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; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter street; F. W. Pitts, 1008 Market street; Foster & Orear, Ferry News Stand; L. E. Lee, Palace Hotel News Stand.

For sale in Los Angeles by B. F. Gardner, 339 So. Spring street, and Oliver & Haines, 106 So. Spring street.

For sale in Omaha by H. C. Shears, 105 N. Sixteenth street, and Burkalow Bros., 1612 Farnam street.

For sale in Salt Lake by the Salt Lake News Co., 77 W. Second South street.

For sale in New Orleans by Ernest & Co., 115 Royal street.

On file in Washington, D. C., with A. W. Dunn, 509 14th N. W.

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

TODAY'S WEATHER.—Showers; cooler; winds mostly southerly.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 10

PROPERTY AND POLITICAL RIGHTS.

Plutocracy, in a country committed to equal and universal suffrage, is a word of imaginary terrors. It may apply properly in a country where equal and universal suffrage is denied, but there can be no plutocracy in a country where equal and universal suffrage prevails, and where, indeed, as in our country, it is the very basis of political action.

We have men like Mr. C. E. S. Wood who fear that our country is galloping into a plutocracy. They do not sufficiently consider the composition of the forces which constitute the actual working system of the state. Property and wealth in the larger masses really have little influence in our politics. Poor men will always be numerous. Rich men will always be few. Equal and universal suffrage puts the same power in the hand of the poor man that the rich man possesses. Is it said that the latter is able by the influence of his wealth to control the vote of the former? Not so. The power does not exist. The employe is protected by secret ballot; his employer knows not how he votes, and any attempt by the employer to put pressure on the employe for control of his political action could only result in making it more certain that the latter would vote against the desire of the former. For human nature, when it has any possible chance of asserting independence, will never bear coercion. No wise employer, whatever his wealth, attempts it; and the working people of the country, time and again, have shown their independence of their employers, as they did notably in 1892, when the great body of employers of the country believed the general interests would be best subserved by re-election of President Harrison; yet the wage-people defeated him.

There are industrial discontents. They exist, have always existed, independent of the form of government. It was long thought by many that political equality would secure industrial equality, but even the most enthusiastic have now practically abandoned that idea. Neither science nor experience sanctions the doctrine of the equality of man; yet this unscientific and a priori idea must be unhesitatingly accepted as one of the paramount forces in American democracy—not realizable, indeed, as a principle or a fact, but effective as an element in the evolution of our civil institutions. At present, with us, the tendency is to make the government—the public business of the state—an industrial, as long ago it was made a political, partnership. Democracy is now construed towards communism, towards a labor copartnership. The political copartnership, on the basis of equality, has failed to make each citizen rich, and those who have not riches suspect those who have them to be robbers, and look upon the state as the chief robber of all. The privileges of democracy breed discontent, and whatever the form or the idea of the state, man cannot get rid of himself. His philosophy, his vagaries, his stomach, are always with him; democracy is not an insurance against the consequences of being born into the world.

But its tendencies are unquestionably as we have described them. This is no statement in hostility to these tendencies, but an inquiry after a truth. When we view the case thus, what danger can we see of the rule of wealth, or plutocracy? To us it seems imaginary. The conditions in our country are not as conditions have been in other countries in past times, when the masses had no political power. Here, through the greatest of all instruments of power, the free ballot, the masses possess far the larger share of it—virtually all. The suffrage of the country has unlimited power over its property, can take it all, through taxation. The people want "free" things, of which we have many in Portland already, and more are wanted; and we get them through taxation of those who have property in sight. As a consequence, the condition of property is low. Through equal and universal suffrage men of no property and little property govern. The outlook at this moment is, in our judgment, far worse for property than for popular rights. "Plutocracy," in a country like ours, is an impossibility. The word is a bugbear. In times past, in states where the people had no suffrage, it was a legitimate word. But with us it is a word of demagogical invention, or importation. We think we are not required to ask Mr. Wood's pardon here, since it was neither invented nor imported by him.

