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, Sunday 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.

Eastern Business Office, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49 Tribune building, New York City; 510-11-12 Tribune building, 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; Frank Scott, 80 Ellis street, and N. Wheatley, 813 Mission street.

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

For sale in Kansas City, Mo., by Ricksecker Cigar Co., Ninth and Walnut streets.

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; Megeath Stationery Co., 1308 Farnam street.

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

For sale in Minneapolis by R. G. Hearsey & Co., 24 Third street South.

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, Sixteenth and Curtis streets.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Fair; northwesterly winds.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 81; minimum temperature, 49; precipitation, none.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 27

THE ILLUSTRATION FROM TEA.

When the heavy customs duties established in 1861 for the tremendous revenue needs of the Civil War period were abolished in 1872, one result of that action was the failure of several important tea houses in the United States. The foreign grower had insisted upon taking up for himself a portion of the duty in advancing prices, and American wholesalers persuaded themselves that in some way the retail trade could be held up to the figures prevalent under the duty. The contrary proved to be the case. Prices were first advanced by nearly the full amount of the duty to be removed, but subsequently fell to the original in-bond figures.

If this history of thirty years ago should repeat itself, we shall have more such failures next year, and a fall in prices approximately corresponding to 10 cents a pound duty, which is to come off January 1, under the repeal law of the recent session of Congress. The Chinamen, with their proverbial shrewdness, have secured about 5 cents a pound advance from the American buyer, and New York wholesalers have induced our dealers generally to buy heavily of in-bond holdings, under the belief that the retail price will remain at something like its present figure. There is a possibility, of course, that between Chinese persistence and increasing American consumption a disastrous fall may be averted, but free accumulations here and phenomenal crops everywhere are ominous, to say the least.

But the parallel of interest and concern is not commercial, but political. Congress has done in 1902 exactly what it did in 1872, and if the tariff is of the public pre-eminence at the next general election it occupied in the reign of the tariffs of 1872 and 1874, we may see such Democratic activity as we saw in 1876 and 1884. The parallel is perfect. The war revenues in 1872, as in 1902, were to be revised, and Congress yielded to the clamor of special interests. That is, it abolished easily supportable and profitable revenue-producing duties on tea and coffee, in order to escape the righteous course suggested by public rights rather than private persistence. Just this has now been done in the abolishment of internal revenue and tea taxes, as a way of escape from reductions on products controlled here at home by protected trusts.

It is significant in another direction that just what Chinese growers are doing now was done by Brazilian coffee-growers in 1872. The 5-cent duty on coffee was removed and the Brazilians gobbled it up forthwith in advance of prices. Here is a pregnant hint as to our rightful course. Congress has grievously erred in taxing tea and letting coffee in free, but a fair and sensible course would be a duty of 5 cents a pound on each. The revenue created would reach some $50,000,000 a year, without appreciable effect on consumption or burden on consumers. If Congress is to deal honestly by the people, it must turn more and more to such customs duties as this, and less and less to duties claimed as vested rights by certain favored interests, to enable them to prey upon the rest of the community. Only so can it escape the censure which was visited by David A. Wells upon the tariff of 1872:

And in carrying out, furthermore, the idea of protection, but one rule for guidance would appear to have been adopted for legislation, viz., the assumption that whatever rate of duty could be shown to be for the advantage of any private interest, the same would prove equally advantageous to the interests of the whole country. The result has been a tariff based upon small issues rather than upon any great National principle; a tariff which is unjust and unequal; which needlessly enhances prices; which takes far more indirectly from the people than is received into the Treasury; which renders an exchange of domestic for foreign commodities nearly impossible; which necessitates the continual exportation of obligations of National indebtedness and of the precious metals; and which, while professing to protect American industry, really, in many cases, discriminates against it.

A STRANGE VINDICATION.

The Salem Journal, which is very friendly to Governor Geer, tells this doleful story:

Look at the money that was spent to get control of the nomination for Governor and other state officers in the last Republican state convention.

