The Oregonian.

Entered at the Postoffice at Portland, Oregon, as second-class matter.

TELEPHONES.
Editorial Rooms....166 | Business Office....667

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By Mail (postage prepaid), in Advance—
Daily, with Sunday, per month.....$0 85
Daily, Sunday excepted, per year..... 7 50
Daily, with Sunday, per year..... 9 00
Sunday, per year..... 2 00
The Weekly, per year..... 1 50
The Weekly, 3 months..... 50
To City Subscribers—
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays excepted.15c
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays included.20c

POSTAGE RATES.
United States, Canada and Mexico:
10 to 16-page paper.....1c
18 to 32-page paper.....2c
Foreign rates double.

News or discussion intended for publication in The Oregonian should be addressed invariably "Editor The Oregonian," not to the name of any individual. Letters relating to advertising, subscriptions or to any business matter should be addressed simply "The Oregonian."

The Oregonian does not buy poems or stories from individuals, and cannot undertake to return any manuscripts sent to it without solicitation. No stamps should be inclosed for this purpose.

Puget Sound Bureau—Captain A. Thompson, office at 1111 Pacific avenue, Tacoma. Box 955, Tacoma Postoffice.

Eastern Business Office—The Tribune building, New York City; "The Rookery," Chicago; the S. C. Beckwith special agency, New York.

For sale in San Francisco by J. K. Cooper, 746 Market street, near the Palace Hotel, and at Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter street.

For sale in Chicago by the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street.

TODAY'S WEATHER.—Showers, with southerly winds.

PORTLAND, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 2.

REMARKABLE VERSATILITY.

In all parts of the country William J. Bryan is under severe criticism for his present position in relation to the Philippine Islands. No public man ever had graver difficulty to meet than that which he has brought upon himself by denying our right to the Philippines, as an expedient for a political campaign, after having urged, as Mr. Bryan did, the ratification of the treaty by which we received the islands from Spain. Such insincerity is believed to be without an example or parallel in our political history. The country is ringing with it. It is the leading feature of the campaign.

A printed open letter dealing with this unexampled tergiversation has been issued by "The Young Men's Republican Club of St. Joseph, Mo." This letter is one of the most forcible documents of the campaign. It is addressed directly to Mr. Bryan, and contains these passages, to-wit:

> You are now stating that we have no right to acquire territory through conquest, yet you urged your friends in the Senate to vote for the ratification of a treaty which gave us title to the Philippines, only by conquest. You are now stating that we have no right to acquire sovereignty over a people without their consent, yet you urged your friends to vote for a treaty which gave us sovereignty over a people without asking their consent and who were then in open rebellion against us. This treaty did not even define the status of these people, but provided that "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress."
>
> Urging a favorable vote on a treaty containing these provisions, and then denying our right to do as you urged us to do, is certainly pure Bryanese, and is a species of logic heretofore unknown among honest people.

This goes directly to the heart of the subject. But Bryan has attempted to answer or parry the criticism by saying that the reason he favored the treaty was that through ratification of it "we should be in better condition to wage a contest against imperialism than we should have been had the treaty been rejected." The answer to this subterfuge is overwhelming, viz: "Had the treaty been rejected, the bugaboo of 'imperialism' would not exist."

We have a right to acquire territory through conquest or purchase, or both, and have repeatedly exercised it. Such right is one of the powers of any sovereign nation. We have, moreover, the right to govern any territory that may be acquired, through regulations prescribed by Congress; and we have the right to make states out of such territory, or not, as we may think fit. We are not bound to admit Alaska as a state, and probably never shall. We kept Utah out for reason, during a very long period, and could have kept her out indefinitely, or forever. So we may act in regard to the Philippine Islands. We may govern them under our familiar territorial system, during all time, if we see fit, without any violation whatever of the Constitution.

We never shall create states there unless we think it best to do so. The notion that we are obliged to make states of them, or violate the Constitution, is a peculiar absurdity.

It was decided by Congress, and accepted as the rule of the country, when the Louisiana purchase was effected, that the Constitution was made for the states, not for territories. Webster, speaking on this subject, afterwards, said: "There is no such thing as extending the Constitution. The Constitution is extended over the United States, and nothing else. It cannot be extended over anything except the old states, and the new states that shall come in hereafter, when they do come in." And Benton, speaking on the same subject, remarked: "History cannot class higher than as a vagary of a diseased imagination this imputed self-acting and self-extension of the Constitution. The Constitution does nothing of itself—not even in the states for which it was made. Every part of it requires a law to put it into operation. No part of it can reach a territory unless imparted to it by act of Congress." And McMaster, author of the great History of the United States, the fifth volume of which has recently come from the press, writes:

> A review of the history of suffrage in the territories makes it clear that foreign soil acquired by Congress is the property of and not a part of the United States; that the territories formed from it are without, and not under, the Constitution; and that in providing them with government Congress is at liberty to establish just such kind as it pleases, with little or no regard for the principles of self-government; that in the past it has set up whatever sort was, in its opinion, best suited to meet the needs of the people, never stopping to ask how far the government so created derived its just powers from the consent of the governed, and that it is under no obligation to grant even a restricted suffrage to the inhabitants of any soil we may acquire unless they are fit to use it properly.

