

The Oregonian.

Entered at the Postoffice at Portland, Oregon, as second-class matter. REVISING SUBSCRIPTION RATES. By Mail (postage prepaid, in Advance): Daily, with Sunday, per month, \$1.00; Daily, with Sunday, per year, \$10.00; Sunday, per year, \$5.00; The Weekly, 3 months, \$1.50; The Weekly, 6 months, \$2.50; The Weekly, 1 year, \$4.50; Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays excepted, 15c; Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays included, 20c.

POSTAGE RATES. United States, Canada and Mexico: 10 to 14-page paper, \$1.00; 14 to 20-page paper, \$1.25; Foreign rates double.

News or discussion intended for publication in The Oregonian should be addressed to the Editor, The Oregonian, 205 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 undertake to return any manuscript sent to it without solicitation. No stamps should be included for this purpose.

Eastern Business Office, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, Tribune building, New York City; 460 "The Hookery," Chicago; the S. G. Beckwith special agency, Boston; the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street, and Charles McDonald, 53 Washington street.

For sale in Los Angeles by H. F. Gardner, 259 So. Spring street, and Oliver & Halnes, 305 So. Spring street.

For sale in Sacramento by Sacramento News Co., 422 K street, Sacramento, Cal.; for sale in Chicago by the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street, and Charles McDonald, 53 Washington street.

For sale in Omaha by Barklow Bros., 1612 Farnam street.

For sale in Salt Lake by the Salt Lake News Co., 71 W. Second South street.

For sale in New Orleans by A. C. Phelps, 609 Commercial street.

For sale in Ogden by W. C. Kind, 204 Twentieth street, and C. H. Myers.

On file at Charleston, S. C., in the Oregon exhibit at the exposition.

For sale in Washington, D. C., by the Ebbett House News.

For sale in Denver, Colo., by Hamilton & McFarland, 1200 Broadway street; Louthan & Jackson Book & Stationery Co., 15th and Lawrence streets; A. Series, 1633 Champa street.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Partly cloudy, with westerly winds.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 52; minimum temperature, 39; precipitation, 0.02 inch.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, MAR. 19.

FALSE AND PERNICIOUS.

The proxy system as now in force in the Republican party in Multnomah County and in Oregon is false in theory and in practice most vicious. It should at once be superseded by a more just and modern plan.

Upon what principle of representative government does the man who has been by law intrusted with delegated powers undertake at his own instance and discretion to delegate those powers to another? The party has elected him, John Jones, to do the work, presumably because it prefers him to William Smith, who was not selected and possibly was even rejected upon application.

Now for Jones to turn this work over to Smith involves an unwarranted abdication of individual authority. It is a legislative conveyance which Jones has no right to bestow or Smith to accept.

These delegates are officers of the law. They are chosen at an election regularly called by the courts under statutory provisions. The County Clerk has certified their election to their offices and the law expressly enacts that they "shall be entitled to sit as the delegates from the said precinct in such conventions."

The system is dangerous in practice, also, as has been said, and evidence of it is plentiful. It opens opportunities for fraud, for perversion or defeat of the popular will. In this way men repudiated at the polls may sit in conventions, the contingency of which and the temptation are hostile to every consideration of fair play and public policy.

against all contingencies the claim of England to the title of "Mistress of the Seas." Her power in this role is yet to be tested by modern standards, but her preparation for defense of this title, if called upon, is certainly being made regardless of expense, and it comes in touch with the best in naval architecture and armament.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Hepburn of Iowa, who is among the foremost advocates of using Government money for constructing an isthmian canal, incoherently boasts his lifelong antagonism to river and harbor improvement. His opposition is most unreasoning and irresponsible, and the positions he assumes are indefensible.

There are those who profess to condemn, on principle, every diversion of taxes to internal improvements. It is a contention, however, that has been discredited by Jefferson and other eminent statesmen of various political affiliations. The question is not one of academic reasoning, but of political expediency, and the ease with which Government raises money through the two methods reserved to it by the Constitution (the customs and internal revenue) has long demonstrated the marked desirability that this class of work should be done by society through the Federal Government, rather than through special appropriations to individual States.

