinds. Hence, so it is with our political opponents when the light of truth is thrown upon the record of the present State administration; they understand it not, for it blinds; it is an unaccustomed light.

"Now, let these things be again plainly told, so that he who runs may read.' In the discussion of the affairs of the Treasury Department of Maryland, during the past eight years, it is my aim and determination to place before the people such a fair and honest comparison that that comparison in itself will constitute a self-evident truth—not against act, accomplishment against accomplishment, truth against truth, and, this being done, I believe I shall have demonstrated a record for good government that cannot be denied nor brushed aside by the subtle art of ridicule or eloquence from the 'golden-tongued' orator of the Democracy of Maryland, but, on the contrary, must merit the hearty commendation of not only the party man, but of the independent voter of all political parties.

The State Debt.

"At the close of the fiscal year 1895 the net debt of the State was $3,005,253.13, while at the close of the fiscal year 1899, September 30, it was $2,597,042.95; and, therefore, a decrease in four years of $408,210.18, notwithstanding the fact the Legislatures of 1896 and 1898 increased the same $1,200,000, which sums added to the above amount, will make an actual reduction in four years of $1,608,210.18, or a per annum reduction of $402,052.54½.

"Col. John Walter Smith, in his speech recently delivered at Elkton, is quoted as having said that the State debt had been increased $860,000 under Republican administration, and in his Music Hall speech of Monday last he again said that it had been increased $860,000, including the Fifth Regiment Armory loan, or a discrepancy of $60,000. Which of these statements is correct, I would respectfully ask? They cannot both be right. In fact, both are absolutely untrue. As a matter of fact, the Legislatures above referred to did increase the State debt $1,200,000 for and on account of the erection of new buildings for the Penitentiary, Second Hospital for the Insane and the House of Correction—much-needed public improvements, long neglected by the Democratic party; but notwithstanding this loan, we have actually paid this increase of $1,200,000, and in addition thereto have further reduced the State debt $408,210.18. Is this not a plain statement, the truth of which cannot be denied, for the figures speak for themselves? I invite Colonel Smith's attention to this statement, and ask him to explain to the voters of Maryland how he finds an increase in the debt of the State of $860,000, when the actual figures demonstrate it has been decreased $408,210.18 over and above all loans created by the Legislatures of 1896 and 1898.

Who Cared For The Funds?

"Let us see who has best cared for and kept inviolate the sinking funds of the State; that is, who have carried to these funds the most money collected from the taxpayers for the purpose of liquidating the debt of the State at maturity. During the years 1892, '93, '94 and '95 the Democratic officials carried to these funds the sum of $974,281.35, being the actual cash transferred from moneys collected from State taxes, although a further sum of $248,343.32 was credited to these funds, being realized from the General Government, sale of State property and collections on the bond of an ex-State official, and which, therefore, cannot be included in this comparison. While during the years 1896, '97, '98 and '99 there was carried to the said funds the sum of $1,139,051.99, or a gain of $164,769.65. But bear in mind that this increase in favor of the Republican administration has been brought about by a tax rate dedicated to such funds of 2 cents less on each $100; or, in other words, the tax rate available under Democratic administration was 7¼, while under Republican administration it was reduced to 5¼, almost a 28 per cent. reduction, the other 2 cents being set aside for the purchase of free schoolbooks, and for such books the State has paid during the past four years the sum of $660,000. But had the levy remained the same as during the last four years of Democratic administration, there could and would have been carried in actual cash this same sum of $660,000, which, added to the gain of $164,769.65, above mentioned, would make an actual gain or difference of $764,769.65 over Democratic rule of four years. Another truth plainly told—a further proof of good government.

Public Schools Question.