These are unquestioned facts of our history; and our practice in dealing with territory acquired by the United States has always been in accord with them. In taking the Philippine Islands, therefore, and governing them under regulations suited to their condition, we do not depart in smallest degree from the principles and the practice we have followed throughout our entire National history. The right exists, and we have always exercised it. Of course the question of policy remains, and is to be considered in connection with the circumstances of every new acquisition. But Mr. Bryan, when he urged ratification of the treaty that brought us the Philippine Islands, committed himself to their acquisition, as a policy; and he stultifies himself now by denying that we had the right to take them and by declaring that we have no right to keep them. It is a position unlike that ever occupied by any other public man in our history. Criticism, censure, reprobation of such method of dealing with a great National and international question, could never be unjustly severe. Bryan's invention of "imperialism," as a political bogy, in the face of his own advocacy of the treaty that constitutes the "imperial" act, is the shortest corner yet turned by any man who has aspired to the Presidency of the United States. It is versatility of a kind not admirable in one seeking such a position.

SOURCE OF GERMAN MILITARISM.

Bryan's appeal to the Germans for their votes is not based upon the ruinous effects of the gold standard, for he has not forgotten how German voters repudiated his rotten-money schemes in 1896. He does address them, however, on the subject of "militarism," and seeks to persuade them that the temporary forces we have had to raise for service in the Philippines betokens a military regime here such as is maintained in Germany. He urges the German, therefore, to vote for Bryan, and thereby escape "militarism" and conscription.

The indications are, however, that the appeal is failing, because the Germans know that the conditions which produce militarism in Germany do not exist and cannot exist here. Germany, from the nature of her geographical position, is surrounded by powerful rivals and even enemies. In Caesar's commentaries the curtain rises on the war between the Teuton and the Gaul, and the conflict, actual or potential, is with us yet. France on the west, Russia on the east, Austria-Hungary and Italy on the south, present a continual menace to Germany's peace and independence. In arms alone lies her self-preservation, and in her devotion to both the theory and the practice of arms she has raised herself to the place of the first military power of the globe.

The United States is confronted by no such contiguous foes, and cannot be. Such armies as we need are recruited in haste for the emergency, and dissolved when the occasion is past. Our little standing Army is only a police force, and often comes dangerously near being inadequate for the requirements. We are in greater danger today of trouble through inadequate military force at home and in the Philippines than from excess. Under our form of government, where the whole Administration and Congress may be overturned at any time by popular vote, it is utter folly to speak of the people being in danger from the growth of the military.

The one crisis in our history when a military regime seriously threatened us was the Civil War. If the South had triumphed, the juxtaposition of two independent if not hostile nations would have made extensive military establishments necessary for each. All that Mr. Bryan's party could do in aid of militarism at that time was done.

Mr. Bryan has no fear of militarism. But he has fears of being defeated again this year—fears that November will doubtless show to have been justifiable.

ROBERTS AND WOLSELEY.

Lord Roberts of Candahar, the greatest living master of the art of war, will on November 1 succeed Lord Wolseley as Commander-in-Chief of the British Army. The fact that Lord Roberts did not succeed to the head of the British Army in 1895, when the superannuated uncle of the Queen, the Duke of Cambridge, was forced to retire, is proof that in Great Britain the rewards of success, like kissing, are won by favor rather than by merit, and nothing but the unexpected opportunity of the Boer War has enabled Lord Roberts at 68 years of age to gather all its laurels and add them to the brilliant wreath of military honors that adorned his brow.

Lord Roberts entered the English Army in 1851. His father was General Abraham Roberts, who served in the first Afghan War; his mother was an Irish woman from Tipperary. Young Roberts won the Victoria Cross in the Indian Mutiny, winning personal praise from Lord Clyde at the relief of Lucknow. In 1868 he was Quartermaster-General of General Robert Napier's Abyssinian expedition; in 1878 he was the hero of the Afghan War, capturing Cabul and then marching with 10,000 men through mountain defiles in Winter from Cabul to the relief of Candahar, where the English Army was beleaguered by a victorious Afghan army under Ayoub Khan. This victorious campaign and its wonderful march gave Roberts the reputation of being the first executive soldier of his day. He was made a Baronet in 1881; succeeded Sir Donald Stewart in command of the Indian Army in 1885; was made a peer in 1892, and then a Field Marshal.

