

CAMERON COUNTY PRESS.

H. H. MULLIN, Editor.

Published Every Thursday.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION. Per year, \$2.00. If paid in advance, \$1.50.

ADVERTISING RATES: Advertisements are published at the rate of one dollar per square for one insertion and fifty cents per square for each subsequent insertion.

Legal and Official Advertising per square, three times or less, 12 cents; each subsequent insertion 10 cents per square.

Local notices 10 cents per line for one insertion; 5 cents per line for each subsequent consecutive insertion.

Obituary notices over five lines, 10 cents per line. Simple announcements of births, marriages and deaths will be inserted free.

Business cards, five lines or less, 15 per year; over five lines, at the regular rates of advertising.

No local inserted for less than 75 cents per issue.

JOHN PRINTING. The Job department of the Press is complete and affords facilities for doing the best class of work.

No paper will be discontinued until arrears are paid, except at the option of the publisher.

Papers sent out of the county must be paid for in advance.

I have a few words to say about street car etiquette, said a writer recently in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, and they will be sprinkled with actual occurrences.

Let me premise by saying that a few years ago I noticed a competition in an English Journal for the best definition of a gentleman and lady.

One specification impressed me. It was to this effect: "A gentleman is one who has always perfect and kind consideration for the rights and privileges of others."

Now, that is a strong statement, but I have noticed hundreds of times that it fills the bill. But what has that to do with etiquette in cars?

A gentleman and his wife were coming to town on a drizzly, sloppy evening to attend the theater. The gentleman was properly attired in evening dress.

Sitting beyond him was a woman with a bedraggled skirt, muddy and wet. When she started to leave the car the gentleman saw her gather her skirt in a mass and prepare to sweep by him, leaving in his lap and on his clothes a bright and elegant sample of the mud and slime that is gathered upon macadamized streets.

He guarded himself by placing his umbrella, so that she would be compelled to miss him entirely. But she couldn't get by. There was some mutual glowering.

"Then: 'Will you please remove your umbrella?'" And he said: "Certainly, if you will drop your skirt, so that I will not be made a sight by the mud that you will drench me with."

She did, and the event was over. Now, as to the comment. The man was right, for the way women sweep their skirts to one side—and many times they are filthy and dirty—and sweep the knees of men, leaving a dirty, ugly trail, is useless and inconsiderate.

Lift them gently at the back, and you will not incur the wrath and cuss words of men who like to appear neat. As to a man. Two women, well gowned and in shades quite easily soiled, were in a car.

There entered a man who was mud from head to heel. Perhaps he had worked in a trench—which was not to his discredit—but there was no reason for forcing himself into the narrow space between them.

Absolutely, they were compelled to stand or undergo the expense of having their nice clothes ruined by the black and white mud with which the man was covered. They stood up. A delicate-looking woman was compelled to sit by a man with a half-consumed cigar, not of the finest.

The smoke persistently drifted toward her face. It was a case of nausea or get up. She got up. Now, why will men hang to a poor, half-smoked "stump" and annoy their neighbors, mostly women, by the rank odor which inevitably comes from a half-consumed cigar that is expiring gradually?

Again as to the women. Why will they not walk toward the front of a car, when there are vacant seats, instead of lingering listlessly by the door, waiting for nine or ten to move up to make a place for them? Have a bit of independence, please, and take a seat in sight, without discommoding a dozen. Go 'way up and sit down.

A new law has just gone into effect in Minnesota the provisions of which are so admirable that the wonder is why they were not adopted long ago in all the states.

The new law provides that the man who refuses or neglects to support his family is guilty of a felony, while the former law made such non-support merely a misdemeanor. The new statute applies to a class of offenders deserving of no sympathy and requiring a great deal more punishment than is generally meted out.

Francis E. Rigby, a wealthy Chicago real estate man, left a will as follows: "Half of my fortune to Ann Rigby Fowler, of Leeds, Yorkshire; half to my wife."

This on a scrap of paper, with hastily scrawled signature and the names of three witnesses, disposes of the estate, for lawyers regretfully admit that with such brevity, that quality being the soul of wit, and wit arguing sanity, there is no place to get a start for a contest.

HAY ON DIPLOMACY.

United States Guided by Monroe Doctrine and Golden Rule.

Secretary of State Outlines Plans of McKinley Which Are Now Being Carried Out by His Successor.