The question is not one of academic reasoning, but of political expediency, and the ease with which Government raises money through the two methods reserved to it by the Constitution (the customs and internal revenue) has long demonstrated the marked desirability that this class of work should be done by society through the Federal Government, rather than through special appropriations to individual States.

Mr. Hepburn is forced to admit that the jobs which formerly characterized river and harbor bills has largely disappeared. No fact in our legislation is more strikingly apparent, and its explanation consists largely in the development of our Engineer Corps to its present trustworthiness and efficacy. It would be impossible for Hepburn or any one else to repeat today the impressive attacks made on river and harbor bills by the "Mistress of the Seas" when the Federal and State appropriations that used to be made for streams that never could be made navigable and for upper reaches of streams whose lower portions were impassable are conspicuous by their absence now, for the simple reason that they have had to run the gauntlet of examinations and recommendations made by boards of United States Engineers. The great bulk of the appropriations is forced to admit that Mr. Hepburn's unreasoning attitude is clearly discovered in his recommendations that Congress set a limit to the depth of harbors and the draft of ships. He might just as well propose that Congress should say how many bushels of wheat shall be sown on an acre or how many letters a man can mail at the New York postoffice in any one day.

Harbors must be deep enough to accommodate the ships that seek them, and the dimensions of the ships will be determined by conditions of trade and tonnage, which Congress is powerless to control. The sole object, of course, in limiting depth of harbors and draft of vessels is to set an arbitrary limit on expenditures. These undertakings cannot be controlled that way. The work done must be commensurate to the need. To set a limit at thirty feet of water might work injustice to some part of the coast, and it would certainly encourage every minor port to demand thirty feet, whether it had use or not for more than twenty.

The justification of river and harbor bills is in their fruits. Mississippi and Columbia River commerce, New York harbor, Galveston and the Erie Canal system are illustrations in point; and no section of the country has gained more or now hopes for more from its improvement than the Mississippi Basin, of which Iowa forms so important a part. Mississippi River improvement has had greatly to do with making the State of Iowa what it is today. There are few more ambitious enterprises on the globe today than the dream of a great commercial highway from Lake Michigan via Chicago River to the Gulf of Mexico—a project that means much to Iowa as well as to the whole Mississippi Basin.

Mr. Hepburn's course is not only adverse to world-wide commercial development, but hostile to the interests of his own State.

A SATISFACTORY ADJUSTMENT.

The relief promised the commerce of Portland through putting on another tug at the mouth of the river and increasing the number of pilots is exceedingly gratifying. The Oregonian believed that relief lay not in attempting to hush up comment upon a condition of affairs at the mouth of the Columbia River that was distinctly inimical to the best interests of Portland and the state, but in giving the broadest publicity possible to the plain facts in the premises. It believed that President Mohler, of the O. R. & N. Co., would refuse to be a party to the selfish scheme of a ring seeking to monopolize the interests of its members, as represented by a wage out of all proportion to the service rendered. The sequel has proved this estimate to be correct. Mr. Mohler, for his company, has met the issue fairly, and relief to our belated and congested commerce is in sight. That is to say, the coming season's shipping will not be delayed at the mouth of the river waiting for tug and pilot service, as it was last season. An open, outspoken policy in a matter of this kind is the best policy.

Commerce is not carried on in corners. Its outgoings and incomings are not of the secret service type. If its operations are facilitated at any port, the commercial, or more directly speaking, the shipping world, knows and appreciates that fact; if its operations are cramped and delayed by a narrow, selfish policy directed to the exclusion of a part of entry, the sea captains who stand on and off the harbor entrance for days waiting in vain to be served may reasonably be expected to make the cause of their detention, especially if it should result in loss of vessel or charter, as sometimes happens, known to all the world. For the commercial advisers of the port to imagine that silence on their part and on the part of the press means the exclusion of the British Empire for carrying on inland war are being severely tested. Lack of drill and preparation in the army are freely alleged; the unprogressive military spirit of British officers is given as the reason for the sacrifice of the lives of thousands of British soldiers to the quick movements and heroically aggressive tactics of the Boer Generals. Whatever censure this kind of policy may attract from the War Office, the Admiralty is forestalled by its determination to make good

increased pay. Moral—if you want anything, ask for it. Grumbling under one's breath does not pay.