But why take so gloomy a view of the future of the people? Man, as man, is superior to wealth, always was; but now, through the power of the masses over government, he has in his hands the means of complete domination over wealth, and taxpayers know how he uses it. The main trouble is that the rulers of the country, under this system, are the cunning and unscrupulous politicians, who lead the masses, exploit the suffrage, squeeze the taxpayer and enrich themselves while pretending that wealth has too much influence, property too much power, in the government. Legitimate property, honest business, are ground heavily under this system, and men who can, try to escape it by putting values into invisible or intangible things; but visible property, as lands, buildings, merchandise, suffers ferribly. We don't know that it can be helped, for perhaps this plunder of property and business is necessary to maintenance of the rights of the people; but a little attention to the facts will show that property and business can have no dangerous power over government, under equal and universal suffrage. Nor are great fortunes more exempt than small ones, except as they may find means of hiding away through investment, in distant parts of the world. If property is fit to be an object of solicitude, there is reason to take a more gloomy view of the future of property than of political rights, for the many, who have little property or none, have full political rights, which give them entire power over all the property of the country. We are not prepared, therefore, to share the gloomy view of those who alarm themselves with the fear that this country will be subjected to the government of an aristocracy of wealth. The question is whether the whole country is to fall under the control of such oligarchies as rule New York, Philadelphia and Chicago; and every man knows what the source of the power of those oligarchies is. It is plunder of the unfortunate owner of property, through equal and universal suffrage. We have had some little taste of it here in Portland—enough, by the way, to account for the apparently irrecoverable depression of property values.

1900 IS NOT 1892.

It is true that labor was prosperous in 1892, yet voted a reversal of our National policy. The fact is cited as destructive of the hypothesis that prosperity will incline the laboring men to vote for McKinley in 1900. The cases are not parallel, and for two reasons.

Labor's rock of offense in 1892 was Whitelaw Reid. His paper, the New York Tribune, was notorious for continued warfare with the Typographical Union. The Republicans were warned in advance that his nomination would incur the enmity of labor organizations, and the sequel proved it's justification. Labor leaders denounced the ticket and came out for Cleveland. Other things entered into the result, but it will hardly be denied that if the labor vote antagonized by Mr. Reid had voted for Mr. Harrison, he might have carried New York, Illinois and Indiana and have been elected.

Labor was regardless of consequences in 1892 to an extent that cannot prevail in 1900. For many years there had been no great commercial or industrial distress, notwithstanding changes of Administration, and the natural feeling was that it would make no difference who was elected. Things have been different the past two Administrations. Memories of 1893-6 are still vivid. They will exert an influence. The burnt child dreads the fire.

It must not be forgotten, moreover, that in this election, as in that of 1896, the issues involve a very real and vital bearing upon our industrial welfare. We shall not quarrel with the man who thinks the tariff aspect of Cleveland's election caused the panic of 1893, though it did not. There are numbers who think so, and they will act accordingly. But this time there is no doubt about it. Whether prosperity was at stake in the election of 1892 or not, there is no doubt that it is at stake in 1900. We give labor credit for ability to understand this, as it understood it in 1896.

STRIKES HERE AND ABROAD.

The present coal strike in Pennsylvania has thus far been remarkably free from scenes of violence. There is in this country a total lack of such excuse for violence as has been present in the great coal strikes of France, whose horrors have been so powerfully depicted by Zola. The French coalminer is paid starvation wages. Young girls barely past puberty and women work underground naked to the waist, loading and pushing the coal cars to and fro in a hot, stifling atmosphere, water dripping everywhere upon them; but neither in the United States nor in England, since 1840, is female labor permitted in the mines. The French coalminers of both sexes are practically starved wolves, and when they strike and riot it is but the desperation of creatures maddened by oppression and morbidized by miserable diet, pestilential air and degrading sexual relations. Out of this French coal pit of filth, want, wretchedness and licentiousness no wonder crime comes forth periodically and runs amuck like a gaunt, starved lunatic through the land. A French coal mining strike is the wild cry of the "lost children" out of a hell of inhuman, cruel and hopeless conditions to which the greed of capital has consigned them. The riot and savagery of striking labor in France is the irruption of wild dogs chained and starved into ferocity in their kennels. Breaking their chains, this howling pack bursts forth, barking dismally for bread and snapping right and left at those who have starved them, to enjoy a holiday of luxurious existence.

A French coal mine strike and riot is an awful rebuke to organized greed and stony-hearted capital, for the French miners have been robbed of the rights of human nature. No wonder Zola saw the specter of another French "red terror" hovering over France, where labor is degraded into a wild beast by the greed and inhumanity of capital and the indifference of the law-making power, but out of our labor situation no "red terror" of anarchy need be apprehended, so long as patriotic men of courage, justice, peace and good will immensely outnumber the anarchists and demagogues of the land. When the quarrel of rioting labor is not just, it will not win in this land; it cannot win until the American flag ceases to stand for liberty throughout the land; individual liberty to have, hold and occupy your own property; individual liberty to sell your labor to whom you please, so long as the terms satisfy you. A nation that invites anarchy by the legal oppression of labor has good reason to fear the specter of the "red terror" that Zola sees hovering like a great unsightly bat with outstretched wings over France, but a nation that has always lifted free labor up since we cast the rattlesnake skin of slavery is not ready to be turned over to social disorder and political revolution, because labor anarchists sometimes attempt to deny that the right to work is as sacred as the right to strike.