Standing in the place of President McKinley, who just before his assassination accepted an invitation to be present, Secretary of State John Hay spoke to the guests at the one hundred and thirty-third banquet of the New York chamber of commerce Tuesday evening, November 19, on "Our Diplomacy," describing the plans of the murdered president which President Roosevelt, aided by the diplomatic corps, is striving to consummate. He said:

"I am asked to say something about our diplomacy. There was a time when diplomacy was a science of intrigue and falsehood, of traps and mines and counter mines. It may be another instance of that credulity with which I have often been charged by European critics when I say that I really believe the world has moved onward in diplomacy as in many other matters. In my experience of diplomatic life, which now covers more years than I like to look back upon, and in the far greater record of American diplomacy, which I have read and studied, I can say without reservation that we have generally told squarely what we wanted, announced early a negotiation what we were willing to give, and allowed the other side to accept or reject our terms. During the time which I have been prominently concerned in our foreign relations I can also say that we have been met by the representatives of other powers in the same spirit of frankness and sincerity.

"As to the measure of success which our recent diplomacy has met with, it is difficult, if not impossible, for me to speak. There are two important lines of human endeavor in which men are forbidden even to allude to their success—affairs of the heart and diplomatic affairs.

Simple Chart the Safest. "But if we are not permitted to boast of what we have done, we can at least say a word about what we have tried to do, and the principles which have guided our action. The briefest expression of our rule of conduct is, perhaps, the Monroe doctrine and the golden rule. With this simple chart we can hardly go far wrong.

"I think I may say that our sister republics to the south of us are perfectly convinced of the sincerity of our attitude. They know we desire the prosperity of each of them, and peace and harmony among them. We no more want their territory than we covet the mountains of the moon.

"As to what we have tried to do—what we are still trying to do—in the general field of diplomacy, there is no reason for doubt on the one hand or reticence on the other. President McKinley in his messages during the last four years has made the subject perfectly clear. We have striven, on the lines laid down by Washington, to cultivate friendly relations with all powers, but not to take part in the formation of groups or combinations among them. A position of complete dependence is not incompatible with relations involving, not friendship alone, but concurrent action as well in important emergencies.

First of All, Peace. "We have kept always in view the fact that we are prominently a people of peace; that our normal activities are in the direction of trade and commerce; that the vast development of our industries imperatively demands that we shall not only regain and confirm our hold on our present markets, but seek constantly by all honorable means to extend our commercial interests in every practicable direction. It is for this reason we have negotiated the treaties of reciprocity which now await action of the senate; all conceived in the traditional American spirit of protection to our own industries, and yet mutually advantageous to ourselves and our neighbors. In the same spirit we have sought successfully to induce all the great powers to unite in a recognition of the general principle of equality of commercial access and opportunity in the markets of the orient. We believe that a fair field and no favor is all we require, and with less than that we cannot be satisfied.

Vast Field in the Pacific. "We consider our interests in the Pacific ocean as great now as those of any other power, and destined to indefinite development. We have opened our doors to the people of Hawaii; we have accepted the responsibility of the Philippines which Providence imposed upon us; we have put an end to embarrassing conditions in which we were involved in Samoa.

"Next in order will come a Pacific cable, and an isthmian canal for the use of all well-disposed peoples, but under exclusive American ownership and American control—of both of which great enterprises President McKinley and President Roosevelt have been the energetic and consistent champions.

"Sure as we are of our rights in these matters, convinced as we are of the authenticity of the vision which we see, thus far and still beckons us forward, I can yet assure you that so long as the administration of your affairs remains in hands as strong and skillful as those to which they have been and are now confided, there will be no more surrender of our rights than there will be violation of the rights of others.

"The president to whom you have given your invaluable trust and confidence, his now immortal predecessor, is as incapable of bullying a strong power as he is of wronging a weak one. He feels and knows—for has he not tested it in the currents of heavy fight as well as in the tollsome work of administration?—that the nation over whose destinies he presides has a giant's strength in the works of war as in the works of peace.

Will Not Abuse His Power. "But that consciousness of strength brings with it no temptation to do injury to any power on earth, the proudest or the humblest. We frankly confess we seek the friendship of all the powers; we want to trade with all peoples; we are conscious we will make our commerce a source of advantage to them and also profit to ourselves. But no wantonness or strength will ever induce us to drive a hard bargain with another nation because it is weak, nor will any fear of ignominious criticism tempt us to insult or defy a great power because it is strong, or even because it is friendly.

"The attitude of our diplomacy may be indicated in a text of Scripture which Franklin—the first and greatest of our diplomats—tells us passed through his mind when he was presented at the court of Versailles. It was a text his father used to quote to him in the old candle shop in Boston when he was a boy. 'Sceat thou a man diligent in his business, he shall stand before kings.'