VETERANS AND SOLDIERS' HOMES.

The American people do not mean to neglect their soldiers, living or dead. Massachusetts has just voted to erect a statue of General Charles Devens, a conscientious war Democrat of 1861, who in 1861, as United States Marshal, sent Thomas Sims back to slavery. The Federal pension roll is enormous. Federal Soldiers' Homes have been generously established. And yet the pension roll is open to criticism because it has been swelled beyond reason through lax pension laws, under which meritorious men not seldom get less than their deserts, while unworthy claimants obtain far more than they deserve. It is probably too late to purge the pension roll of fraud, for Congress is not willing to undertake it, but it seems to us it is not too late to improve the so-called Federal Soldiers' Homes by making them more of a general hospital for a barracks. These homes are located at Dayton, O.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Togus, Me.; Hampton, Va.; Leavenworth, Kan.; Santa Monica, Cal.; Danville, Ill., and Marion, Ind. At these homes there are assembled about 27,000 veterans.

Then there are state homes provided by California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Of the administration of the State Soldiers' Homes as a whole we do not know enough to speak with authority, but of the National Soldiers' Homes it is safe to say that they are probably all open to the criticism that the old veterans at a time of life when they need something more humane are given nothing but a very comfortable barracks. Some rooms have 100 occupants. There is no doubt that the veteran is treated as well as possible in these National Homes, under the present barracks system, but the trouble is that no well-bred man would willingly enter a Soldiers' Home where in his old age, when he most feels the need of privacy, he could not possibly have it.

Most of the veterans of the Union are 60 years of age and upwards, an age when it is very difficult to get any comfort in large numbers together. And yet these old men are obliged to herd together. There are 100 cots in a single room. At the mess table from 500 to 1000 men are assembled.

These arrangements are all admirable for men who are soldiers in age, obligations, in physical and mental fitness for a soldier's life. But these poor old fellows are no longer soldiers in age, strength of body or spirit; they are only ghosts of soldiers in body, and it is not humane that they should be deprived of what they need far more than a library, a billiard-room, social hall, card-room, theater, church and music; and that is some privacy of life in their rooms and at their meals. And this is the reason why so many decent old veterans shrink from these splendid Federal Homes. They feel that it is a perfectly honorable place of refuge, because it was earned by the same service that obtained a pension; but in spite of its comforts and its privileges, the decent, well-bred veteran prefers a very hard and comfortable home of his own that implies some privacy when he seeks his bed or takes his meals. This lack of privacy, this fact that the National Soldiers' Home is not really a home at all, but a great barracks, makes it repulsive to the veteran, whose nerves are impaired by age, who needs above all things a chance for quiet rest and solitude when he desires it as he marches to the grave. It may be said that the lack of privacy of old veterans who find this lack of privacy more repulsive than hard living outside the home.

The truth is that there were probably a million of men enlisted in the Union Army during the war who were so decently brought up that the lack of privacy in their Army life was endurable in youth, but was then endurable because it was necessary, because they were young, strong and virile. They were then healthy, happy, impulsive, inexperienced, reckless, noisy, and yet a vast multitude of young fellows, entirely able to endure hardship and without experience or imagination enough to fear it. For these strong-nerved young soldiers it was not difficult to endure the repulsive coincidents of Army life; but as soldiers in 1861-63 they had more privacy than a Federal Soldiers' Home holds out to a decent veteran; for four men were naturally friends lived together under the same shelter tent during campaigns, had private quarters in the barracks, and when they sought sleep, if a strong-nerved young soldier, these men in war time sought privacy, how great must be the need of it when these men are no longer soldiers in mind or body, but men sinking into old age, growing nervous, querulous and impatient at needless restraint or wanton disturbance.

