The Oregonian.

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

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By Mail (postage prepaid, in Advance—

Daily, with Sunday, per month.....$ 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 14-page paper.....1c
16 to 28-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.

Eastern Business Office, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49 Tribune building, New York City; 469 "The Rookery," Chicago; the S. C. Beckwith special agency, Eastern representative.

For sale in San Francisco by L. E. Lee, Palace Hotel news stand; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter street; F. W. Pitts, 1008 Market street; J. K. Cooper Co., 746 Market street, near the Palace Hotel; Foster & Orear, Ferry news stand.

For sale in Los Angeles by B. F. Gardner, 250 So. Spring street, and Oliver & Haines, 305 So. Spring street.

For sale in Sacramento by Sacramento News Co., 429 K street, Sacramento, Cal.

For sale in Chicago by the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street, and Charles MacDonald, 53 Washington street.

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

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

For sale in Ogden by C. H. Myers.

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

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

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

For sale in Denver, Colo., by Hamilton & Kendrick, 906-912 Seventeenth street; Louthan & Jackson Book & Stationery Co., 15th and Lawrence streets; A. Series, 1653 Champa street.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Showers, with south to west winds.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 53; minimum temperature, 44; precipitation, 0.01 inch.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, APRIL 12.

IT IS A SIMPLE ISSUE.

Idle talk is indulged here and there that George E. Chamberlain is to be the next Governor of Oregon. He will undoubtedly get his party vote, but he will not be Governor. The reason is that there is a Republican majority of 10,000 to 15,000 in Oregon.

Our Democratic brethren will find it useless to bank on the supposition of Republican disaffection. The notion that Mr. Furnish will not receive the Republican vote because he has not always been a Republican will be found illusive. He has been a Republican since 1896; he came to the Republican party at the time when tens of thousands of Democrats came to it; and it was this accession of strength to the Republican party that saved it and delivered the country from the menace of Bryanism.

Mr. Furnish is a man of ability, of character and of force. He is not a stump speaker, which is no defect; for your stump speaker is usually a shallow man, whose flatulent eloquence confuses the matter of discussion and darkens knowledge. But Mr. Furnish has clear ideas of business and of duty, and a force of character essential to the office of Governor of Oregon. In that office he will not be merely a complaisant politician, yielding to the demands of "good fellowship" and "political pull."

Republicans will vote for Mr. Furnish because they want to support Republican policy, and intend to do so. The political status of Oregon will be determined and announced by the vote for Governor. The question then is this: Is the general policy of the Republican party of the country to be sustained, or is the Democratic policy to be substituted for it? Is the policy of the Republican party good for the country, or better than that of the Democratic party, or is it not? These are the questions; not whether a man was born a Republican or has voted the Republican ticket all his life, but whether or not he is a Republican on the issues of the present time, and is a supporter and representative of the party, and of its policies and purposes. The issue is altogether above individuals.

But even if be placed on the individual candidates, you will find Mr. Furnish a man who came to the Republican party on the supreme issues of 1896 and has adhered to it loyally since, and Mr. Chamberlain, a man who stuck to Bryanism and all its dangerous vagaries, and now advocates the cowardly policy of "scuttle," or abandonment of the positions, responsibilities and opportunities devolved on us by the Spanish War. Again, you will find in Mr. Furnish a thorough business man, and in Mr. Chamberlain one whose whole thought and dependence is politics. It is not, however, a question merely as between candidates as men, but a question mainly as between great parties and what they stand for. If you are a Republican and believe in the general policy and purposes of the Republican party, you will vote the Republican ticket, because that is the only way through which you can maintain your principles and reach your objects. But if you are not a Republican, and if you think the Democratic party offers better things for the country, there is the Democratic ticket, and you will vote it.

A GOOD MAN GONE.

General Wade Hampton, of South Carolina, who died yesterday, aged 84, was a distinguished cavalry leader of the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia, and next to General J. E. B. Stuart was General Lee's ablest cavalry leader, rising to the rank of Lieutenant-General. He bore a distinguished part in the battles of Fair Oaks and Fredericksburg. At Gettysburg he was wounded. After the death of General Stuart at Yellow Tavern, in May, 1864, General Hampton succeeded to the chief command of Lee's Cavalry Corps, which he commanded with great ability from that time until the close of the Virginia campaign of 1864. In the Winter of 1864-65 General Hampton was placed on duty at the South to resist the march of Sherman from Savannah through the Carolinas. He fought under General Joe Johnston in the battle of Bentonville, N. C., in March, 1865. When Johnston surrendered to Sherman, Hampton was so irreconcilable that he refused to bring in his cavalry for the surrender.