"Let me be diligent in our business and we shall stand—stand, you see, not crawl nor swag—stand, as a friend and equal, asking nothing, putting up with nothing, but what is right and just, among our peers in the great democracy of nations."

Mr. Bryan must be still thinking up something that he can print about the results of the recent election in general and about the result in his own state in particular. — Albany Journal.

POLICY OF DEMOCRATS.

The Outlook for a Vigorous and Intelligent Opposition Not Encouraging.

Senator Bailey, of Texas, formerly democratic leader in the house, is quoted as saying that there will be no meeting of the democratic members of congress to outline a policy of opposition, but that events will be allowed to take their course. Probably this is the best that can be done. For you cannot tell what you are going to oppose until you know what is going to be done, says the Indianapolis News (Ind.). Thus, to a certain extent, the democrats must meet issues as they rise, and be governed largely by circumstances. Yet it does not seem to be remembered that opposition to be effective and to command respect must grow out of certain well-defined and firmly held principles. If the democrats were conscious of having these, they would understand that their opposition was not something born of the occasion, but the necessary and inevitable result of their doctrines. Where there was no issue between them and the republicans there would be no disagreement. For instance, Senator Bailey says that he is for the isthmian canal, and that if the new treaty is as strongly American as it is said to be, he will support it. This is proper, of course. Yet the difficulty is that the democrats are likely to find so many points of agreement with the republicans that they will generally be supporting republican policies. Most of the democrats are expansionists, and so will favor holding to our new possessions. They cannot oppose the republican party for refusing to enact further currency legislation—as it may do. It will be hard to make an issue either for or against reciprocity. Even in antagonizing subsidy legislation, the democrats will find many republicans with them.

So it will be seen that it is a difficult matter not simply to map out a programme in advance, but to lay down any broad general principles for the guidance of the party. This is one of the great weaknesses of the present democratic organization. It has the appearance of waiting idly and helplessly for something to happen that may give it a chance again. It may be that nothing better than this can be expected at the present time. But even if this be so the situation is none the less unfortunate. The outlook for a vigorous, aggressive and thoroughly intelligent opposition party is not encouraging. The democratic party is as badly off as the liberal party in Great Britain, and nothing worse than this could be said.

THERE WILL BE NO TINKERING Prosperity is Here and It Will Be Well to Let It Remain with Us.

Democratic papers are able to applaud one republican member of the congress about to assemble, and that is Representative Babcock, of Wisconsin, who has prepared a bill to revise the iron and steel tariff schedule. Mr. Babcock assumes that his bill would regulate prices in the interest of American consumers. That point is entirely conjectural. American consumers are not complaining, unless it is of a shortage of railway cars to get iron, steel and other manufactured products as fast as they are wanted. American workers in steel and iron industries are not complaining. They are all employed at good wages. The rule of letting well enough alone is good. Within ten years there have been three prolonged periods of tariff revision. The last brought forth the tariff which Nelson Dingley shaped and President McKinley approved. Both were great masters of the tariff question. Their object was to restore prosperity. It is here, says the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and it would be unwise to risk existing conditions by experimenting with theories like the one advanced by Mr. Babcock.

The tariff question cannot be reopened at one single point. A prolonged change in the steel and iron schedule means a corresponding attack on many other schedules. Mr. Babcock is not the only tariff theorist in congress. The others are equally sure that they can guess results correctly. Tariff making at best is disturbing to business. Margins of profit are involved in scores of industrial interests. Tariff changes often settle the question whether a factory shall keep on or close. A tariff contest in congress induces, for the time being, inaction in business. The United States is enjoying under the present tariff the busiest and most prosperous times the country has ever known. Mr. Babcock's theory will be much safer on the shelf beside the tariff lobby than as an entering wedge to admit the whole army of tariff rippers. Ostensibly aimed at large steel and iron establishments, it would hit the people. It is distinctly an ill-advised hazardous proposition.

COMMENT AND OPINION. Col. Dan Lamont was closer to the presidency in the days of Grover Cleveland than he ever will be again. — Chicago Tribune.

We regret to observe that the democratic party in the state of Iowa bears a striking resemblance to a canceled postage stamp. — Hartford Times.

Those who are impressed with the necessity of tariff revision must at least admit that the country has done fairly well under the present tariff. — Kansas City Journal.

WHAT THE PEOPLE KNOW.

Advantages Resulting from the Working Out of Republican Policies.

"It would seem," wistfully remarks Mr. Bryan, in comment on the recent elections, "that republican policies ought to arouse overwhelming opposition among the wealth producers of the country, for surely no man who earns his living can point to any advantages which the republican party brings to the masses of the people. But they evidently fail," he plaintively adds, "to appreciate the viciousness of the principles which are at work."