Measured by his fame, the length, difficulty, variety and importance of his service, Lord Roberts was easily the first soldier of England in 1895, when Lord Wolseley was appointed to a place that had been filled by Wellington and by his brilliant lieutenants, Lords Hill and Hardinge, after he relinquished active service. Now, what had Wolseley done that he should have been preferred to Lord Roberts for the head of the British Army? He entered the army in 1852, a year later than Lord Roberts; he was wounded in the second Burmese War; served as an engineer officer in the Crimean War, where he was twice wounded; he served on the staff during the Indian Mutiny of 1857; served as Lieutenant-Colonel in the China War of 1860; as Colonel Wolseley, commanded the Red River expedition in the half-breed Riel's rebellion of 1870. As Major-General, Wolseley commanded in the Ashantee War of 1873-74; was Lieutenant-General in the Zulu War of 1879; Commander of the English troops that defeated Arabi Pasha at Tel-el-Kebir in 1882; commanded in the Soudan campaign of 1884-85. He was voted $125,000 for his services in the Ashantee campaign, and $100,000 for Egypt, and became Commander-in-Chief in 1895, while Lord Roberts became Commander of the forces in Ireland. In brief, General Wolseley lost Khartoum by his slowness, defeated the barbarian negro King of Ashantee and defeated Arabi Pasha when the crack troops of the English Army whipped an Egyptian rabble that were afterwards easily beaten by the Arabs of the Soudan. Wolseley, who never commanded to exceed 10,000 men in action in his life, never commanded them against a well-armed white foe; he fought Indian half-breeds in Manitoba, negroes armed with spears and flintlocks at Coomassie; he fought Zulus in South Africa. His military fame was very cheap and easily won. It is represented by the Red River campaign against Riel, the conquest of the negro King Koffee, of Ashantee, the defeat of Arabi Pasha and the march to Khartoum, in which he was outgeneraled by the Mahdi, who held Wolseley's advance back with one hand while he seized Khartoum with the other.

Wolseley was conspicuous for nothing so much as for his respectful reference in his public and private writings to "General Jackson and General Lee," while General Grant is insultingly spoken of as "Mr. Grant." Wolseley was taken to task very sharply, not only by our own General Sherman, but by leading English papers, for his contemptuous and supercilious treatment of the campaigns of our Civil War as not legitimate or valuable lessons in the modern art of war. The truth is that it was the stupid disregard of the lessons of our American war that was responsible for the severe defeats inflicted upon the English troops before Ladysmith, Modder River and Magersfontein. It was proved time and again in our American Civil War that an intrenched line defended by riflemen could not be carried by direct attack unless the attacking party were composed of picked troops and outnumbered the assaulted at least three to one. It was proved time and again in our Civil War that mounted riflemen were the best troops to meet an enemy composed of sharpshooting mounted irregulars. The neglect of the lessons of our Civil War by Wolseley's pets, Buller and Methuen, cost them fearful losses, and had Lord Roberts been equally insular in his military brains, Buller would be before Ladysmith today and Lord Roberts would not yet be in Pretoria.

ONE BALLOT FOR PRIMARIES.

In another column appears a collection of interviews taken by the St. Paul Pioneer Press on the subject of the Minneapolis direct primary law. The interviews are from prominent men, and are remarkable that they unite in favoring the law, despite the apparent objection first raised upon the supposed selection of Dr. Ames, believed to be a weak Republican candidate, by Democratic votes. It now appears, as The Oregonian ventured to believe at the time, that this weakness of the law was more apparent than real. The Pioneer Press, in fact, says so specifically. It says that while Ames undoubtedly received a very large number of Democratic votes, it does not appear that any considerable number of them were cast to weaken the Republican ticket. His heavy vote seems to have been an expression in his favor as against Gray, which is likely to be carried to the polls. So far from weakening the ticket, it says, "his nomination has decidedly strengthened it, and those who did seek to encompass his nomination under the delusion that he was weak have learned a lesson that they will not forget."

It has been proposed to amend the Minneapolis law by providing separate party primaries, or else requiring voters to specify their party and receive only the one ticket. This suggestion is disapproved by the Pioneer Press, which says the remedy would be worse than the disease. If we are to require a declaration of party affiliation, the Pioneer Press argues, then there will be no full and free expression of choice. Where a machine exists it can continue to manipulate the primaries, even under the Australian system, and where a machine does not exist it would still be worth while to erect one. As long as there are separate primaries those only who are most active in politics, those who are in politics for "what there is in it," will be able to throttle a free expression of public opinion; there would be little more check upon them than under the present system, since the primary would continue to be not a governmental, but a quasi-private affair.