Governor Geer and his friends spent all they had in the primaries, and when the state convention met, delegation after delegation had to be bought over again.

They simply could not do it, and the anti-Geer combine had the money. How many young men were consulted about these nominations, anyway?

The Oregonian prefers to think that Governor Geer is misrepresented in this statement. It does not believe that he tried to buy a renomination, and it knows that control of the convention was not bought away from him. The Journal was of those who complained that Geer was not renominated, and it supported Chamberlain. It complained and still complains that Geer was beaten with money, yet says that Geer and his friends used money, too—all the money they had—but after they had spent all they had in the primaries, delegations in the state convention were bought away from them by those who could bid higher. This is a slanderous statement, both as to Governor Geer and as to his opponents. The state convention was a deliberative body, composed of representative and honorable men, or there are none in Oregon. There was not the slightest reason for suspicion of the use of money in it. Nobody attempted it; nobody would have had the hardihood to think it. The Salem Journal takes a strange course for vindication of Governor Geer. He will scarcely thank it. Was it Franklin or Solomon or Mark Twain, or neither of them, yet one of the wise, who originated that remark about a man's "fool friends"?

GROWTH OF PACIFIC PORTS.

The records show that New York's complaint of declining commerce is not so much a complaint against rival Atlantic ports, but a recognition of the relatively greater growth of trade with newer portions of the country. Compared with other Atlantic ports, New York is holding its own. Compared with Pacific ports, for example, New York is losing, but losing along with other Atlantic ports. The New York Journal of Commerce supplies this table:

	Imports— Per ct. of total.	Imports— Per ct. Atlantic ports.	Exports— Per ct. of total.	Exports— Per ct. Atlantic ports.
1902	61.98	80.19	35.49	54.76
1901	64.05	78.62	35.60	52.81
1900	63.21	77.52	37.21	53.85
1899	66.78	80.80	37.44	52.76
1898	65.30	80.14	38.17	51.09
1897	62.85	73.17	37.27	53.42
1896	64.12	77.48	40.14	55.72
1895	65.20	77.55	40.32	55.15
1894	63.47	77.34	41.38	55.08
1893	63.31	76.47	40.99	55.65

The table makes it clear that while the per cent of total imports has noticeably declined from 65 per cent to 62, the per cent of Atlantic ports is about where it was four years ago, and higher than it was nine years ago. Exports tell much the same story. But the decline in total exports merely reflects a uniform geographical tendency, thus:

	1902.	1894.
Atlantic ports	64.81	73.13
Gulf and Mexican	20.80	14.99
Pacific	6.33	3.92
Northern border and interior	8.06	5.96
Totals	100.00	100.0

The Journal of Commerce correctly concludes, therefore, that the difficulty is much less that New York is losing to other Atlantic ports through railway differentials or other influences, though this is to some extent true, than that the Atlantic ports are losing relatively because of the growth of the newer parts of the country. The increased shipments of corn and cotton from the Gulf ports is due in the main to their proximity to the place of production. It is within recent years that Texas has become a large cotton-grower, and the corn belt has been moving toward the Southwest, which throws more of the corn exports to Galveston and New Orleans. The development of the Pacific Coast naturally increases the amount of exportation from San Francisco, Portland and Puget Sound ports. The ports along our northern border are growing in importance and are doing more of their foreign trade direct.

Now, the real significance of hope and reassurance in all this lies in the fact that these gains for other sections over New York do not consist altogether of the increased trade conducted with the regions nearer the gaining than the losing points. The percentage of growth shown by Gulf ports is greater than the increased percentage of our total trade in Gulf State products, and so on. Thus, in eight years the volume of trade going through Pacific ports has increased by 65 per cent, while the country as a whole has increased its trade with China, for example, but 16 per cent in ten years. It is fair to assume that the Pacific ports will continue to do a larger and larger share of this country's trade with the Orient. The Treasury's statistics give the following very creditable showing for Pacific ports:

Fiscal year.	Imports.	Exports.
1893	$48,315,035	$42,229,504
1894	41,241,034	34,599,339
1895	40,290,105	36,061,032
1896	49,174,138	44,071,169
1897	43,906,143	58,925,171
1898	59,283,791	74,183,222
1899	45,873,236	56,203,575
1900	58,916,113	70,175,057
1901	48,202,943	69,553,962
1902	54,301,387	87,515,283

A powerful contributory cause in this rise of Pacific port trade is the activity of transcontinental railroads, which have done and are still doing much to encourage direct trade across the Pacific in preference to the Suez or Cape Horn routes.