After the war Hampton, who belonged to one of the wealthiest and most distinguished planter families of South Carolina, behaved with moderation. When the carpet-bag government was upset in 1873 he was elected United States Senator, and bore himself with dignity and self-restraint during his whole term of service, which continued until the planter class were driven out of power by the success of the small farmer or "poor white" faction of the South Carolina Democracy. General Hampton was always humane in his treatment of the colored population, and enjoyed their respect and confidence to the last. He was the grandson of General Wade Hampton, who commanded our American Army in an abortive expedition against Canada in the War of 1812-14. At the outbreak of the Civil War General Hampton was a very rich man, owning a large plantation in South Carolina and another in Mississippi, and possessing 3000 slaves. The war deprived him of a great deal of his wealth, and he died in reduced circumstances. It should be remembered to his credit that in the Senate he was always the champion of sound money, joining Senator Bayard in his opposition to the Bland silver bill of 1877-78.

THE PLATFORM.

The Democratic platform is long enough for about two National conventions. It is a dreary waste of complaint. Its discontent spreads itself out over the entire face of creation. Whatever is, is wrong. Unless the Democrats can get in, they must soon despair of the cosmic experiment.

It's a hard world the Democrats of Oregon look out upon with April-clouded eyes. The wealth of the country is passing into the hands of the favored few. Our cities are under municipal misrule, the state is burdened with extravagance. The emoluments of state officials are "scandalous," railroads are given over to "discrimination," labor laws are "unjust and discriminating," the Legislative apportionment is a "gerrymander," the tariff is "plundering the masses," the administration of the dependencies is "burdensome and less defensible than the acts of the British Parliament," the Nicaragua Canal is going to be delayed—if not defeated—by Republicans, the present laws are destroying our merchant marine and the subsidy scheme is "audacious robbery," failure to enact certain railroad laws is "inhuman," the President's recent civil service order is condemned as "autocratic," the suppression of the Philippine insurrection is "the slaughter of a weaker people," and, in general, where we ought to have "reason and righteousness," we get only "hypocrisy and delusion."

If there is anything going on under the sun which the Democrats have not denounced, the omission, we take it, is due to the fact that their attention has not been called to it. The incompleteness of the indictment drawn up against the prevailing order of creation must be imputed to the press of time, and not to any latent contentment in the Democratic breast, either with the victories of our arms and our trade abroad or the healthy proportions of business at home. Had time and space afforded, we should doubtless have been further regaled with censure upon Great Britain for pursuing the South African War, rebuke of Vesuvius for the overthrow of Herculaneum, and invidious reference to the precession of the equinoxes. It is an impressive thought that the decline and fall of American agriculture, manufactures, wealth, population and trade throughout the past forty years has only been interrupted once by complete Democratic ascendency in Congress and the White House. Otherwise the memorable epoch of 1893-7 might have been continuous.

One of the truest things in the Democratic platform was left out of it. This is the expression in the rejected Philippine plank, "The Democrats of Oregon yield to irrevocable events." This is true of the party, and deserves recognition. It declared in 1864 that the war for the Union was a failure, but the next year peace came and the Democrats yielded to an irrevocable event. They declared in 1896 that the gold standard was a failure, but it was adopted by the people in two National elections, and again the Democrats yielded to an irrevocable event. This year the demand is for abandonment of the Philippines, but the people will support American sovereignty there as they did in 1898 and 1900, and again the Democrats will yield to an irrevocable event.

As irrevocable events come and go, the Democratic party is foolish enough to put itself in such an attitude toward them that its only part in their onward march is to yield. In the path of National development it stands an obstacle. Rather than get on the train of progress it prefers to dash out its brains against the oncoming locomotive. Another irrevocable event will be along in June, and the Democratic nominees will be found yielding with their usual grace.

TWO CHOICES, BUT NO THIRD.

Both parties have fittingly recognized the disposition of the Philippine Islands as the principal issue of the campaign—the Democrats in the space accorded it, the Republicans in giving it the first position—in their respective platforms. It is the issue. Upon other points, where the Democrats momentarily cease to be querulous and propose something definite, the platforms agree—as in flat salaries for state officials, election of Senators by popular vote, initiative and referendum, Chinese exclusion, river improvement, organized labor, land laws, trusts, Federal aid to irrigation, isthmian canal. The great difference is over the Philippines. This is in keeping with the issue made up in Congress and already determined for the elections of November throughout the whole country. The whole issue is, Go or stay?