Members of the Oregon Legislature, and all others interested, therefore, ought to take notice that the scheme for separate primaries or separate tickets is a very promising one for those who will seek to give us a bogus instead of a real primary reform. In last Saturday's issue Mr. Bingham showed up the constitutional dangers of such a provision. Here we have its practical dangers. The conclusions of so able and upright a paper as the St. Paul Pioneer Press cannot be lightly set aside on this question or on any other. It insists that the Minneapolis experiment, even in the face of the selection of Ames, demonstrates the necessity of a single ballot containing all names, given to each voter without inquiry into or restriction upon his party affiliation. This is the primary ballot needed by Oregon.

The list of missionaries murdered in China during the past Summer continues to grow, and makes from week to week pathetic reading. It contains the names of men, women and children, a large number of the latter—mostly young children, who later would have been sent home to be educated—appearing as victims to their parents' missionary zeal. The loss in property has been very heavy, almost everything belonging to the missions and missionaries having been destroyed. The churches are rallying to the support of the missionary boards, the receipts for the financial year of the American Board showing an excess of $93,756 over those of the previous year. This indicates that men and women imbued with missionary zeal will continue to take their lives in their hands and go to China in the forlorn hope of inducing the uncounted millions of that vast empire to substitute the Christian religion for that of Confucius.

Reviewing the demands upon which the miners' strike was based, it would seem that an increase of 10 per cent in wages would not go far toward satisfying them. They were principally as follows: (1) An increase of 20 per cent in wages; (2) a reduction of price of powder from $2 75 to $1 50 a keg (the difference being the price they have been compelled to pay the companies in excess of the market price); (3) a fair system of dockage that will prevent the operator from docking the miner sometimes as much as 12 per cent for alleged impurities of the coal, the former being sole judge of the impurity; (4) a fixed ton of 2240 pounds, to conform to the law of the state; (5) the abolishment of the company stores, where men are obliged to pay more for family supplies than in the outside market; and (6) the abolishment of the company doctors, who are supported by $1 a month taken from every miner's wage. Upon some of these points of difference the public is not qualified to judge, since they refer to a business system the details of which it knows little. Upon the company store question, however, all may form an intelligent opinion, and in point of fact all have done so. The consensus of this opinion is that this institution is not and cannot be justified by any system of fair dealing between men and men, and that, in the name of common honesty, the company store should be abolished. The strike settled on any basis that does not include this will not be settled; it will only be temporarily suspended.

"Piles of lumber, piles of coal, piles of machinery of all kinds; boilers weighing from three to five tons standing on end, buried in the sand," is a brief description of the appearance of Nome beach after the great storm in a letter written by a resident of this city, who is still there but expects to come out before navigation closes.

> The strength of the cruel sea,
> When loosed in its angry might,

—is well illustrated by this wreckage, representing hundreds of thousands of dollars in money irretrievably lost, and the futile hopes of many thousand men. A writer in a recent issue of the New York Independent says of this first storm that succeeded the smiling Summer calm on Behring Sea: "No one knows how many lives were lost, though a few bodies were washed upon a shore where all men are alike—and most without friends." The hopeless pathos of this picture is lighted a little further on in the article, however, by the statement that all night long while the gale raged a little schooner battling with the surf flew her signals of distress, while all the townspeople sighed and sympathized, but could not lend assistance, adding: "But fate was only jesting with the poor sailors, for the morning found their craft high and dry on the beach and themselves drinking friendly coffee in the tents of strangers." Common distress makes common cause, and in this fact there is reason to hope that those remaining at Nome after the last ship comes out will not suffer hunger, since all accounts agree that provisions equal to the necessities of several thousand men are in supply.

Much privation, want and wretchedness no doubt exist among the families of the striking miners of Pennsylvania. Humanity must hope that the condition of these people will be bettered by the strike—though for the present their privations are increased. It is noticed that the poverty of these people has become a special subject of comment and illustration by the sensational journals of New York, which are doing their best to make party capital out of it. It is an unworthy and reprehensible effort. Wherever great multitudes of people dwell, poverty is the common lot of many. At this moment it would be easy to find a far greater number of poor and destitute people in the City of New York—which has the blessings of Tammany rule—than in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania.

The Young Men's Christian Association makes its most practical showing for good in the community in its night school system, the classes in which have recently been formed for the season. It may be regarded as proven that a young man who spends the evenings of wage-earning or otherwise busy days in study, with a view to rendering himself competent in some business or vocation, will succeed to the credit of the organization that gives him an opportunity to study, and ultimately to his own profit. The community is interested in knowing that the students' classes in the Y. M. C. A. are large, since every man turned out of a night school that is conducted on practical lines means a self-supporting, self-respecting member added to its list.

The appointment of Lord Roberts to the head of the British Army means its speedy reorganization, and the report that Lord Kitchener will accompany him probably means that he will be the executive Chief of the Army Staff of Lord Roberts. Out of this reorganization will come some system of conscription, for intelligent England sees that it is inevitable. England sees that to discharge her impending military and naval responsibilities she cannot trust to her present volunteer system, and she will be obliged to enact in some modified form the conscription system of the great Continental powers of Europe.