What Mr. Bryan fails to appreciate, says the Chicago Inter Ocean, is the fact that the people can and do understand the advantages that republican policies bring to them. In order to understand they have but to contrast their present condition with that under which they suffered a few years ago. Then one faction of the democratic party had paralyzed industry by destroying the confidence of capital in its profit-making powers. As a result hundreds of thousands of artisans were forced into idleness.

For this calamity the democratic faction led by Mr. Bryan proposed a most wonderful remedy. It was nothing less than to cut in two the value of the artisan's wages. The republican party, however, proposed to continue to pay the artisan in 100-cent dollars, and at the same time to assure his getting them by restoring capital's confidence in the profit-making powers of industry.

The majority of the people understood and approved the republican party's policies and returned it to power. It restored capital's confidence in the future industry and in the security of investment. It assured labor of employment and that its wages would be paid in currency worth exactly what it professed to be. The result of this restoration of confidence and assurance of justice was speedily seen. The country entered upon an era of prosperity greater and more generally diffused than it had ever before.

The republican party did more. It led the nation to victory in war, vindicated its honor, delivered millions long oppressed, and enlarged the boundaries of freedom. Mr. Bryan sought to convince the people that they were going forward, not to glory, but shame—that the expansion of their dominions was not an extension of liberty, but the establishment of slavery—and that their only salvation was to run away from their plain duty and destiny.

Once more the people, in a majority, even more overwhelming, approved republican policies and rejected Mr. Bryan's. Incapable himself of understanding the people, Mr. Bryan now takes refuge in the last argument of the defeated and discredited politician. He waits that the people do not understand, and complains of their stupidity.

A DEMOCRATIC PROBABILITY. Indications of a Violent Swing of the Party Pendulum in 1904.

Daniel S. Lamont, of New York, is likely to be a candidate for the presidential nomination in the next democratic national convention, according to reports which come out of the east. The men who bring this news are friends of Mr. Lamont, and they believe that what they hear is true, says the Chicago Record-Herald.

The Lamont suggestion as a matter of course, comes from and finds favor with those democrats who believe in Grover Cleveland, and have not yet lost all faith in his brand of democracy. They see no salvation for their party except a return to the "ancient faith." In Mr. Lamont they would have a candidate who would bring back into aggressive action for democratic tickets those influences which were lost in 1896 on account of the silver question, and yet a candidate against whom many of the objections to other men in the "gold bug" wing of the party would not lie.

Mr. Lamont, it will be remembered, came into prominence as secretary to the president during the first Cleveland term, and in that subordinate position was about the biggest man in the country, according to the public's view, after the president himself. That all came from his faculty for handling men democratically as well as adroitly. Nothing of that reputation was materially damaged during the second Cleveland administration, when he was secretary of war.

Mr. Lamont is now a rich man. He is a director in many large corporations, including the Northwestern Security company, which is effecting virtually a consolidation of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Burlington and Union Pacific railroad interests. This is the one fact which looms largest in the eyes of the democrats to whom the Lamont suggestion has been advanced as a possibility of the future.

It is generally believed that the democratic pendulum is quite ready for such a violent swing—from Bryan, of 1896 and 1900, to an active representative of some of the nation's largest corporations.

Some extremists in Germany are talking of a tariff war against the United States. But the talk will probably come to nothing. No country which is dependent on others for many necessities of life, including food articles, is in a position to wage a tariff war—especially against the nation which is the chief source of supply. — Troy Times.

PROFESSOR DEFENDS FASHION.

Chicago University Teacher Deals Psychologically with the Modern Social Life.

That fashion is necessary to and formative of social life and that George Washington was one of the early exponents of fashion—these statements were made the other day by Prof. George E. Vincent, of the University of Chicago, in an address before the Daughters of the American Revolution. The subject was "The Psychology of Fashion." He said that efforts to break down the barriers of fashion such as are attempted in the church societies were dismal failures. Persons who insist on ultra conventionalism he referred to as snobs, and others, who, because they are self-conscious and unable to fit into the social structure, ridicule fashion, were designated as bores. "The basis of fashion in this country," declared Prof. Vincent, "is competitive imitation. Each person, in whatever station of life, but more particularly in the upper and middle classes, attempts to outdo a neighbor in the style of garments and architecture of manners laid down by some leader."

Liberty of Interpretation. A church was a considerable time without a pastor. A great number of persons of varied talents preached to them with a view to obtaining the post. A very ambitious young man was asked to supply them for a Sabbath. All went well until he gave out the text: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh." Imagine the consternation the people experienced when he read out the text in a lofty and commanding manner. He was unaware of the feeling he created. The people did the opposite from the text. The young man was not called.