If the Democrats of Oregon wish to retain the Philippine Islands "under such local self-government as the people may be or may become fitted to participate in," they would, of course, vote for Williamson and Tongue and a Republican Legislature to choose a Republican Senator, for just that programme is what the Republicans of Oregon propose and what the Republicans in Congress contemplate. But they do not. They demand independence for the islands under some such absurd conditions as are contended for by the Democrats in Congress. The idea is for us to stay in the Philippines long enough to pacify their bandits, drain their swamps, reconstruct their cities on modern sanitary lines, build them railroads, develop their resources, establish peace and industry, and then turn over their sovereignty. It is an undertaking no nation of any virile force would contemplate.

The Philippines are rightfully ours, and we need them as an outlet to our overflowing energies and as a vantage-ground for the Pacific trade of the twentieth century. If they are to be independent, our only course is to get out at once and leave them to themselves. Unless we are sovereign there, we shall neither enforce order in them nor provide protection from outside interference. If they are to be independent they must maintain their own independence. Authority must be commensurate with responsibility. No power is going to accept the burdens of protection without the prerogative of enforcing compliance with its purposes.

The Oregon Democrats seek to mitigate somewhat the bluntness of the National Democratic demand for abandonment of the Philippines. This is natural, as they know full well the temper of the people of Oregon, but it is vain. Democrats who go to House or Senate from Oregon will act with their party there. A vote for the Democratic ticket is a vote to nullify Dewey's victory at Manila, and all that American arms, diplomacy and commercial enterprise have accomplished across the Pacific in the past four years.

THE FEE ABUSE.

The Democrats in state convention, following the example of the Republican convention held ten days earlier, urge in positive terms that all state officials be put upon flat salaries, and that all fees collected for official service be paid into the state treasury. So far, good. The change is one which ought to have been made long ago. Again and again The Oregonian has set forth the evils, direct and general, which flow from the existing system; and in the name of business common sense and of political decency it has persistently urged the thing which all parties now declare their eagerness to do.

But, after getting themselves in line by duplicating the pledge made ten days before by the Republicans, the Democrats go further, and in the face of the record which makes the effort ridiculous they seek to put upon the Republican party the whole odium of this long-standing scandal. "Judging by long past experience," says the Democratic platform, the Republican party "will not and does not intend to remedy this evil." There is humor here. Let us look at the history of this fee business, including the opportunities which the Democratic party has had to enforce reform if it had really wished it.

The State of Oregon was organized under Democratic authority in 1859. Its constitution, in which the fee system was fixed to an extent—in particular the regulations governing that worst of all abuses, the State Printer's office—was drafted by a Democratic convention. The first state administration—that which established the practice in the several state offices, and which gave to this system of practice the authority which attaches to official precedent—was under Democratic hands. Again, it was under Democratic administration that of La Fayette Grover, afterward made a Senator of the United States by favor of the Democratic party, that the fee system, under the policy of "organizing the offices"—a phrase familiar to those whose memories go back to the early '70s—was worked up into the existing scandalous system.

Indeed, "organization of the offices" was not the only scandal of that Democratic era. There are those who have not forgotten the scheme of "litigant advertising" devised to support the Democratic press of the state, and under which the whole volume of legal advertising business was bestowed as a monopoly upon Democratic newspapers under a schedule of "legal" rates so high as to be little better than plain robbery. This "litigant advertising" project, which formed part of the general scheme of Democratic aggrandizement, was an outrage so direct and so flagrant as to rouse universal indignation and protest among men of all parties, and it was soon overborne; but the other features of the scheme being less directly oppressive, though scarcely less unreasonable and injurious, were permitted to stand and have stood to this day. It has cost the people of Oregon enormously, and it is not to the credit of either the Democratic or Republican party that it has been permitted so long to exist.

In a tone of virtuous indignation the Democratic platform reproaches the Republican party for its neglect of many opportunities for reforming this "simply scandalous" system created by its own agents. We shall not say there is no justice in this reproach, but it comes curiously from a party whose "opportunity" for enforcing reforms has been at least equal to that of the party which it accuses. Indeed, the Democratic opportunity, if periods of administrative authority be compared, has been rather greater than the Republican opportunity. In the forty-three years and some odd months in which Oregon has existed as a state, with power to regulate its own affairs, the Republican party has been in administrative authority nineteen years, as against twenty-four years of Democratic rule. We do not seek to excuse the Republican party under Geer, Lord, Moody, Woods and Gibbs from responsibility in this matter; but we do say that its responsibility was not greater—its "opportunity" no fairer—than that of the Democratic party under Pennoyer, Thayer, Chadwick, Grover and Whiteaker. The fault of the Republican party in this matter is that it has not hitherto corrected the abuses which the Democratic party introduced into our state government. But if the Democratic party should again be entrusted with the government of the state, it would be the same "organized appetite" as heretofore, and its officials would oppose and defeat all bills to cut off the fees. To be sure, a Democratic convention—in imitation of a Republican convention previously held—calls for reform of this abuse. Why, let us ask, has not this demand been made at times when, the party, being in power, might have brought about reform? George Chamberlain was Attorney-General. Did he attempt it? Pennoyer was Governor. What did he do about it?