The public schools of this city have settled down to their work in earnest, with a total at the close of the second week of 10,350 pupils enrolled. The showing is one to make glad the hearts of citizens who note in the increase of homes and families the true growth of a city.

The address of Governor Geer at Ashland, Saturday night, is a most important contribution to the campaign. It is a noteworthy and unanswerable argument against the fallacies and fancies of the "anti-imperialists."

Supposed Defect Not a Defect.

St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Not only is the nomination of Dr. Ames anything but a proof of the possibility of nominations by opposing parties, but those occasions must be rare indeed when any effective action of this kind can be taken. Not only must there be an absence of all contest on the side of the conspirators to enable them to desert their own ticket for their opponent's, but there must be a weak candidate on the other ticket for whom they can afford to vote. Moreover, to make it effective such a conspiracy must be known to hundreds and become a matter of common knowledge. It could be offset in twenty different ways, such as the withdrawal under pressure of the weaker candidate, or in the event of his probable refusal, by a concentration of voters on the stronger candidate. The fact of the matter is that this objection is largely imaginary. The possibility of working any such scheme is so small as to be negligible, and it is as possible for one party as another. So far as it is possible, it will force the best men to the front by discouraging the ambitions of weaklings. In this way, and because no Democrat can vote a Republican ticket or vice versa without sacrificing his vote for the candidates of his own party, this fancied defect will work its own cure. And in so far as it encourages the candidacy of stronger men it is one of the best features of the law, which ought not to be sacrificed to serve the ends of the ward heeler and the machine politician.

MINNEAPOLIS LAW APPROVED.

Interviews in St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Senator Hiler H. Horton was one of those who secured the amendment of the law in the Senate of 1899 so as to leave St. Paul out. "After the recent county convention," said he yesterday, "I am almost prepared to give my unqualified approval to the direct primary law. The great Republican Seventh Ward might as well have been unrepresented in that convention so far as having any influence in the results was concerned. But after all, the law has been only partially tested in Minneapolis. The results of the election are needed to show whether the allegation is true that the selection of the Republican ticket was largely affected by Democratic votes. If it is, the law should be modified before its operations are extended."

J. H. Skinner, president of St. Paul Jobbers' Union—I believe a direct primary law is a step in the right direction. It ought to allow candidates to go before the people with much greater freedom with regard to pledges, and in a position to give a much better administration than at present. The individual voter will control the nominations, and there will be no politicians with wards in their vest pockets. I favor any law that will increase the attendance and importance of the individual at the primaries.

C. J. McConville expressed himself in favor of the new law and said: "I believe we should give it a trial. Under the present system it is difficult to get good men to go to the primaries, as they feel everything is arranged beforehand, and they really have no voice in the selection of candidates. Under the primary law I believe good men will attend the primaries, good men will be nominated and will accept office when it is thus tendered by the people."

Armand Albrecht—I believe the Minneapolis primary law has sounded the death knell of the American political boss. The law may not in its present form be perfect in all essential features, but in its essence it is bound to find general adoption and approval, in my judgment, throughout the country. One of its cardinal advantages is the absolute secrecy of the ballot, so that all intimidation and improper influences are eliminated from the primay election. The Minneapolis system is a simple and economical one and the concurrence of the primaries of all parties on the same day is, to my mind, an advantage, notwithstanding the criticisms that have been made on that score. I think a similar law, with various improvements which experience will suggest, should be adopted throughout the state without delay. It is a boon not only to the voter, but to the candidate for office.

C. A. Severance—I am in favor of legislation that will give not only St. Paul but the whole state a direct primary election law. I believe the principle a salutary one. It affords every voter what the present system does not, a fair chance to expres shis choice.

"I have not given the subject much consideration," said A. K. Pruden, president of the Commercial Club, "but I should say that it is a long step in the right direction—the best election reform since the adoption of the Australian ballot. As far as I can see its defects are such as time will enable the people to detect and correct."

T. G. Walther, vice-president C. W. Hackett Hardware Company—I heartily favor the new primary law. I want to vote for my candidate at the primaries, and not for some delegate over whom I have no control.

L. W. French, secretary and treasurer Kellogg, Johnson & Co.—I approve of this change. It's a great improvement upon the old primary election.

Richards Gordon, of Gordon & Ferguson—It is a good thing, a very good thing. It permits a voter to express his preference directly without the intermediary of delegates or of political "workers." When I lived in Vicksburg, Miss., 20 years ago, we dispensed with primary elections. Some weeks before the general elections various men would publish cards announcing themselves as candidates. Each would-be officeholder would name his political party and request the support of his "fellow citizens." Well, the candidates and their friends would watch the result of these announcements, and the men who failed to arouse the necessary enthusiasm would gradually drop out. So when the convention of any party assembled there would be perhaps only three of four candidates still in the field. Then the convention would select one of those candidates.