The conservative labor of America will never let labor anarchists, like those of Coeur d'Alene, cut the throat of liberty under law. Labor lashed by starvation and hopeless misery into riot, rage and prospective terrorism is the picture that oppressed and tortured humanity may present any moment in France, but in the case of the Homestead riots of 1896 and the Coeur d'Alene riots of 1899 the labor that committed murder and wantonly destroyed property was well paid, well fed, well clothed, four times beyond the best remunerated identical labor of the highest and most humane civilization of Europe. There are probably 20,000,000 of wageworkers in the United States. The ballots of the wageworkers of America make its laws and unmake them, and the whole spirit of our laws is in defense of the rights of the workingman; not in contempt or subversion of those rights. The sympathy of the public is so strong with labor that seldom does labor fail to carry the public with its cause if it keeps within the law. It is only when labor wantonly destroys property or violently insists that every wageworker shall, under pain of death, ask leave of striking labor to earn his own bread under conditions and limitations fixed by striking labor, that the American public does not sympathize with American labor.

A DESERTED CAUSE.

The most recent exploit of the Civil Service Reform League was the ostentatious dispatch of circulars to Chairman Hanna and Chairman Jones demanding abstinence this year from calls upon Federal office-holders for campaign contributions. In due course of time a promise was obtained and promulgated from Chairman Jones, under the terms of which he undertook to forego assessing the Federal office-holders for funds to assist in Bryan's election and their own consequent removal from office—a result which the league must have regarded as a highly solemn and impartial achievement. This act, however, is apparently the only effort the reformers recognize as incumbent upon themselves this campaign. Yet there is another that may without impropriety be suggested.

Four years ago the league reflected upon the hostile attitude of the Democratic party toward civil service reform, and it issued an address to the country, setting forth the attitude of the parties to the reform, to the disadvantage of the Bryanites. Today the same hostile attitude is maintained, but we hear nothing about it. The most direct Bryanite assault upon the civil service is contained in a letter from Mr. Bryan himself, sent to a clerk in the railway mail service, at Indianapolis, and by its recipient given to the press. In this letter Mr. Bryan says:

> We are in favor of fixed terms of office in the civil departments of the Government. We want it so that when a man goes into office he will know how long he is going to stay and when he is going out. We do not want to build up an office-holding class and fill our offices for life, because men appointed under those conditions are likely to have no concern except to draw their salaries. We believe that a life tenure, which relieves a man from all further care, is destructive of the highest form of citizenship, and ought not to be tolerated in a country like ours.

The spoils doctrine was never more clearly stated or positively indorsed. Mr. Schurz is president of the Civil Service Reform League. He is working for Bryan, and will doubtless prefer to sacrifice the civil service as well as the gold standard upon the altar of Aguinaldism. But that is no reason why the league as a whole must do likewise. Is Schurz the whole league, or is he running it to suit himself, regardless of the consent of the governed?

AMERICAN MACHINERY ABROAD.

The growth within the past four years in our shipments of manufactures to foreign countries is amazing. This is especially true in regard to American machinery, the exports of which in the last year were enormous, and the demand for which is still rapidly increasing. This represents more than a triumph in finance; it is a tribute to the inventive and mechanical skill of American workers in iron and steel that cannot be questioned. When skilled English engineers, with a natural preference for their own land and its products, and when great inventors and manufacturers of the Old World, come to America to obtain machinery that cannot be gotten elsewhere, but one conclusion is possible. Not only England, but France, Germany and Russia, share in the admiration for American ingenuity and skill thus disclosed, and buy of us as a matter of highest self-interest.

There is no sentiment in all this. It is a plain business proposition. These foreigners who are buying shiploads of machinery from us would not come hither as purchasers if they could do as well or nearly as well as at home. The truth is that Americans lead in all labor-saving and progressive ideas as worked out in machinery, and it is this that enables them to attract Old World buyers and underbid on contracts foreign competitors who have the initial advantage of low wages. The American manufacturer pays the highest wages given by any employer in the world, but he gets more out of his men because of their readiness to lay hold on mechanical means for reducing the cost of production.