"And this is not all. I now call your attention to a statement that touches every home and fireside in the State—public schools, the foundation stone upon which is reared the intelligence, prosperity and welfare of our Commonwealth, and a statement equally as self-evident as those which have preceded, for it seems that our Democratic friend demands the proofs, and I galdly accept the gage thus thrown down. For the last four years of Democratic rule the amounts distributed to public schools aggregated $2,390,985.30, while during a like period of time under Republican administration there was distributed $2,652,008.03, a showing in favor of the Republican administration of $261,022.73, or a yearly increase of $72,755.68. Will the Democratic orators say this is a juggling of figures? If so, let them point out the juggling. Nay, it is but the naked truth, and they can answer it not. And the record for good government is not yet exhausted. Consider for a moment the comparison of tax on gross receipts of corporations. Again let the books speak. Exceedingly marked has been the increase in revenue under the operations of the new assessment law of 1896 from this source. The amounts received for the last four years of Democratic control—1892-3-4-5—aggregated only the sum of $524,696.99, as against the sum of $742,054.14 of four years of Republican administration, or an increase of $217,054.15. Even more marked is a comparison between the year 1896, operating under the Democratic assessment law of 1876, and the year 1899, conducted under the operation of the Republican assessment law of 1896, for the receipts for the year 1896 amounted to only $118,291.81, as against $260,985.30 for the year 1899, or the remarkable gain of $142,691.49. And if our opponents find any legerdemain in this, let them explain the trick. Truths cannot be trampled upon. It is with no small degree of pride that we can point to the fact that the charitable and educational institutions of this State have been well maintained during Republican control. These institutions received from the treasury in the years 1892-3-4-5 the sum of $1,491,585.68, while during the last four years there has been paid them the splendid sum of $1,717,629.94, or a larger appropriation under the present administration of $226,044.26.

Mindful Of Obligations.

"Thus is it demonstrated that the Republican party is not unmindful of the obligations due and the help that should be given institutions of this character., And will our Democratic friend say we should not have been so liberal in this direction? I think not, but, if so, then we are most willing to discuss this issue before the voters of Maryland. Now follows a brief review of one of the acts of omission or commission of the Democratic Treasury officials concerning the manner in which they, as custodians, failed to add to the public talents entrusted to their care. I refer to the fact that prior to the year 1853 no moneys were earned upon State deposits in banks. Why this should have been so I know not; neither do I believe that the people of this State will ever know, but if there be those who can offer a defense for this neglect of duty, let them speak. Perhaps some justification for this lack of duty may be presented by the Democratic orators during this campaign. In the years 1896-7-8-9 moneys from this source yielded the sum of $33,376.65, while in 1893-4-5 the Democratic officials only collected the sum of $13,782.32. In other words, the present administration has received for the four years past $19,594.33 more money than did the Democrats during 30 years of control.

Faithful To Their Trust.

"I would ask if this was not evidence of the faithful performance of a public trust committed to the care of the Republican officials. Can this be said of our predecessors in office? Let this count in the indictment be answered. And yet there is another cause contributing to the result and record for good government thus made. An examination of the tax accounts of the Comptroller's office shows that during the term of my Republican predecessor, the Hon. Robert P. Graham, and myself overdue or delinquent taxes to the amount of $413,029.34 were collected and turned into the treasury of our administrations. Not one cent of these taxes matured during either the administration of Mr. Graham or myself. It was all overdue prior to M. Graham's accession to office, in January, 1896. Some of it had been due for over 10 years, and a large amount was collected by suit and persistent effort on the part of the Treasury officials. Some of it was forced from collectors whose terms of office had expired for more than five or six years, and yet had never paid one cent of the taxes charged against them. This sum of $413,029.34 represents such taxes exclusively, and does not include one cent that was levied during either Mr. Graham's term or my own. I would ask the intelligent voters of Maryland to weigh well the work thus done. Let youthful men—men interested in the advancement of Maryland—examine and weigh well this record. Nay, not only the record of the Treasury Department of the State, but let every act of the Republican party since its ascendency to power in the State be closely scrutinized.

Make Your Comparisons.