Governor John Lind is heartily in favor of the direct primary law and considers it an important refom. When asked his opinion he responded energetically:

"I heartily believe that the introduction of the direct primary law is as much of a reform as was the introduction of the Australian ballot system some years ago. The law has come to stay. I shall urge in my message to the next Legislature that its operations be extended to the larger cities of the state, and I should be very glad to see it made general. It may be better for the present to have it introduced to the larger municipalities, where it can be enforced, until people grow accustomed to its workings."

Adjutant-General Lambert—Anything which tends to shorten the distance between voters and the matters to be voted upon is a step in the right direction. The direct primary election law is such a measure. I hope to see it extended to all the state.

From a Defeated Candidate.

F. G. McMillan, Minneapolis, chairman State Board of Equalization—I was one of the candidates defeated at the primary election. This, however, does not lessen my favorable opinion of the law. It is in the interests of the class of voters who never before had a chance in the primaries and it ought to be extended. It is an important reform in the methods of naming party candidates.

State Auditor R. C. Dunn—To my personal knowledge there have been times when not a sufficient number of men to organize have held a caucus and nominated convention delegates. It is common knowledge that a few men together have frequently carried caucuses. The new primary election law is a most excellent measures. Let the people decide upon their nominees. It is a measure which will bring the finish of machine politics.

J. W. L. Corning, president of the Board of School Inspectors—I have given the direct primary law considerable attention. I am convinced that it sounds the deathknell of wardheelers and machine politics, and when generally applied will enable a voter to attend primaries without the ancient conviction that it is a mere matter of form and his vote for delegates means nothing on the floor of the convention. For years we have had the choice of two evils. Either a Democratic ring to manipulate affairs according to their will, or a Republican ring to do the same. Give the people a chance. The law to my mind is in accord with the fundamental idea of our government.

Irwen Leviston, superintendent of public schools—To my mind the new law provides an informal election, at which the voters' majority decision decides what names shall go on the general election ticket. This is a most excellent idea and the measure is one which will produce good results.

Judge Bazille, of the Probate Court, expressed himself as warmly in favor of the direct primary law and its extension. "I consider it one of the best laws ever passed by a Minnesota Legislature," he said. "It is the only way to obtain an expression of the people's desire as to their public officers."

Controller J. J. McCardy—The law may not be perfect. Few laws are, and even those few may be evaded in one way or another by the unscrupulous. But the law is a step in the right direction, and if it becomes general, and public sentiment back of it, the men who are looking for votes will not attempt to "monkey" with it.

"I have been up to Minneapolis and talked with Judge Elliott and others regarding the working of the law, and from what I have learned I believe it is all right in theory if not in detail. I think its application ought to be extended." This was the expression of Assistant Corporation Attorney Griggs.

County Auditor W. R. Johnson—I have not looked closely into the merits of the law, but I have felt for years that the principle which seems to be its foundation was a good one. I have felt in many conventions I have attended as a delegate where delegates elected by the people as their representatives were traded like cattle, that the whole system was wrong. I have always been willing, when a candidate for office, to go before a convention of delegates on my merits as a citizen and a Republican, and whenever I have entered into any combination it has been because I have been forced to do so under the pernicious existing system. Anything that will eradicate that system I favor.

President Kenneth Clark, of the Fire Board, said he had given some attention to the features of the law and the results secured from its initial operation, and he believed it ought to be extended to every city in the United States. It would go farther toward clearing the political field of the wardheeler than any measure that has ever been adopted except the Australian ballot law.

Clerk of the District Court E. G. Rogers—While I am not prepared to express a positive opinion on the merits or demerits of the Hennepin County primary law, I am of the opinion that a direct primary law in the not remote future for the state is a certainty. Experience will probably remedy present evils. Public sentiment seems to be veering in favor of such a law, and under our system of government it would seem the nearer you get to the people the better.

County Attorney H. G. Bigelow—I believe in the direct primary. I have always believed if we could have a direct primary law which would call out the direct interest of the people and cause them to take part in the primary elections it would be a great improvement over the present method. I consider the Hennepin County law an improvement on all previous methods. A direct primary law would to a large extent do away with the present system of wild combinations and the general tone of politics would be elevated.

PEFFER FOR M'KINLEY.

Can't Stand Bryanite Assaults on His Country's Honor.