These are among the glorious victories of peace—victories many of them made possible, however, by war and its ever-present menace. With the products of our skill, industry and enterprise in demand everywhere, added to the fact that we are fast becoming the great creditor Nation of the world, surely there is not much to desire in the way of change in our National policy.

The Greenbackers have the best of the fiat-money argument when they say to the free-silver Bryanites: "If a legal-tender dollar can be made out of less than 50 cents' worth of silver, why not make a more convenient dollar out of less than a cent's worth of paper?" The advocates of free silver, bimetalism and greenbacks are all bitten by the same bee in their bonnet, that all money is the creation of law, and that it is law that gives it monetary force. Silverism and greenbackism are fathered by the same fallacy. The silver craze, born out of the greenback inflation, has loaded us up with millions of unavailable assets in shape of silver and added that amount to our National obligations. We cannot force silver dollars into circulation; we cannot sell our silver hoard to any advantage. Greenback inflation, held to be a grave military necessity during the Civil War, cost us $800,000,000, and the silver craze has cost us over $600,000,000. The only difference today between the Populist who is a Greenbacker pure and simple and a Free-Silverite is the difference between two roads that both lead to unlimited flat money, whether silver or paper, the difference defined by the man who, when asked which of two roads to take, replied: "Well, they are both so bad that if you take either one you will wish you had taken the other."

The initiative and referendum is a popular measure of theoretical reform with political doctrinaires, but the trouble is that in practice the people seldom pay any attention to it. At the recent election in Maine there was submitted an amendment to the constitution establishing the office of State Auditor. The proposition was defeated; but it is noteworthy that little attention was paid to it by the voters. In Cumberland County, out of 15,000 men who voted for Governor, only 3536 had interest enough to mark their ballots either way. The average voter does not improve the opportunity of the referendum when it comes rarely; the vote on the woman suffrage and other amendments at our June election shows that the voter in Oregon is about as indifferent in such matters as the voter in Maine. In practice the initiative and referendum comes to naught; sometimes, as in one of the Dakotas, the failure to vote on amendments referred to the people has saddled the state with unwelcome and most expensive obligations, which have been incurred through default of the popular vote.

It may be said of John G. Woolley, Prohibition candidate for President of the United States, that a man of more lofty political ideals never raised or bore the standard of political conscience into a hopeless fight. It is the great misfortune of Mr. Woolley that he has to deal with ready-made men and not men fashioned to his order. Speaking of himself and his associates in the prohibition idea, he says: "As to when or how, or, indeed, whether we may compass the destruction of the liquor traffic, we are anxious, but we do not despair; confident, but we do not prophesy; but meanwhile, we roll in the luxury of self-respect and glorify God and our country with our bodies and our spirits, which are theirs." This is rather more elaborate than the simple, persistent declaration of our prohibition friends, with which, through repetition hammered on the ear, we have become familiar in past years, that they were content to "stand up and be counted" against the liquor traffic, but it amounts to the same thing.

The Oregonian has received from an anonymous San Francisco source printed proof sheets of an elaborate article exposing the inaccuracies, absurdities and blunders of various school geographies. It happens that these same text-books were in competition with Harr Wagner's great work, and the suspicion would therefore seem to be justified that the eminent California scholar had compiled and consigned to the mails these copious criticisms of the rival books. The Oregonian is willing to concede without examination the demerits and defects of these geographies. They have nothing—or very little—to do with the case. How they excuse the superlative stupidity and babbling ignorance so abundantly displayed throughout the Wagner geography it does not see.

Politicians tramping over Oregon are haranguing on the dangers of wealth and its designs on the liberties of the people; though there is hardly enough wealth in Oregon to set a hen withal. What Oregon wants is wealth, and wealth in great masses and combinations, for the development of great industries. The state gets ahead but slowly, because it is so poor. Yet the Bryan doctrine is that wealth is the public enemy; and this is the staple of the Bryan campaign. One thing it is doing; it is making capital extremely wary and cautious, is causing slackness already in the operations of business, is shortening orders and contracts and putting us on the start for another period of "hard times," sure to ensue if Bryan's party should be successful.

Bryan makes his campaign against "combinations of capital" and "aggregations of capital." For the present he ignores "16 to 1," and has less and less to say about "imperialism." But should he become President, is it likely that means would be found to prevent combinations of capital, or would the country acquiesce in such endeavor, if Bryan's party attempted it? What would be practicable here? Are industrial enterprises to be forbidden because they are on a large scale? It is as well to have definite ideas about these things.