Cornelius Gardener, Major of the Thirteenth United States Infantry, was graduated from West Point in 1873, ranking No. 37 in a class of forty-one members. He became Second Lieutenant Nineteenth United States Infantry in 1873; Captain Nineteenth Infantry in February, 1891; Major of Thirteenth Infantry in September, 1899. He was born in the Netherlands, and was appointed to the Military Academy from Michigan. In the Spanish-American War he was Colonel of the Thirty-first Michigan Infantry from April 28, 1898, to May 17, 1899, and was appointed Colonel of the Thirtieth United States Infantry July 5, 1899. During his term of service from 1873 to date Major Gardener does not appear to have won any marked military distinction, for his name is not among those officers who won brevets for gallant service in Indian warfare or obtained medals of honor. He was born in a foreign country, and is probably not intensely American in temperament or opinions. His very low rank in his class at West Point would indicate that he was not a cadet of much promise when he graduated, and his failure to obtain any such distinction in service as younger graduates have obtained fortify the presumption that he is better acquainted with the pen-and-ink qualifications of an officer than he is with his field duties and experience.

When the defeated Senator Jones, of Arkansas, completes his term, next March, he will have been twenty-four years in Congress, six of which were spent in the House and eighteen in the Senate. He has been chairman of the Democratic National Committee in two Presidential campaigns. His defeat is said to be largely due to the charge of duplicity in the appointment of a member of the St. Louis Fair Commission from Arkansas. He agreed to support ex-Governor Jones, of Arkansas, for the position, and wrote him a letter announcing that he had seen President McKinley and obtained his promise that the ex-Governor would be appointed. At the same time Senator Jones was recommending another man for the place, who was appointed. The original letters to prove this charge are published, and Senator Berry is named as a witness. Senator Jones has evidently closed his long political career of thirty years clothed in shame as with a garment.

One-fifth of the amount—$10,000—which Congress is expected to allow for the payment of bills incident to the assassination and death of President McKinley will be given to Dr. Mann, the operating surgeon who was first called to the wounded man's relief. This is a generous allowance, though, under all the circumstances, an equitable one. The responsibility of the surgeon in such a case is enormous, and in this instance it was assumed intelligently and the duty that it entailed was discharged promptly and with a skill so rare that an autopsy did not disclose the slightest mistake. That Nature refused to supplement the surgeon's work by following it up with repairs that she alone could make was a misfortune, but in no sense the fault of any one.

The War Department seems to have acted unwisely in the suppression of Major Gardener's report in criticism of severe methods in Luzon and Samar. If it had been promptly published last December it would have been an old story by this time, threshed out and exploded, whereas it now comes as a feather in the cap of Miles and a sweet morsel to those cordial enemies of the American name—Patterson, Carmack et id omne. As for Gardener, he evidently missed his calling. A man so imbued with antipathy to villainous saltpeter should have been president of some society for the suppression of guns, drums and swords. War, in Major Gardener's view, should be conducted without mental distress or bodily injury to any of the combatants.

The House Democrats cheerfully set the date when the Filipinos will be fitted for self-government at 1911. It is a wild guess, and wholly gratuitous. If the Democrats were in power today they would have to proceed for the first thing to put down the remnants of the insurrection and establish peace and order. What, then, is to be gained by setting 1911 as the date of our retirement? Nothing, except to provide some specific hook on which to hang a protest against everything the Administration is doing. Such child's play is a very poor excuse for constructive statesmanship.

An impressive exhibit in American "tyranny" was afforded in Porto Rico when the Public Prosecutor joined with the attorney for the defense in asking for the release of a man held for peaceable agitation of labor's rights. The people were astounded, the dispatches say, for they had not been accustomed to anything of this sort under the Spanish regime. Porto Rico will find, as she goes on, what liberty of thought and action goes with the flag she ignorantly but trustingly welcomed when our Army set foot there in the Summer of 1898.

When Representative Underwood, of Alabama, was asked if he would vote to abolish the sugar trust's differential on refined sugar, he evaded the question, in response to promptings from Democratic colleagues about him. The act is typical of the Democratic position. They continually yawp and howl about subservience to the trusts, but they never come to the front in a manly way in support of a straightforward proposal, either for justice to the islands or relief of home consumers.

Depew follows the lead of Senator Hoar in the groundless contention that to elect Senators by popular vote will unfavorably affect the character of the Senate, and is therefore an obnoxious innovation. There is no more danger in electing Senators by popular vote in states with limited franchise than there is in electing Representatives. Whatever change the amendment would make in the character of the Senate would be for the better.