"Let the comparison of four years of Democratic rule be made with four years of Republican rule, and may I ask upon which side is found the record for good government? The Republican party has kept its pledges to the people, and the Democratic party has made theirs, and then broken them year by year. Which party will you trust? The party which fulfills its promises, or the party which violates them? Trust a party which respects the wishes of the people, not one which rides rough-shod over the rights and demands of a just people. I appeal to the Republican forces to stand solid. I appeal to the independent voters of Maryland to again stand by the colors of that party which they helped put in power in 1895, and as they rendered magnificent service in that memorable campaign, so do we ask and hope for their services in the political battle of 1899. This done, and the candidates on the Republican ticket elected, I promise you, my friends, that the record for good government shall be faithfully continued. This done, I say to you that the ship of State will be safe, and that ship of which the Hon. Isidor Rayner speaks will find a resting place beneath the waters and in the sands of well-merited oblivion."

THE ELECTION LAW

It Was Passed In The Face Of Democratic Opposition.

Mr. Bruce, The Democratic President Of The Senate In 1896, Gives A Circumstantial Account Of The Fight For And Against The Bill—The Influences Now At The Front In Democratic Politics Exerted To The Utmost To Accomplish Its Defeat.

To the Editor of the News:

In his speech at Elkton, Mr. John Walter Smith, the Democratic candidate for the office of Governor, is reported in THE SUN to have said: "The election law of 1896 received the approval of a Democratic Senate, so that both parties should have credit for that measure."

It so happens that I was President of the State Senate in 1896, when the election law was passed by that body, and that through the fortuitous importance attaching to my vote at that time, because of the nice balance of party strength in the Senate, I exercised some degree of influence upon its fortunes.

Together with Senator Michael, of Harford, I constituted what was known in 1896 as the "Balance of Power" between the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate; that is to say, while we were Democrats of the school of Mr. Cleveland, we were both indexibly hostile to the old ceedingly marked has been the increase in ring, and fully in sympathy with the electoral and administrative reforms which the Republicans were pledged by the election of 1895 to carry into effect. It may, therefore, be of some interest to the public at this conjuncture to know just how far, according to my recollection, the Democrats in the State Senate, and especially Mr. John Walter Smith, contributed to the passage of the election law.

And now that the Republican party is standing to no little extent upon its State record since 1895, this is a point of capital importance. With due deference to the Maryland State Democratic Editors' Association, which in one of its recently inspired utterances still finds cumbrous, ambiguous and expensive provisions in the election law, that law is one of the noblest statutes that the spirit of a free people ever wrung from an odious oppressor.

"Justified The Revolution Of 1895."

If there were nothing else to justify the glorious popular revolution of 1895, it would justify it. It is not too much to say that it marked a new era in the history of the State. It gave the people of Baltimore city a free and fair ballot—the right preservative of all rights. It brought padded and fraudulent registration lists to an end. It broke up and dispersed the gangs of repeaters which at every recurring election had been let loose upon us by wretches in Baltimore connected with the Democratic organization higher in point of social position, but equally as, if not more flagitious in point of character. It purged the ballot-box of knavery, riot and the stain of blood. It wiped out the connivance of the police at election outrages. It stilled the nimble fingers of the hireling attorneys, who had for years prostituted their time and talents to the dishonorable task of interpolating insidious subtleties into the body of our election laws. It terminated, at least until the old ring regains power, the spectacle of the entire election machinery of the State habitually, systematically and shamelessly perverted to the purpose of stifling the just indignation of the people and reducing them to the limp and helpless condition of a man in the abominable colls of a loathsome and powerful reptile. It has made election day as quiet as Sunday, and so smooth and satisfactory in every respect have been its actual workings that not a whisper has ever assailed its results.

The Gorman Opposition.