The political oratory of the present year in the great states is awfully poor. Bryan is reported daily; so is Roosevelt, and less noted persons are everywhere on the stump. East of the Rocky Mountains no speech has yet appeared comparable in ability with that delivered at Hillsboro, Or., by Hon. George H. Williams. Bryan's work this year strikes every reader as far below his performances four years ago, and Roosevelt has nowhere come up to public expectation. It is a dreary lot of stuff we get from the "great orators" every day.

A Baker City dispatch to the Spokane Spokesman-Review says that the "enthusiasm of the crowd" that listened to Anti-Imperialist C. E. S. Wood's recent anti-imperialist oration "was not with the speaker. Bets of $100 were made here tonight that McKinley will carry Baker County, heretofore a Democratic county." For the sake of a worthy and able Portland citizen who has gone wrong politically, let us express the hope that Baker County has not conceived a sudden affection for McKinley for the enemies he has made.

Men can't vote for Bryan without voting for sixteen to one, and for everything the country condemned four years ago.

An Independent Estimate.

The Boston Herald is the great newspaper of New England. Throughout that section its circulation is general, indeed universal. It is an independent jou nal, with leanings towards the Democratic party during many years, till the nomination of Bryan in 1896 compelled it to support of McKinley. It has since been unable to favor the Bryanized Democratic party, but is studiously fair and often sympathetic towards it, in the presentation of news and discussion of opinions and events. In its issue of October 4 it has the following on the political outlook in New England and the country at large:

> The Herald has, perhaps, said enough with regard to the political indications in the country, but it would not be a fully faithful recorder of the signs of the times if it omitted to note the increasing indications towards the support of McKinley in the portion of the country in which it is published. These are found very much in the business world here. They are seen among people who do not fully sustain the President's action in administration, and who are less influenced by the feeling that the Nation is fairly prosperous now than by the dread of what such a change as they apprehend would be produced by the election of Bryan might bring. This has weight in many minds, and we think is aiding the Republicans in this region more than campaign speaking and campaign canvassing. We write of the situation here. Of what it is in other quarters, we have varying and conflicting accounts. The Republicans are claiming that they are to carry even Mr. Bryan's own state of Nebraska, and to make heavy inroads upon that rock-ribbed Democratic state, Missouri. We place no more confidence in them than we do in the Democratic claim that this party is to succeed in Illinois and Ohio. New York, where the same influences operate as are apparent in New England, we regard as practically conceded to the Republicans, while Indiana, in a spirit of unwonted candor on both sides, is admitted to be in doubt as to her electoral vote.

"GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION."

Events Show Exactly What Bryanism Means by It.

St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Mr. Bryan in his letter of acceptance referred to what he said was "the growing practice of calling on the army to settle labor troubles," the evident purpose of this utterance being to commend himself to the lawless elements of the country as the champion of "Free Riot." But it was a gross perversion of the facts of history. The New York Evening Post points out the fact the army has been used to put down labor disturbances only twice since the great railway strikes of nearly a quarter of a century ago. The two occasions were the Debs riots in Chicago and the Coeur d'Alene riots in Idaho. In the first case Chicago was terrorized by a lawless mob engaged in a furious riot of violence and incendiarism which the city government did nothing to restrain. It was then the duty of Governor Altgeld to call out the militia, but he practically let the rioters have their own way. The mob had stopped the running of all trains, including those carrying the United States mails, and on this ground President Cleveland promptly sent some regular troops to prevent interference with the mails. The whole nation, without regard to party, applauded his action. Mr. Bryan would not have interfered, and the reign of free riot and incendiarism would probably have continued until Chicago was in ashes.

In the second case, early in 1899, as a sequence of the labor troubles which had broken out among the Coeur d'Alene miners, a body of armed and masked men seized a Northern Pacific train and ran it to Wardner to reinforce the strikers. Here a mob of 1000 men put dynamite under the mill of two non-union mines and utterly destroyed the $250,000 structure. The mob terrorized the whole country. The county authorities would do nothing. The Democratic-Populist Governor, Steunenberg, believed it his duty to restore order. The Idaho militia being in the Philippines, he called on President McKinley for federal troops to suppress the riots. The President did so, as he was bound to do, on the request of the Governor of the state. Bryan would not have furnished the troops, and the reign of terror established by the lawless mob would probably have continued until every mining mill in the state had been destroyed and whole counties depopulated. As the Chicago Tribune says, "the odd thing is that in the first case a Democratic President acted without the request of a Democratic Mayor or Governor, and in the other case a Republican President acted on the request of a Democratic-Populist Governor." In both cases the law-abiding people of the whole country approved their action. But Free Riot is one of the cardinal articles of Bryan's creed; and his protest against the use of the troops in both these cases shows that, in like crises, he would do nothing to restrain any outbreak of lawless violence which the local authorities were unable to repress, either upon the call of the Governor of a state, as the Constitution requires, or in any other case.