Editor San Francisco Call: I am asked why I favor the re-election of President McKinley. It is because after vehemently urging on a war with Spain, and after unbroken series of victories of our arms on sea and land; after an energetic and successful conduct of the war and an able and patriotic management of the affairs of Government and a brilliant handling of our foreign relations, adding glory and prestige to our people and terminating in a treaty placing us at the right of the front rank of the nations of earth, with new and grave responsibilities attaching—after all these splendid achievements, the Democratic party, aided by its fusion allies, has raised a hue and cry, charging all manner of public crimes against the Administration — despotic use of power, usurpation, fraud, corruption, perfidy, calling on the nations to behold our National shame and beseeching their own countrymen to aid them in their wicked onslaught upon the good name, the honor and dignity of their own people.

I look on this brazen assault on the honor of the Republic as little less than treason, and the success of the Republican party alone canc prevent the attainment of the end sought by the unholy alliance. If there were no other reasons, this alone would insure my vote for the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

To my mind, and I have watched things closely, the President's course from the beginning of the war to the present time, has been remarkably free from mistakes. He has been vigilant, active, patriotic and in all things American. In the government of the Philippines he has not only followed the law and the precedents, but he has done the work efficiently and humanely. He has treated the situation just as Washington did in the Northwest Territory, as Jefferson did in the Louisiana purchase, as Monroe did in Florida, as Jackson did in the Seminole country, as Polk did in Mexico, New Mexico and California, and as Lincoln did in the States of the Southern Confederacy. All the precedents are on the President's side.

The Democrats say "the very existence of the Republic is in issue," and they declare that to be the paramount issue of the campaign. If that be true, the danger in restoring their party to power is all the greater.

Republicans with absolute unanimity—men, women and children—have uniformly defended the Republic. The party was formed for that purpose. Republicans believe in equal liberty, equal laws and universal obedience to lawful authority. The wholesale disfranchisement of American citizens in Southern States is not being done by Republicans. Democrats are doing that.

The Democratic party is not fit to govern this country under modern conditions of universal freedom. Look back upon the second administration of President Cleveland. Upward of $200,000,000 in United States bonds were sold without special authority of Congress to procure gold for the redemption reserve. Most of the bonds were sold to or through syndicates of speculators at enormous profits, and it was expected by a great many people that the next Administration would continue the same policy. But the Republicans were wiser. The war with Spain made large expenditures necessary. Congress authorized the borrowing of money, and $200,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds were sold to our own people in sums of $25 up to $500. This is the fourth year of the McKinley Administration, and not a dollar of gold has been bought or borrowed; the Treasury now holds nearly, if not quite, $450,000,000 in gold coin and bullion, and there is plenty of money in the country for the transaction of the people's business.

The Nation is now passing through a crucial period beginning with the declaration of the war with Spain. Our Government and people have had to face new conditions and to solve new problems. All these the President now has well in hand. Our own countrymen and the people of other lands understand the policy of the United States in regard to these important affairs. Any change of administration before all these pending questions are settled would be attended with more or less inconvenience; but to change to a radically different policy is to assume much risk. If the Democrats mean what they say, their success this year will work a complete reversal of the wise and statesmanslike policy which has been inaugurated in the Philippines by President McKinley, and new and costly troubles would be sure to follow. Economy, justice, good government and humanity—every good impulse and every just and righteous consideration, demand that we do not change the policy of the Administration until the country is past the danger point.

The Chinese troubles serve to emphasize the importance of keeping trained men at the helm until the storm is scattered.

W. A. PEFFER.

Topeka, Kan., Sept. 20, 1900.

Application for Injunction Denied.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., Oct. 1.—The application of the Chicago Board of Trade for a temporary injunction restraining the Milwaukee outside commissionmen and brokers from making use of the Chicago quotations was denied by Judge Seaman today. The answer of the brokers, the court said, raises an issue as to whether the Board of Trade has not lost its right of property in the quotations by publication, which can only be determined by the taking of proofs. And until the proofs are taken and the clear right of the board to an injunction appears, a restraining order will not be granted. The case will be sent to a referee to take testimony.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Colonel Roosevelt probably didn't know that the Victor Bryanites were loaded.

Leave the Dowager Empress alone. She will turn up for the Fall clearance sales.

Towne apparently has not yet found out that he was crucified on a double cross.

Spain is building a navy which cannot be sunk. She evidently does not intend to launch it.

Bryan's war record is not very strong, but there seems to be no likelihood that he will ever break it.

Kentucky justice is working overtime these days. It is not every year that $100,000 rewards are lying around loose.

The candy venders, of course, have a pull, but just at present they seem to be pushing their business a little too hard.

Of course, Tammany cannot be expected to be easy on New York just now. Croker has got to have money to bet on Bryan.

A few Colorado receptions like the one at Victor will do more for the Republican ticket than the opposition of Altgeld.

John P. Altgeld is going to speak for Bryan in the East next week. It looks as if Croker was sparring for longer odds.

Now that the strike is going to be settled, we can add the full coal scuttle to the full dinner pail on our campaign banners.