It does not seem to The Oregonian a conclusive argument against the fitness of Mr. Furnish for the office of Governor—though it is the only argument yet made by his opponents—that he has had the industry and capacity to succeed in business. That is a strange argument to be made for behoof of Mr. Chamberlain.

It is not hard to explain Grosvenor's new light on the tariff question. He has been looking about in Ohio and has heard from the same manufacturers whose views found reflection last September in President McKinley's Buffalo speech.

Senator Patterson is determined to write down the American Government as a tyrant, and the American soldier as an assassin. It is a worthy ambition, truly, and one that will be worthily answered at the November polls.

"What do you read, my lord?" asked Polonius, as he observed Hamlet with the Oregon Democratic platform of 1902. And the Dane, with his usual cogency and truth, replied, "Words, words, words!"

Oregon has run a little distance the oldest settler. There were new men in both conventions.

NEXT GOVERNOR OF OREGON.

An Account of the Man as He Is Known in His Own Town and County.

Pendleton Tribune.

The Republican party has placed at the head of its state ticket a man of rare character. There are but few like him in Oregon. He was nominated by delegates many of whom knew but little of his personal traits, his career, his habits of thought or his methods of winning victories in the battle of life. He is a new star in politics, and even the wise astronomers of the party he represents are not able to determine his position in the political firmament.

The career of W. J. Furnish has been one marked by success in all its undertakings. From the time he began life by doing janitor work to pay his tuition at school until he won the nomination for Governor by a great majority, he has never failed to accomplish his purpose. To give a sketch of the character of the man is hardly necessary, for his attainments in life speak for him more than a brief character study could reveal. He is understood by what he does more than by what he says. A few things may be said, however, for the benefit of those who do not know him. He is an indefatigable worker, always with an object in view. He is self-reliant, depending on his own judgment and asking advice only for the information it may contain. He possesses strong instincts and intuitions and readily detects men's motives. Possessing quick perception for the genuine he soon discovers the false, which he deals with dexterously. He has the faculty in his business dealings of arousing honor in men and promoting integrity and accurate methods in financial affairs. His business qualities are the best, and he impresses them, instinctively, upon every one he does business with. He has always been liberal, and many men in Umatilla County owe their success to him as cashier and president of the Pendleton Savings Bank. He can in no way be called cold and hard because he is a banker, but, though accurate, business like and safe in the banking business, he is smypathetic and generous and has done a great deal to promote the financial interests of Umatilla County and Eastern Oregon.

Mr. Furnish is not a man who carries things by small margins. He does nothing by halves, indifferently, or with any notion of possible failure. Some have attributed his success to luck, but those who have worked nearest him know it is due chiefly to untiring energy. He never assumes that a victory is won till the votes are counted. As long as there is a vote to win in his favor he wants it, as long as there is a point to gain in the fight, he does not neglect the opportunity. His campaigns are systematically and thoroughly arranged and carried out to the utmost detail. Not only is this done in city and county politics, where he obtained his schooling, but he has shown well his ability to carry his careful methods into state politics. Because he is a banker, it is charged he uses money illegally, but these charges are made only by those who have suffered defeat at his hands. He uses money for legitimate purposes, but his success in politics is due to his personality, his sagacity, foresight and energy. His success in business has not come to him suddenly, easily or in large amount at a time. He has wrested it with native strength and ability, by steady degrees from natural resources and opportunities. There is nothing of the dramatic or the ostentatious about him. He makes no pretensions that are not well supported. He does nothing he will not defend and makes no claims that he will not fight for. He never guesses, nor does he act until the facts are known. When the people of Oregon know the man as he is known in his own town and county, they will realize the wisdom of the Republican State Convention in choosing him as its nominee both for his ability as a candidate and for the office of Chief Executive of the state.

Post-Check Currency Scheme.

An idea which is gaining favor wherever it is known is that of the post-check currency system, which has been proposed to Congress with strong approval from men of knowledge and authority in matters relating to the currency.

It is proposed to reprint all $1, $2 and $5 Treasury notes, coin or silver certificates now in circulation and have the faces of the new bills provided with blank lines. This would be the ordinary money of the day, as heretofore, but when a man wished to send money by mail, say $3, he could take one of the new bills from his pocketbook, write on its face the name of the person or firm to whom it is to go, the city and state, and affix a 2-cent stamp in a blank square to be left on the bill, canceling the stamp with his initials and the date, and signing his name on the back. The bill, which previously was negotiable money, is instantly transformed into a personal check on the United States Government for $3, as safe for transmission as any bank check. This is inclosed in a letter to the person or firm desired, and can be collected by the receiver upon identification at the postoffice named.