DISAPPEARANCE OF KASKASKIA.

No Vestige Remains of the Old Town of Illinois.

Chicago Inter Ocean, October 6.

One hundred years before Illinois became a territory, and 111 years before it became a state, there was a town at Kaskaskia. Fifty years before there was a white settlement at St. Louis or any military post at Pittsburg, and 96 years before the foundations were laid for Fort Dearborn at Chicago, Kaskaskia was a thriving village.

As early as 1710 there were in the town three mills for grinding corn. As early as 1765 the town contained 65 families of whites. In 1771, five years before the Revolutionary War, it contained 80 houses, and had a population of 500 whites and 500 negroes. In 1809 it was made the capital of Illinois territory. It was the capital of the state from 1818 until 1821, and was the seat of Randolph County until 1847.

The first brick house built west of Pittsburg was constructed in Kaskaskia. For over half a century Kaskaskia was the metropolis of the Upper Mississippi Valley, and was the focus of commerce in the Northwest Territory.

On Thursday the last vestige of this historic settlement was swept away by the Mississippi River. The work of destruction that began with the great flood of 1844 was completed, and the home of the early Illinois Governors—the first state capital—ceased to exist. Its destruction was complete. Not a stone was left to mark the place.

Chicago, that was built in a swamp, is the second city in America. New Orleans, located in what was believed an unsafe and unhealthy district, is the commercial metropolis of the Southwest. But Kaskaskia, which was set on a spot chosen from the boundless variety of the Virgin West, is merely a memory.

Hill's Work at Kansas City.

New York Sun.

That the Hon. David B. Hill played hanky panky with the Democratic income tax at Kansas City seems to be affirmed by himself in his speech in Brooklyn on Monday night:

> It is true, as is well known, that I sought to secure a modification of the proposed platform in some particulars, in which, however, I was only partially successful.

As Mr. Hill has defended everything in the platform excepting free silver, which was reaffirmed against his objections, one must conclude that his "partial success" was in preventing a specific reaffirmation of the income tax. It was a glorious victory.

Demo-Pops Out of Tune.

Senator Butler attended a Populist meeting near Fayetteville, N. C., a few days since, at which he made a speech denouncing the Democrats. The Senator had little to say about the Presidential campaign, but hurled metaphorical bricks at the Democrats for their violence in the late state canvass. The Populist meetings nowadays in North Carolina are devoted to efforts to get even with their former allies for their course in state politics. The breach between the Populists and the Democrats in that section seems to be irreparable. Those Populists who really adhere to Bryanism went back to the Democratic party some time ago.

SENATOR HOAR ON THE ISSUES.

I am asked to state briefly why I think anti-imperialists should vote for President McKinley this Fall. There is, in judgment, such a thing as imperialism, and such a thing as anti-imperialism. The imperialist says the Philippine Islands are ours. The anti-imperialists say the Philippine Islands belong to the Philippine people. The imperialist says he will establish for them the best government we think they are fit for. The anti-imperialists say they have a right to establish for themselves such a government as they think good and fit for themselves.

It is thoroughly unmanly and un-American to take to the woods. Either President McKinley or Mr. Bryan will be chosen. Voting for a third party, under the circumstances, is no better than not to vote at all. You may as well leave your vote with the census officer as to leave it with the election officer, unless you vote for one or the other of these two men.

Now, President McKinley made the treaty, and Mr. Bryan, when its defeat was assured, came to Washington and saved it. These two great political leaders, between whom you are to take your choice, are equally responsible for everything that has happened so far. When the treaty became the law of the land, the public faith was pledged to pay $20,000,000 for sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, and that Congress, and not the people, should dispose of them hereafter. It became the Constitutional duty of the President, until Congress should act, or declare otherwise, to reduce them to order and submission. The Supreme Court of the United States so held long ago. The only difference up to this point between President McKinley and Mr. Bryan is that President McKinley believed he was doing right, belonged to a party which had always been, as he himself had been, the champion of political liberty, in the past, and is right on all of the other questions that are at stake in the coming election, and is fit to be trusted with all new questions that shall arise. On the other hand, Mr. Bryan thought the whole transaction wrong, makes some thin and frivolous excuses for his conduct, and the party with whom he acts; and the man who surround him and will surround him as his counselors are men who have been the opponents of righteousness, equality and civil liberty always in the past, are wrong on all the other great questions that are at stake in the present election, and are not, in my judgment, to be trusted with new questions, however important or vital, that are to come up in the future.