Practically, these Federal Soldiers' Homes repel by their lack of privacy the very best class of Union veterans, who prefer to live in a modest, useful, but to a crowded barracks. The vicious, noisy, worthless veteran will seek such homes and stay in them as long as he can, for he enjoys the idleness and the turbulence that wear upon the decent old man. That is why the decent Union veteran often finds the Federal Soldiers' Home odious. There is, it would seem, a lack of good sense in housing a throng of weary-souled, broken-down old men upon the plan of a large garrison post of vigorous young soldiers.

The literary remains of the English historian, Orden, are in course of publication under the editorship of his widow. In one of Green's historical articles concerning the famous old university city of Oxford is the statement that the most characteristic result of the Norman conquest was the Jewish settlement; planted in the very heart of the town of Oxford. This settlement possessed its own language, its own religion and law, its peculiar commerce, its peculiar dress. The policy of the Norman Kings secured each Hebrew settlement from the common taxation, the common justice and the common obligations of Englishmen. The city bailiff could not enter the Jew settlement; the church itself was powerless against the synagogue. The historian Green says that almost to the end of the thirteenth century the attitude of the Jew in England through the protection of the King was one of proud defiance. We quote:

His bonds were kept under the royal seal. His courts were visited with heavy penalties any outbreak of violence against the interests of the King. The thunders of the church broke vainly on the yellow garb of the Jew. In a well-known story of Eadmer's the Red King actually forbids the conversion of a Jew to the Christian faith, it was a poor exchange which would have robbed him of a valuable property, and given him only a subject.

Green recognizes the fact that with the Jewish settlement began the cultivation of the physical sciences in Oxford. The Jews brought to England the medical knowledge and surgical skill of the East; and to their wealth and influence was due the remarkable development of domestic architecture in Oxford. From the standpoint of learning, medicine, surgery, physical science and domestic architecture, the expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I was as regrettable as their expulsion from Spain. In nothing was the superiority of Cromwell's mind to the popular prejudice of his time more strikingly displayed than in his reversal of this ancient exclusion of the Jews from England.

The troubles of the Finns in their native land increase. Their latest grievance is on account of the determination of the Russian Governor of Finland to deprive them of their native press. Within a few weeks past a number of the Finnish newspapers, including some of the most important journals in Finland, have been arbitrarily suppressed, and others have been suspended. The immediate cause of this action was certain editorials in the issues of March 2, the forty-first anniversary of the emancipation of the serfs, in which recent reactionary measures were lamented, that it was said, had largely disillusioned the political and social aspirations raised by the emancipation of the peasants. It would seem that with the example of Poland before them the people of Finland would cease their hopeless struggle against the power that, thoroughly equipped for the purpose, has set out to Russinize them. There are two courses open to them. One is to submit, the other to emigrate. The latter alternative is, for a home-loving people, perhaps the hardest to accept.

Orders and decorations will be bestowed with a liberal hand by the German Emperor as supplemental to the late visit of his brother, Prince Henry, to the United States. The high officials of the German-American steamship line are hereby notified that the Prince across the seas and back again, have already been the recipients of imperial favor in the bestowal of the decorations of the Red Eagle. This should not be taken as a compliment to the American eagle in appreciation of its dignified silence while American hospitality was outdoing itself in entertaining the visitor. Our historical book knows when to scream and when to look down, and so it is with the Prince's presence. It represents "liberty," the one principle that neither asks nor receives the favor of monarchs. It will be in good voice about July 4.

The closing of the Oregon City branch of the Portland Flouring Mills will after harvest be likely to work something of a hardship upon a number of men who are presently employed in its employment. On this account the event will be regretted, since, however capable men in an special line of industry are, it is not easy to shift the endeavor to a line distinctly different, in response to a sudden emergency. For this reason the most skilled and steady workmen are often placed at a disadvantage in the industrial world, and are entitled to warm sympathy and intelligent consideration in such an instance. The working world and its demands will soon absorb these laborers, though at present they are probably perplexed, not knowing just what to turn to.