The tiresome and time-consuming trip to the postoffice to secure a money order is avoided and a convenient, safe and instantly available form of safe money is supplied with which the public can transact mail business which now aggregates in small sums upward of $2,000,000,000 a year. The small fee charged would probably aggregate a larger revenue to the Government than is received from the present money-order system.

The proponents of the scheme are men who do a large business by mail and who believe that the new form of currency would increase their business. The post-check currency would do away with the nuisance of sending large amounts of stamps. One large Chicago publisher reports the receipt of upward of $350,000 in stamps in one year, nearly $1000 per day. Others have the same experience on a smaller scale. Stealing in the mails would be stopped by the adoption of the idea. It is said that the postal authorities recommend the scheme.

"I Said an Elder Soldier, Not a Better."

Roseburg Plaindealer.

It is said Mr. Furnish has not always been a Republican. While this is true, yet he has done more for the party in the few years he has been associated with it than many men who voted for Lincoln and have been with it ever since. It is a noteworthy fact that many of the bright young men who a few years ago were laboring with the Democratic party are now active and energetic Republicans. It is unnecessary to go to Eastern Oregon for examples; they are manifest in Douglas County. In nearly every precinct in this county can be found bright young and old men, so far as that is concerned, who six or eight years ago were active Democrats, but are now just as active Republicans. This is not to their discredit, but it is a tribute to their integrity and loyalty to the best interest of their country. A man who sees his duty and is afraid or unwilling to do it is not the highest example of citizenship.

Denial With a String to It.

Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Senator Hanna is not a candidate for the Presidency. He has said so over and over again, and his word ought to be sufficient. Mr. Hanna has even been quoted as saying the connection of his name with the Presidency is ridiculous, which is, of course, an exaggerated way of putting it. Senator Hanna having said that he is not seeking the Presidency, he is to be believed. But every statesman of the present day is "in the hands of his friends," and President Roosevelt will not fail to notice that some of the friends of Mr. Hanna are just now displaying "pernicious activity."

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY.

Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The ground of hope is in the infinity of the world, which infinity reappears in every particle; the powers of all society, in every individual, and of all mind in every mind. I know against all appearances that the universe can receive no detriment; that there is a remedy for every wrong, and a satisfaction for every soul. Here is this wonderful thought. But whence came it? Who put it in the mind? It was not I, it was not you; it is elemental—belongs to thought and virtue; and, whenever we have either, we see the beams of this light. When the master of the universe has points to carry in his government, he impresses his will in the structure of minds. . . .

There is a drawback to the value of all statements of the doctrine; and I think that one abstains from writing or printing on the immortality of the soul, because, when he comes to the end of his statement, the hungry eyes that run through it will close disappointed; the listeners say, That is not here which we desire—and I shall be as much wronged by their hasty conclusion as they feel themselves wronged by my omissions. I mean that I am a better believer, and all serious souls are better believers, in the immortality than we can give grounds for. The real evidence is too subtle, or is higher than we can write down in propositions; and therefore Wordsworth's "Ode" is the best modern essay on the subject.

We cannot prove our faith by syllogisms. The argument refuses to form in the mind. A confusion, an inference, a grand augury, is ever hovering; but attempt to ground it, and the reasons are all vanishing and inadequate. You cannot make a written theory or demonstration of this as you can an orrery of the Copernican astronomy. It must be sacredly treated. Speak of the mount in the mount. Not by literature or theology, but only by rare integrity, by a man permeated and perfumed with airs of heaven—with manliest or womanliest enduring love—can the vision be clear to a use the most sublime. And hence the fact that in the minds of men the testimony of a few inspired souls has had such weight and penetration. You shall not say: "Oh my bishop, O my pastor, is there any resurrection? What do you think? Did Dr. Channing believe that we should know each other? Did Wesley? Did Butler? Did Fenelon? What questions are these! Go read Milton, Shakespeare, or any truly ideal poet. Read Plato or any seer of the interior realities. Read St. Augustine, Swedenborg, Immanuel Kant. Let any master simply recite to you the substantial laws of the intellect, and in the presence of the laws themselves you will never ask such primary school questions.

Is immortality only an intellectual quality, or, shall I say, only an energy, there being no passive? He has it, and he alone, who gives life to all names, persons, things, where he comes. No religion, not the wildest mythology, dies for him; no art is lost. He vivifies what he touches. Future state is an illusion for the ever-present state. It is not length of life, but depth of life. It is not duration, but a taking of the soul out of time, as all high action of the mind does; when we are living in the sentiments, we ask no questions about time. The spiritual world takes place—that which is always the same. But see how the sentiment is wise. Jesus explained nothing; but the influence of him took people out of time, and they felt eternal. A great integrity makes us immortal; an admiration, a deep love, a strong will, arms us above fear.