I say to the lover of liberty, I say to the anti-imperialist, I say to the man who thinks the Republican party has made a great and grievous mistake, you cannot look for the correction of that mistake to a candidate or to a party who, whatever they may think of the principles applied to the Philippine Islands, means to apply those principles in their worst form to citizens of the United States.

In the matter of imperialism there has been little practical difference between President McKinley and Mr. Bryan in the past. There will be little practical difference in the future. Mr. Bryan does not even promise to use his power as Executive and Commander-in-Chief in calling our troops from the Philippines. He only promises to call Congress together. He knows very well he cannot command even the strength of his own party to undo the mischief which 17 of his own followers in the Senate, at his own instance, wrought when they ratified the treaty—Messrs. McEnery, McLaurin, Morgan, Pettus, Sullivan, Allen, Butler, Harris, Teller, Kyle and Jones of Nevada—have not changed their minds. Possibly Mr. Clay, of Georgia, and Mr. Kenney, of Delaware, among his associates, have done so. It is hopeless, even if the Democrats get a tie, or even a majority in the Senate, to expect them to accomplish anything in behalf of the independence of the Philippine Islands.

In 1896 you regarded Mr. Bryan's campaign as a "passionate crusade of dishonor." You said its success would bring with it not only adversity, but disgrace. Would its success not bring disgrace now? Mr. Bryan said at Topeka that if he were elected the free coinage of silver should be accomplished before another Presidential election. Secretary Gage says he can lawfully accomplish it by Executive power alone. Whether Mr. Gage is right in his construction of the powers of the President under existing law, I will not undertake to say. But I will undertake to say that Mr. Bryan will not hesitate to use that power if he has the great authority of Mr. Gage for its lawfulness. I do not believe the man who promoted the ratification of the Spanish treaty means business in this matter of the Philippine Islands. But I do believe he means business in the matter of the free coinage of silver, in the matter of free trade, and in his purpose to reconstruct the Supreme Court. He means bad business. He means business which will overthrow prosperity and embarrass manufacture; which will reduce wages and destroy credit; which will debauch the currency and render the standard of value uncertain; which will impair the obligation of contracts and the value of savings; which will hurt our credit and break our faith. All this you believe, as I do. You said so in 1896. You have been confirmed in your opinion by everything that has happened since. Will you support a candidate who, if he have his way, you admit will accomplish all these things, because he and his party give you an empty promise of justice to 10,000,000 Asiatics, and at the same time threaten grievous injustice and wrong to 10,000,000 Americans?

I will not vote for a candidate for the Presidency, or help to bring a party into power who, while they plant one heel on the forehead of Booker Washington and the other on the forehead of Robert Small, wave the flag over Aguinaldo and Mabini.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

Worcester, Mass, October 1.

Better Safe Than Sorry.

Hartford Courant.

The question at the core of this campaign is a very simple one. Isn't it better to be safe than to be sorry? In other words, Isn't it wiser to put in the White House for four years to come a man who is pledged to maintain the gold standard than to put there a man who is pledged to strike it down (and the Nation's credit with it) if he can?

That Full Dinner Pail.

Chicago Record.

In speaking of the full dinner pail, Mr. Bryan declares that what the workingmen need is intellectual food. Would he take out the pie, cake and chicken from the laborer's lunch basket and substitute therefor parts of the Congressional Record relating to free silver, expansion and trusts?

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The colored people of Oregon refuse to be oppressed, even in Bryan's speeches.

The situation in China seems to have slowed down to the ultimatum stage once more.

For a dead man, Professor Andree supplies a remarkable amount of "copy" to the newspapers.

Bryan does not think much of the full dinner pail as an issue. The full pocketbook for W. J. Bryan is what he seems to be after.

It is usually advisable for a minister who has any swearing to do to hire someone who can do it in such a way as not to excite comment.

Some one who has an issue which will not wear out after two days' use can hear of something to his advantage by communication with J. K. Jones.

The fact that Bourke Cockran and other Democratic orators have weak throats does not trouble Bryan. He is glad of an opportunity to do all the talking.

It is said that people usually hear better with their right ear than their left. The Democrats must have had their left ears to the ground when they heard the voice of the public calling them to the rescue.

It is now said that Oom Paul paid Web Davis $125,000 for championing the cause of the Boers in America. If this is true it shows that even Uncle Paul can't resist the temptation to buy a gold brick when it is offered to him cheap.