The bill which afterward became the present election law was introduced by Mr. Pennington, of Baltimore, a Republican, into the House of Delegates, which was overwhelmingly Republican, and was promptly passed by that body by a unanimous vote and sent to the Senate, with the impression and hope unquestionably upon the part of some of the more reactionary Republicans in the House that the Democrats in the Senate would turn it down. A day or so before it was passed by the Senate a Gorman Democrat, a commanding influence in that body, came to my office, adjoining the Senate lobby, and in an interview of great length employed every form of argument and persuasion at his command to induce me to vote against it. Conversation with other Gorman Democrats in and outside of the Senate had already made me more or less familiar with the grounds of his and their antagonism as expressed to me on this occasion. They were that owing to differences between urban and rural conditions a new registration was not needed in the counties of the State, that the rank and file of the Democratic party were terribly disheartened by their recent defeat, and from despondency could not readily be induced to register, and that some of them could not be induced to do so under any circumstances except by being paid to do so, and that the Democratic party being out of power it did not have sufficient resources to furnish this inducement. To this I replied that I was pledged by my convictions and sympathies, repeatedly declared, and by the convictions and sympathies of my people—the people of Baltimore city—to the passage of this very law; that I thought that even from the standpoint of party expediency the proper thing for the Democrats was to vote for it, but that, however this might be, there were public considerations involved in the matter higher than any possible party considerations, and that I should certainly vote for it. To the argument that no new registration was needed in the counties I replied that I myself was satisfied, from what I had been told by Republican as well as Democratic members of the Senate, that apart from Baltimore county (where Mr. J. P. T. Talbott and his political associates had created in the Twelfth district very much the same conditions as those prevailing in the city) and Anne Arundel and Howard counties, there was no need for a new registration in the counties, but that an effort at that time to curtail the scope of the new registration contemplated by the bill might provoke long discussion, and that I was too much interested in the passage of the bill to take any chances on it.

About the same time the same individual had an extended conversation with Senator Michael just outside of my office, in the passage leading from the Senate lobby to the State House lavatory, at which, as Senator Michael afterward informed me, he repeated the same arguments and with the same result.

Of course, I knew that the real, controlling reasons why the Gorman Democrats were opposed to the election law were their expectation of recovering power and their indisposition, strengthened by habit and inveterate practice, to surrender any of the unconscionable advantages that the existing election laws afforded to a party in power.

A Caucus That Failed.

The next step was to call a meeting of all the Democratic members of the Senate at my office for the purpose of bringing the collective pressure of the opponents of the law to bear upon its friends. This meeting was held, according to my recollection, just before the noon session of the Senate on March 27, 1896. Senator Johnson, of Dorchester, an excellent gentleman and a most useful member of the Senate, presided. There were present, according to my recollection, all the Democratic members of the Senate, including Mr. John Walter Smith and Dr. Hering, the present Democratic candidate for the office of Comptroller. A heated discussion followed, as was perhaps too apt to be the case when I found myself in places where the influence of Mr. Gorman was paramount. On the one hand, reasons were given why the Democrats of the Senate should stand as a unit against the bill, and on the other I endeavored to give reasons why they should stand as a unit for it. The discussion had no result, except to develop the fact that the only persons present who were favorable to the passage of the bill were Senator Johnson, Senator Jackson (ex-Governor Jackson), of Wicomico county, a true friend of the bill; Senator Michael and myself, and finally Senator Johnson broke it short by remarking that its continuance promised nothing but further discord and that while both as a citizen and a party man he was earnestly in favor of the bill, yet he had always made it the rule of his political conduct to bow to the will of the majority—remarks which he immediately afterward followed up by asking all present who were in favor of the bill being voted down to say aye. At this a chorus of voices responded aye, whereupon before the negative could be put, I rose to my feet and said that it was impossible for me to be bound by the action of even a majority in such a matter, and that I intended to inform Mr. Randall, of Anne Arundel, one of the leaders of the Republicans in the Senate, that the Republicans could rely upon my vote in favor of the bill, and that if they did not pass it the responsibility would justly rest upon the Republican party. The meeting immediately dispersed, and we all proceeded to the Senate chamber, where it being time for the noon session the Republicans were already awaiting us. I at once went to Mr. Randall and told him that the Democratic members of the Senate generally were opposed to the passage of the bill, but that he could count upon my vote in its favor, and that I knew that the vote of Senator Michael would also be cast in its favor, and that our votes, with the united votes of the Republicans, would be sufficient to pass it.