SENATOR JONES' DEFEAT.

How It Is Regarded by a Leading Southern Newspaper.

Richmond News, Dem.

We have never believed in the official Democratic party theory that the last two National campaigns were won for the Republicans by bribery and intimidation. If there had been debauchery on the wholesale scale necessary to sweep the country as the country was swept, inevitably somebody would have confessed or been discovered before now.

It is true, the Republicans had enormous advantage in financial resources and the Democrats had practically none, but, so far as can be gathered, the money was used in making close polls of doubtful states, perfecting organizations, making close canvasses and distributing literature. So far as we have been able to see, the Republicans had the argument and the facts on their side in the currency question, and they had with them the influence and sympathy of the business men of every community in the land. Colonel Bryan and Senator Jones consistently and persistently ignored and antagonized this mighty force. While sympathizing with the personal humiliation and disappointment of the fine but foolish old fighter of Arkansas, we must feel that his removal from National politics removes a stumbling block from the way of the Democratic party. It appears to be a repudiation, by the people throughout the country who are most intensely loyal followers of the party flag, of the policies, methods and systems by which the party has been controlled for the last eight years.

It will give a strong impetus to the work of party pacification because it is an unanswerable argument for the retirement of the men who have been leading and representing the party and for the restoration of the old leadership.

Giants in Power, Infants in Dependence.

Kansas City Star.

The Westinghouse Company needed an extensive plant in Manchester, and it wanted it soon. British contractors declared it could not be built in less than five years. An American agreed to do the work in 15 months. In the review of the difficulties he overcame may be found the difference between English and American procedure. Where the British contractors used the mails, the American telegraphed. Where the Englishman was used to working 10 men, the American put on 100. Where the conservative builder employed hand labor, the American fitted up machines. Everywhere the American introduced the best modern methods and applied them with the same thoroughness and foresight that Napoleon used in his successful campaigns.

The Manchester incident is not an isolated case. Americans built a bridge for Kitchener over the Atbara River in Egypt because they could do it in a third the time asked by English contractors. The Burmah viaduct—a notable achievement in bridge building—is to the credit of American engineers because of their energy and resourcefulness. These performances of American contractors abroad are typical of what they are constantly doing in the United States.

Do such men need subsidies to help them build ships? Do they need protective duties to enable them to manufacture goods.

The Christmas Farce.

New York Evening Sun.

One man who made a contract with Christmas, and on reflection threw it into the waste-paper basket, says the fellow was half crazy. It must be a moderate statement of his mental condition, and to think that this grotesque promoter, this weaver of fearsome stories about the corruption of Congressmen, took in the leader of the Democratic minority. Christmas is a character for opera bouffe, and the constructors of farce comedy should not overlook "Slim" Jim Richardson.

Oh, Wert Thou in the Cauld Blast.

Robert Burns.

Oh, wert thou in the cauld blast,
On yonder lea, on yonder lea;
My plaidie to the angry airt,
I'd shelter thee, I'd shelter thee;
Or did misfortune's bitter storm
Around thee blaw, around thee blaw,
Thy bield should be my bosom,
To share it a', to share it a'.

Or were I in the wildest waste,
Sae black and bare, sae black and bare,
The desert were a paradise.
If thou wert there, if thou wert there.
Or were I monarch o' the globe,
Wi' thee to reign, wi' thee to reign;
The brightest jewel in my crown
Wad be my queen, wad be my queen.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

How quiet it is in Portland today!

Good morning, what are you taking for that cold.

The Democratic idea of harmony is shouting in unison.

A candidate named Butcher certainly ought to be able to make a killing.

Cecil Rhodes has not yet sent any advice to Carnegie on the safety of dying rich.

Don't worry about the weather. Spring will be here in a month or two at the farthest.

Long-headed steamship owners will outfit excursion ships to bring over parties of royal visitors from Europe.

The pessimist who said there was nothing to do but work has evidently never attended a Democratic convention.

The provision in the Democratic platform regarding fuel stations in the Philippines makes it a coal-scuttle policy.

The President is receiving congratulations on getting back from South Carolina without stirring up any of the animals.

The Democratic delegate
In labor pauses not, nor balks,
He simply opens wide his mouth,
And talks, and talks, and talks, and talks.

If Miss Stone was wise she kept the address of the brigand who got the money. She may need him as an angel for her theatrical enterprise.

And yet the sound of the lamentations of his fellow Democrats at the political decease of Hon. James K. Jones do not drown all other noises in the land.