Lord Roberts is going home, but, of course, he has left some "report with regret" blanks in South Africa for the other Generals to fill out.

Some cows belonging to John Preston, a farmer of Plainfield, Conn., broke through a fence into the orchard and ate their fill of apples. Some process of fermentation apparently was undergone by the fruit, for in a few hours the animals were gloriously tipsy. They lunged and staggered about, bellowed and fought and not for two days was it possible to milk them. In fact, the cider had stopped milk secretion.

A home for ex-millionaires is planned by one of their kind, and plungers who are broken on the wheel can find rest and quiet in Poughkeepsie. Richard B. Ferris, who for 50 years has been vice-president of the Bank of New York, closed a deal recently for the purchase of a historic mansion in Poughkeepsie, the fund for which was left by Samuel M. Pingle. The home is intended solely for men who have made and lost fortunes.

Two hundred and ten million barrels of apples are produced annually in the United States. Of these 3,000,000 barrels are sold to England alone. Iowa produces enough to supply England's demand. Every Winter from 6,000,000 to 10,000,000 barrels are held in cold storage. New York, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, California, Colorado, Missouri and Kansas are the apple states. Yet Maine ships 3,000,000 barrels and the other New England States about 2,000,000 each. All the Eastern and Middle States are vast producers, as well as Oregon.

Boston's annual try-out of hand organs and street pianos took place the other day under the auspices of the Board of Police Commissioners, and the owners of 30 instruments took part in the recital. Licenses for the coming year are to be issued this month, but none will be granted to the proprietors of hurdy-gurdies which failed to come up to the requirements of the police officials at the recent test. The recital took place in a hall hired for the purpose, where for over two hours a large audience was treated to a concert of ragtime music. Two professional tuners were in attendance, and upon their practiced ears the police tribunal depended for the decision and weeding out of discordant instruments.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

Likely.—Mrs. Youngwed—This milk ought to be good, dear. The man says it is certified. Youngwed—Who, by the Water Commissioner?—Detroit Free Press.

Unnoticed.—"Listen to me!" roared the stump orator. But his words were in vain. Without knowing it, he was addressing an audience made up almost entirely of cable-car conductors.—Harper's Bazar.

Enterprise.—"I'm a lucky fellow, I am. Both my coal bins are running over." "Got coal to burn, eh?" "Burn! I guess not. I can't afford to burn it. I'm going to sell it again."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

A Dilemma.—Driver of Terrified Pony—Pull your confounded dog away, you silly idiot! Leader of playful hoarhound—Beg pardon, sir, but master told me particular not to cross 'im, he might collar me!—Punch.

Fair Visitor—So you have really decided not to sell your house? Fair Host—Yes. You see, we placed the matter in the hands of a real estate agent. After reading his lovely advertisement of our property neither John nor myself could think of parting with such a wonderful and perfect home.—Tit-Bits.

Why She Had None.—"Have you noticed," said the secretary of the meeting to the treasurer, "that the little woman in the corner is the only one who has suggested no beautiful theory of child-training?" "Oh, she hasn't any," replied the treasurer. "How does that happen?" asked the secretary. "She's married and has children herself."—Chicago Evening Post.

My little West End friend came home from Sunday school yesterday in a very thoughtful mood. He sat beside his mother nervously crushing his lesson paper, and then said: "Say, mamma dear, don't you think I've been a pretty good boy since I started to go to Sunday school?" "Yes, my boy, certainly." "Don't you think I am good enough to be trusted now all right?" "Of course I do, but why do you ask?" "Oh, nothin', only I was just wondering why you kept the cookies locked up the same as you did before I went to Sunday school, that's all."—Albany Journal.

The "Idle" Soldiers.

Baltimore American.

("This country has a hundred thousand soldiers walking around in idleness."—W. J. Bryan.)

Walking around in idleness,
Wherever the flag's assailed;
Meeting the foe with an idle might
That never yet has failed.
Lawton, and Liscum, and Logan, too—
Capron—the list is long—
Went to their death in "idleness,"
And their "idleness" was wrong.

Grant and Sherman and Sheridan—
Why should we call the roll?
They idled away in the idle fight—
In fights that tried the soul.
"Walking around in idleness"—
Braving the leaden hail;
What of the glow of a nation's pride?
Is that but an idle tale?

"Walking around in idleness,"
Over the Pekin road;
Scorched and worn by the galling sun,
Lugging an idle load.
Fighting with idle energy,
Cheering with idle breath—
Thinking, with idle love, of home,
And dying an idle death.

Private Smith, with an idle groan,
Gone to a home above;
And idle tears mark the idle woe
And the idle mother's love.
"Walking around in idleness"—
Lawton and Liscum, too;
Legions more will come idly when
There are idle deeds to do.