The beauty seen is partly in him who sees it. — Bovee.

Advertisement for Castoria 900 Drops. A Vegetable Preparation for Assimilating the Food and Regulating the Stomachs and Bowels of Infants and Children. Promotes Digestion, Cheerfulness and Rest. Contains neither Opium, Morphine nor Mineral. NOT NARCOTIC. Fac Simile Signature of Dr. J. C. Fitcher, NEW YORK.

Advertisement for Castoria. For Infants and Children. The Kind You Have Always Bought Bears the Signature of Dr. J. C. Fitcher. In Use For Over Thirty Years. CASTORIA THE CENTAUR COMPANY, NEW YORK CITY.

"WHAR DEW I CUM IN?" (Being the Soliloquy of a Farmer on the Free Raw Sugar Question.) Thar's a mighty lot er talkin' about farmers 'n thar rights, 'N the wonderful prosperity thet beet growin' invites. Thar's er heap of foolish crowin' 'n the "beats" begin ter shout 'N holler fer the Tariff ter keep free raw sugar out! But I notia thet the beet-producin' farms are very few, An' the farmers through the country aint got much ef it ter dew. The hull land aint a-raisin' beets, 'n aint goin' ter begin, Beet growin's right fer sum, I guess—but, whar dew I cum in? The farmer gits four dollars now fer every ton o' beets— A hansom price, I must allow—but hidin' sun deceits. Beet sugar manfacturers admit es they hev found Thet "granulated" costs 'em sumthin' like trow cents a pound. In fact thet leaves a profit on which they'd greatly thrive— And—if it kin be sold fer three, why should we pay 'em FIVE? It seems ter me es thet's a game thet's mighty like a skin— But—if thar's any benefit—waal—whar dew I cum in? When Uncle Sam's in want o' cash we're glad ter help him out, 'N we'll stand all the taxes thet are needed, never doubt, But when his pocket-book's well lined an' nary cent he lacks, Et seems ter me his duty's ter repeat thet sugar tax. Them fellers wot is interested sez it's to protect The beet-producin' farmer thet the duty thet collect, But I guess thet explanation es a little bit too thin— The sugar maker,—he's all right;—but—whar dew we cum in? Take off raw sugar duty an' the price will quickly fall, To everybody's benefit, fer sugar's used by all. The poor will bless the Government thet placed it in thar reach— ('N millions of our citizens fer sugar now beseech) The dealer 'll be delighted—less expenditure fer him— More demand 'n bigger profits—which at present are but slim. An' the farmer 'll be as well paid as he ever yet hes ben— But he'll buy his sugar cheaper—thet's whar he an' I'll cum in. Now, whar's the sense er reason of the sugar tax to-day, When our treasury's a-bugin' an' we hev no debts ter pay? The duty on raw sugar's Fifty million every year— An' the people's got ter pay it—thet's a fact thet's very clear. Fifty million! Great Jerusha! Ter protect beet magnates, too, Why should they tax ALL the people—just ter help a scattered FEW? And the FEW? Beet-sugar MAKERS! Don't it really seem a sin Thus ter help an' fill thar coffers? Whar dew you an' I cum in? The farmer growin' beets hes got a contract price fer years,— Free raw sugar wouldn't hurt him, an' of it he has no fears, But mebbe, like myself—he's also growing fruit so nice— Ter preserve it—at a profit—he needs sugar—at a price! The repealing of the duty, surely cuts the price in two— Thet'll make a mighty difference, neighbor, both ter me an' you! Let the sugar manfacturer make such profits as he kin— Ter him it may seem right enuff—but whar dew I cum in? An' I aint agoin' ter swaller all the argumts they shout Thet the farmers need protection—an must bar raw sugar out. Common sense es plainly showin' thet the people in the land Want raw sugar free in future—an' its freedom will demand. 'Tis a tax no longer needed—hateful to the public view,— Taxing millions of our people to enrich a favored few. They can't bind me any longer with the foolish yarns they spin,— While they're busy makin' money—whar dew you an' I cum in? I'm agoin' ter keep on hustlin', talkin', pleadin' with my friends,— Aint no sense in lettin' others gain thar selfish privet ends. I'm agoin' ter write torrower to my Congressman 'nd say Thet he oughter do his best ter kill that tax without delay! Feller-farmers, do your utmost—whether you grow beets or not— To repeal the tax on sugar—you can but improve your lot! Cheaper sugar helps your pocket, greater blessings you can win— When we've three-cent granulated—that's whar you an' I cum in!