Mr. Hood ought to have kept cases on his other self. He may find it has been doing all sorts of things he wouldn't like to be responsible for.

Dr. Paul Lindau, the director of the Berliner Theater, of Berlin, will soon give a performance of "Hamlet" in the form in which it was originally produced by the traveling English players in Germany. The history of these English players, who in the 17th and 18th centuries went on "tour" in Germany, is not without importance for the development of the German drama. Lessing, when a boy, was deeply impressed by the English actors during their visit to the "seven cities" of Lausitz. Dr. Lindau has requested Professor Creizenach, who has investigated the history of the English players, to write a short essay on their efforts and the significance of their "Hamlet," and this essay will be recited as an introduction of the performance at the Berliner Theater.

A visitor to a London workhouse recently found an old Irish woman in one of the wards very ill, and thought it advisable that she should see the priest without delay. A few days afterward, when the old woman had rallied a little, the visitor said to her, "Well, Mrs. O'Connor, did the priest come to you?" She replied, "Yes, avic, but I was surprised to find a gintleman like him so ignorant." "Ignorant! What do you mean?" "Shure, he knows no Irish." (Mrs. O'Connor knew her prayers in Irish, but could not say them in English.) "Well, that is unfortunate," the lady replied. "Yes," said the old woman, "and the crathur, he was so fretted about it I said to him, 'Well, never mind, Father, God Almighty understands almost all languages, and who knows but he might understand the English.'"

In the eulogy of the Boers Sienkiewicz, the Polish novelist, said the other day: "Their simplicity and admirable heroism have gained the sympathy of the whole world. Unfortunately they are not numerous, and are also decimated by the long and exhaustive struggle for independence. In my opinion they are consequently menaced with a two-fold danger. If they are vanquished they will have to submit to English rule. If victors, they will be unable to isolate themselves from the rest of the world, and will necessarily be swamped by the rising tide of European immigration. But, excluding the hypothesis of foreign intervention, the Boers, despite the heroism, must and will be vanquished. And then what a chance in their misfortune to be vanquished by Anglo-Saxons, and not, for instance, by Prussians!"

Bonnie Doon.

Robert Burns.

Ye banks and braes o' bonnie Doon
How can ye blume sae fair!
How can ye chant, ye little birds,
And I sae fu' o' care!

Thou'll break my heart, thou bonnie bird
That sings upon the bough;
Thou minds me o' the happy days
When my fause Luve was true.

Thou'll break my heart, thou bonnie bird
That sings beside thy mate;
For sae I sat, and sae I sang,
And wist na o' my fate.

Aft has I roved by bonnie Doon
To see the woodbine twine,
And like bird sang o' its love;
And sae did I o' mine.

Wi' lightsome heart I pu'd a rose,
Frae aff its thorny tree;
And my fause luver staw the rose,
But left the thorn wi' me.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

Teacher (in mineralogy class)—Johnny, give me the name of the largest known diamond. Johnny—The ace.—Tit-Bits.

Obstacles.—"Now, my dear, marry him. He is old, it is true, but he has money." "But, mamma, the man may live for months!"—Life.

"Rose and Mabel have never spoken since they took part in private theatricals." "Professional jealousy?" "Worse than that—amateur jealousy."—Life.

To Stay.—"What are you here for?" inquired the visitor at the penitentiary. "For keeps," replied the convict known as No. 1147, with a mirthless laugh.—Chicago Tribune.

Good Reasoning.—Mother—Why, Gertrude! Why are you praying at noon? Gertrude—Well, mamma, I thought probably during lunch hours God wouldn't be so busy listening to others.—Puck.

He—Darling, what do you suppose I have done today? She—I couldn't guess in a hundred years. He—I have had my life insured. She—That's just like you, John Mann. All you seem to think of is yourself.—Boston Transcript.

In an Ice Cream Parlor.—He—I wonder why it is no man has ever succeeded in capturing the wealthy Miss Bullion? Sweet Girl (between spoonfuls)—She has always been rich enough to buy her own ice cream.—New York Weekly.

A Question of Privilege.—Mistress (after a heated discussion with argumentative cook)—Are you the mistress of this house, I should like to know? Cook—No, ma'am, I ain't, but—Mistress (triumphantly)—Then don't talk like an idiot!—Punch.

"It's a Poor Rule," etc.—"Don't bother your father tonight," advised the mother. "He's tired and cross." The little one looked surprised. "Must I let him alone?" she asked. "Yes." "He doesn't let me alone when I'm cross." "Well, that's different," explained her mother. "I should think it was different," retorted the little one, "but I don't see why it should be. I get a spanking when I'm cross."—Chicago Evening Post.