John Walter Smith's Tactics.

In a short time the bill, at the same noon session, came up on its final passage, and certain amendments were offered to it by Mr. Randall and Senator Crothers, a Democrat of Cecil, and adopted. In view of what had taken place at the meeting at my office, as these amendments were one by one offered to the bill, I began to fear more and more the idea of its not being passed without amendment, and while this apprehension was working in my mind a number of leading Republicans in the House who were known by me to be staunch friends of the bill came up one after the other to my seat as presiding officer of the Senate and informed me that there was a Republican element in the House that was co-operating with the Democratic opponents of the bill in the Senate to get the bill back by amendment to the House, so that an effort could be made to defeat it there. I did not know then, and I do not know now, how strong this element was, but I was averse to taking any risks whatever with the bill, and I accordingly left the chair and went to Senator Randall's desk and told him of the apprehensions and suggested to him the expediency of moving a reconsideration of all the amendments engrafted upon the bill, so that it might at once be passed by the Senate. He, the fearless and enlightened advocate of all good legislation, did me the honor to act straightway upon my suggestion, and moved the reconsideration of the last amendment adopted. At once Mr. John Walter Smith made himself conspicuous above all his associates in his determination to insist upon the amendment of the bill and its consequent return to the House by moving a recess of the Senate until 8 P. M. This motion was rejected, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor. Not content with this result, Mr. Smith then moved that the Senate go into executive session—another dilatory motion. This motion also was defeated, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor, too. Still not content, Mr. Smith moved an adjournment—another dilatory motion. This motion, like its predecessors, was defeated, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor, too. Senators Jackson, Michael and myself were the only Democrats that voted against these motions.

Jackson And Michael Were True.

The question then recurred on the motion to reconsider. Senators Jackson, Michael and myself were the only Democrats who voted for it, and the result was a tie vote, several of the Republican Senators who had not been apprised of the situation voting against it. The friends of the bill realizing from this result that time was needed to explain the situation fully to those Senators—all of whom we knew to be thoroughly friendly to the law—then yielded to a motion made by Mr. Smith to adjourn until 8 P. M. During the interval the situation was fully explained to the three Republican Senators, and, seeing that they were in a hopeless minority, the Gorman Democrats at the night session desisted from their opposition to the passage of the bill, and every one of the amendments was in detail reconsidered and rejected, the bill was passed, all the members of the Senate except Senators Fibley, Talbott and Tilghman, Democrats, voting for it, and a weapon, keen and bright and obedient to all the liberal and righteous impulses of our people placed in the hands of the freemen of this ancient and honorable Commonwealth.

Such was the history of the passage of the election law by the Senate. To my dying day it will be a source of gratification to me that all of these things I saw and part of them I was.

It is true that without the aid of at least one Democratic vote the Republicans would have been powerless to pass the bill in the Senate, but it is equally as true that without the united support of the Republicans it would have been defeated in the Senate.

And I cannot conclude this narrative without saying that the attitude of Mr. John Walter Smith toward this bill was simply typical of his attitude toward every measure seeking the extirpation of depraved politics that was introduced into the Senate at the sessions of 1894 and 1896, when he and I were both members of that body.

"Obsequious Servitor Of Mr. Gorman."