The vibratory motion of the leaf of the aspen and other poplar trees is caused by a flattening of the petiole at its junction with the lamina. The lower part of the leaf stalk is elongated and rigid, thus forming a basis upon which the flattened portion of the stalk can, in virtue of its elasticity, move to and fro as the wind acts upon the leaves of the tree. There have been several theories offered by botanists, none of them very satisfactory, however, to explain the origin of this curious structure and the purpose served by the "trembling" of the leaf. H. J. Colbourn, in a recent letter to Nature, suggests a new explanation. He thinks the vibration may be an adaptation for rapidly throwing off the excess of condensed moisture, which is likely to form on the foliage of trees in marshy situations.

At one of the meetings during the opening of the Republican campaign in Ohio Senator Hanna was called upon for a speech after Senator Depew had concluded. The Ohio Senator remarked that it was not fair to expect a speech from him after the able address of his predecessor, so instead of making a speech he would tell a story, illustrative of the workingman's dinner pail. A farmer, he said, bought a cow and calf from a neighbor. He started to lead the cow home, the calf following along beside. On the way a steer jumped the fence and tore down the road, the calf following. Tying the cow to a rail the farmer gave chase after the calf. He ran until he was out of breath, and finding he could not overtake the fleeing animal he stopped and shaking his fist in its direction, shouted: "Go ahead, blame you! You'll know the difference when dinner time comes!"

Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, the young millionaire who recently entered the ministry, preached his first sermon in St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, in New Haven, Conn., on September 16. A little before the service he said to a Yale professor: "I almost wish I was a poor man. The money that I have inherited is an incumbrance to me. People will never forget that I am wealthy, and that in spite of all I can do my advent to the priesthood has been sensational. Could I have become a minister without attracting all this attention I could have done more good. It is discouraging to me, because in my audiences I shall not be able to know whether the people are worshipers or are there out of curiosity. And what can a rich man do? If he helps the people of Galveston he will be immediately advertised in all the papers. But I am going ahead and live down my reputation as a rich man. I want to be a humble preacher of the word of God, and I hope, somehow, to make the people forget that I have been called a millionaire."

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

His Reply.—Sappington—Your sister looks sweet enough to eat. Little Rodney—She does eat.—Judge.

Up to Date.—Customer—Some crabs, please. Waiter—Shirt-waist or hunting-case? Customer—What do you mean? Waiter—Soft or hard-shell, sir?—Puck.

He—How I envy the man who just sang the solo. She—Why, I thought he had an exceptionally poor voice. He—Oh, it isn't his voice I envy; it's his nerve.—Tit-Bits.

Early Piety.—Rev. Mr. Whangle—My boy, I'm sorry to see you flying your kite on the Sabbath day. The Boy—It's all right, sir; this is a regular Sunday kite, this is. It's made out of the Christian Globe, an' got a tail of tracts. I've got another for week days.—Pick-Me-Up.

Teacher—Jimmy, if you found 18 pennies and another boy should take two-thirds of them away, what would each of you have? Jimmy—I'd have six pennies an' he'd have a good thumpin', 'less he handed back the rest of 'em mighty quick.—Glasgow Evening Times.

Unanimous Opinion.—"Candidly, Jane," said a September bridegroom to his bride in a spirit of self-abasement, "I can't perceive what you saw in me to make you willing to marry me." "Never mind, dear," replied the bride; "that's what all my relatives say."—Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph.

The Official Forecaster.

Chicago Times-Herald.

The forecast man sits down
And figures pro and con;
He's sure of Arkansaw
And Maine and Oregon;
Ohio and New York
He takes with grace and ease;
He carries Illinois
As calmly as you please;
New Jersey, Maryland,
Wisconsin, Delaware,
He gathers in his list
And never turns a hair!
He studies, then, a bit,
Subtracts and multiplies,
And, wearied, finally
He shuts his tired eyes
And gives the other side
A small state here and there—
Not that its vote's in doubt,
But merely to be fair.

All Sorts of People.

Indianapolis Sun.

To make the world go, why, it takes
All kinds of people. There's the snob,
The pampered pup, the rounder rake,
The woman ever at the job
Of spreading tales; the man who'll lie;
"I'll pay for this some other time,"
E'en while he looks you in the eye
With nerve and manner most sublime.
Then there's the hypocritic man,
The jealous woman, and the sneak,
The selfish man with tracts of land,
Too wrapped up in himself to speak!
It takes them all—the high and low,
For they unto the world belong.
It takes them all to make her go—
To keep her always going—wrong.