Dr. Feinberg, a young physician of Berlin, has made a discovery which he says makes the diagnosis of cancer in its early stage possible. He has discovered a certain independent animal organism, to subdue which is to cure this disease, which, next to leprosy, if indeed not equal to it in baffling virulence, is the despair of the medical scientist, so far as he permits himself to despair of tracking down and conquering any insidious foe to human life. If means of cure follow this discovery, those afflicted with cancer will be more fortunate than those whom the bacillus inexperienced have attacked and yet found themselves. The discovery, however, is an important one, and perhaps in due time will be followed by a remedy.

The city has seldom had a more generous bequest as represented by the labor and love of years than that given by Benjamin Rupp, and which is now fairly in place in the City Museum. The collection of birds and animals, which comprises this bequest, represents the labor of years of a man devoted to his work and discharging its details with patient fidelity. The collection has been carefully transferred to the City Museum, and to its donor the thanks of the city are due, and will doubtless, at the proper time and in the proper way, be rendered.

A New York dispatch says that over 300,000 dressmakers have declared their intention of forming a union that shall include the whole of the United States. A preliminary meeting looking toward this latest coalition in the industrial world was held a few days ago, and active steps will, it is said, be taken to perfect the organization. Perhaps this will result in the revival of the lost art of cutting, fitting and making in homes. Greater disaster than this has followed in the wake of industrial combination.

An indictment has been returned against the Louisville & Nashville for paying freight rebates contrary to law. This is the way to proceed—use the existing statutes, of which there are few enough, if they are enforced. What is needed is aroused public sentiment behind the law, and this seems now to be coming along.

Senator Morgan's ability, character and long services to the isthmian canal project seem to deserve a better notice than that which he has received in the charge of the measure. His limitations, however, in the way of force and directness are severe, and the cause will doubtless gain in the substitution of Senator Mitchell.

Bryan has no sympathy with the Democratic protest against investigation of negro disfranchisement. This is thoroughly Bryan. He has no sympathy with anything save himself and his own peculiar political properties. His conceit equals his stubbornness.

No one is quite so impressed with the claims of the British as the Simon delegate philosophically, as the underdog of the King. The thunders of the church

TO USE THE EARTH'S ENERGY.

Commenting on the experiments now being carried on by the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Professor William Hallowell of Columbia College, says the idea of obtaining steam power from the heated depths of the earth is entirely feasible. It has been demonstrated that there is a regular rise of temperature for every foot of penetration into the earth's surface, and it is only a matter of going deep enough to get heat enough to make steam power. The heat of the 200-foot level in the Comstock mine is 145 degrees, and in a deep well near Pittsburgh it is 125 degrees. Professor Hallowell estimates that at a depth of 1,000 feet there will be found a temperature of at least 200 degrees, or more than is requisite in boiling water.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

GOOD ADVICE TO THE DEMOCRACY.

Indianapolis News. Much has been written and spoken of late about the reorganization of the Democratic party, and it is, of course, clear that something will have to be done. But there is one phase of the question to which little attention has been paid. And, strange as it may seem, the speech of Mr. Alford, delivered Saturday, brings this question to the front. He spoke of the various reorganization suggestions, and said with entire truth that the only idea that many men seemed to have was that there must be a change in order that the party might win, and that the only reason that these men wanted to win was that the party might get control of the office. It is all very well to have a campaign for the Democratic party, it had better never win.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.

But this thought naturally suggests another one—that of the great amount of the same one. For, as it is true that the Democratic leaders have no right to sacrifice principles to success, neither have they any right to demand that the people should have a chance to carry principles into effect—a foolish notion of consistency, in other words, the question concerns other people than those charged with the guidance of the Democratic party. Namely, the people at large. There has been too much fooling already. No man has any right to destroy the usefulness and to put in jeopardy the life of a great party, and that at a time when it may be very sorely needed by the country, simply because he has found that his leadership is fatal.