What his course was at previous sessions of the Legislature, when political conditions at Annapolis can only be compared to a corrupt, stagnant pool, in which there is not one living thing except sour marsh grass and leeches, I have not taken the trouble to inquire. I was not a member of the State Senate in 1898, and what he did at that session to thwart genuine police reorganization, under the guidance of the trio of outsiders who called themselves leaders, but were in reality but members of the Third House, I leave for others to tell. Suffice it to say that if, during the sessions of 1894 and 1896, there was a more active and docile, nay, a more obsequious servitor of Mr. Gorman in the Senate, I do not know him. This was so well understood that in 1896 a considerable body of Democrats refused to be brought in even by a caucus to his nomination as United States Senator. He used his influence and voted against the fence of Mr. Gorman was paramount. On the one hand, reasons were given why the Democrats of the Senate should stand as a unit against the bill, and on the other I endeavored to give reasons why they should stand as a unit for it. The discussion had no result, except to develop the fact that the only persons present who were favorable to the passage of the bill were Senator Johnson, Senator Jackson (ex-Governor Jackson), of Wicomico county, a true friend of the bill; Senator Michael and myself, and finally Senator Johnson broke it short by remarking that its continuance promised nothing but further discord and that while both as a citizen and a party man he was earnestly in favor of the bill, yet he had always made it the rule of his political conduct to bow to the will of the majority—remarks which he immediately afterward followed up by asking all present who were in favor of the bill being voted down to say aye. At this a chorus of voices responded aye, whereupon before the negative could be put, I rose to my feet and said that it was impossible for me to be bound by the action of even a majority in such a matter, and that I intended to inform Mr. Randall, of Anne Arundel, one of the leaders of the Republicans in the Senate, that the Republicans could rely upon my vote in favor of the bill, and that if they did not pass it the responsibility would justly rest upon the Republican party. The meeting immediately dispersed, and we all proceeded to the Senate chamber, where it being time for the noon session the Republicans were already awaiting us. I at once went to Mr. Randall and told him that the Democratic members of the Senate generally were opposed to the passage of the bill, but that he could count upon my vote in its favor, and that I knew that the vote of Senator Michael would also be cast in its favor, and that our votes, with the united votes of the Republicans, would be sufficient to pass it.

John Walter Smith's Tactics.

In a short time the bill, at the same noon session, came up on its final passage, and certain amendments were offered to it by Mr. Randall and Senator Crothers, a Democrat of Cecil, and adopted. In view of what had taken place at the meeting at my office, as these amendments were one by one offered to the bill, I began to fear more and more the idea of its not being passed without amendment, and while this apprehension was working in my mind a number of leading Republicans in the House who were known by me to be staunch friends of the bill came up one after the other to my seat as presiding officer of the Senate and informed me that there was a Republican element in the House that was co-operating with the Democratic opponents of the bill in the Senate to get the bill back by amendment to the House, so that an effort could be made to defeat it there. I did not know then, and I do not know now, how strong this element was, but I was averse to taking any risks whatever with the bill, and I accordingly left the chair and went to Senator Randall's desk and told him of the apprehensions and suggested to him the expediency of moving a reconsideration of all the amendments engrafted upon the bill, so that it might at once be passed by the Senate. He, the fearless and enlightened advocate of all good legislation, did me the honor to act straightway upon my suggestion, and moved the reconsideration of the last amendment adopted. At once Mr. John Walter Smith made himself conspicuous above all his associates in his determination to insist upon the amendment of the bill and its consequent return to the House by moving a recess of the Senate until 8 P. M. This motion was rejected, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor. Not content with this result, Mr. Smith then moved that the Senate go into executive session—another dilatory motion. This motion also was defeated, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor, too. Still not content, Mr. Smith moved an adjournment—another dilatory motion. This motion, like its predecessors, was defeated, both Mr. Smith and Dr. Hering voting in its favor, too. Senators Jackson, Michael and myself were the only Democrats that voted against these motions.

Jackson And Michael Were True.

The question then recurred on the motion to reconsider. Senators Jackson, Michael and myself were the only Democrats who voted for it, and the result was a tie vote, several of the Republican Senators who had not been apprised of the situation voting against it. The friends of the bill realizing from this result that time was needed to explain the situation fully to those Senators—all of whom we knew to be thoroughly friendly to the law—then yielded to a motion made by Mr. Smith to adjourn until 8 P. M. During the interval the situation was fully explained to the three Republican Senators, and, seeing that they were in a hopeless minority, the Gorman Democrats at the night session desisted from their opposition to the passage of the bill, and every one of the amendments was in detail reconsidered and rejected, the bill was passed, all the members of the Senate except Senators Fibley, Talbott and Tilghman, Democrats, voting for it, and a weapon, keen and bright and obedient to all the liberal and righteous impulses of our people placed in the hands of the freemen of this ancient and honorable Commonwealth.

Such was the history of the passage of the election law by the Senate. To my dying day it will be a source of gratification to me that all of these things I saw and part of them I was.

It is true that without the aid of at least one Democratic vote the Republicans would have been powerless to pass the bill in the Senate, but it is equally as true that without the united support of the Republicans it would have been defeated in the Senate.

And I cannot conclude this narrative without saying that the attitude of Mr. John Walter Smith toward this bill was simply typical of his attitude toward every measure seeking the extirpation of depraved politics that was introduced into the Senate at the sessions of 1894 and 1896, when he and I were both members of that body.

Easy, Affable, Electioneering Address."

Mr. Smith enjoys, and, I have no doubt, justly enjoys the reputation of being a man of integrity in his personal and business relations, and despite his vote for Bryan, his intimate association with Mr. Gorman and long course of enmity to everything that the independent voters of this city hold most dear, he has an easy, affable, electioneering address, which does not hesitate to invade even the counting houses of merchants, who know that the election of Bryan would bring a deadly blight upon the present era of splendid commercial prosperity; the sanctums of editors who helped to hurl Mr. Gorman from power, and even the quiet walks of independents, who, looking back at the election law, the city charter and the specific pledge of police reorganization which the voters have obtained from the Republicans, are prepared to say with the Italian patriot: "A step forward if we were to die and not a step backward if we were to live." But handshakes, smooth promises about police reorganization bills and Corrupt Practices Acts, which Mr. Smith has already in the Legislature antagonized in principle or worse, and which, if he was elected, Mr. Gorman and Mr. Rasin would be careful enough to see never reached him, will, I believe, avail him but little. With that black cloud gathering again in the West and threatening again the wages of the wage-earner and the interest of the capitalist, and knowing as we do that Messrs. Smith, Hering and Rayner were nominated weeks in advance of the State Convention by Messrs. Gorman and Rasin, there is but one thing, in my judgment, for the independent voters to do, and that is to come together again, as they have so often done before, and throw their solid weight in the scales for pure politics, improved administration and sound money.

W. CABELL BRUCE.

Baltimore, October 14.

MR. MALSTER'S SPEECH

At Music Hall On Saturday Evening.

Following Is The Speech Of Mayor Wm. T. Malster At The Great Republican Ratification Meeting At Music Hall Last Saturday Night.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I can hardly be expected to advance an expression or suggestion that will enlighten you upon the issues of the great political parties in Maryland after having them so ably and forcibly presented by the gentlemen who preceded me. Gentlemen, the Democratic party has no issue. The "Philippines," "Imperialism" and the war are not issues. But the Republican party has an issue; it is that which interests every man, the rich as well as the poor, the capitalist and the toiler alike, and that is the currency question.

Let the Democrats avoid it as they may, it will not down. Like Banquo's ghost, it will present itself when least expected. But, my friends, I am not here to discuss issues. I shall leave that to those who are probably more qualified to the task. I will, however, remind you of the fact that the Republican party of Maryland is in jeopardy; the hand of its natural enemy, the Democratic party, is at its throat. It behooves us to be up and doing.

"It has been intimated to me that there were some Republicans who were not going to support the Republican ticket. Gentlemen, I take issue with that man, and say that he is not now and never was a Republican, for no good Republican would ever desert his party in its time of need. "Ah," you say, "I have a grievance." Gentleman, can you possibly have a grievance with the whole party? Oh, no! I have many grievances, but not with the party. I am going to bury my grievances right here tonight upon the altar of reason and Republicanism. I will vote the whole ticket from top to bottom, that the grand old party shall not be wrested from the

(Continued on third page.)

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2929_scm3534-0132.jpg