SENATOR LODGE CORRECTED.

Ex-Governor Chamberlain, of South Carolina, has done the cause of sound politics and education an important service in his recent paper before the Massachusetts Historical Society on "The Historical Conception of the United States Constitution and the Union." Mr. Chamberlain shows that United States Senator Lodge was utterly wrong when, in his biography of Daniel Webster, he said:

When the Constitution was adopted by the votes of states at Philadelphia, and accepted by the votes of states in popular conventions, it is safe to say that there was not a man in the country, from Washington and Hamilton, on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason, on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment entered upon by the states, and from which each and every state had the right peaceably to withdraw—a right which was very likely to be exercised.

Goldwin Smith adopts this erroneous view of Senator Lodge when he says that "few can doubt that the Union originally was and was generally taken by the parties to it to be a compact dissoluble at pleasure, certainly dissoluble on breach of the articles of the Union." Mr. Lodge's erroneous statement has been in print and accepted by the youth of the land as authentic history, for Mr. Lodge is a graduate of Harvard and for a number of years employed his leisure in the writing of American history and biography. Mr. Chamberlain shows that the nation formed in 1789 "was originally intended to be perpetual and indissoluble, except of course by force or common consent." George Mason, of Virginia, who was against the adoption of the Federal Constitution, said: "This paper (the Constitution) will be the great charter of America; it will be paramount to everything. After having once consented to it, we cannot recede from it." James Madison, of Virginia, who was for the adoption of the Constitution, wrote Alexander Hamilton, while the New York convention called to ratify or reject the Constitution was in session, as follows in answer to a suggestion of the possibility of a peaceable secession:

My opinion is that a reservation of a right to withdraw, if amendments be not decided on under the form of the Constitution within a certain time, is a conditional ratification; that it does not make New York a member of the new Union, and consequently that she could not be received on that plan. Compacts must be reciprocal—this principle could not in such a case be preserved. The Constitution requires an adoption in toto and forever. It has been so adopted by the other states. An adoption for a limited time would be as ineffective as an adoption of some of the articles only. In short, any condition whatever must vitiate the ratification.

Madison here distinctly declared as a framer of the Constitution that the compact was perpetual. Of course, the issue of peaceable secession ceased to be practical politics with the triumph of the armies of the Union. It was practical politics in 1802 when the New England Federalists were foaming at the mouth with epileptic rage at Jefferson's Administration. It was practical politics in 1811, when the question of the admission of Louisiana as a state was under discussion. It was practical politics in 1814, when the Hartford convention was in session, and it was practical politics in the sense that it was a live question from 1820 until the duel to the death between North and South broke out in 1861. With the triumph of the Union arms the question whether a state or any number of states had a right to secede without being liable to coercion by the Government of the United States was settled for all time.

The Civil War settled the point that the Federal Government would always maintain the Union by force of arms whenever necessary. As practical politics the North and South have no further concern with the doctrine of peaceable secession, but as an academical question it will always be most interesting, and it is of high historical importance that our growing youth should not be educated to believe on the authority of Mr. Lodge that the framers of the Constitution did not hold it to be indissoluble, and expected that ultimately peaceable secession would be permitted under it to take place. It is a matter of present and future consequence that the growing generation be not taught by a New England man in his histories and biographies that the South really had a legal right peaceably to secede and flock by herself uncoerced. Mr. Chamberlain shows by the contemporaneous understanding of the nature of the Constitution as expressed both by Madison and George Mason when it was adopted that the right of peaceable secession never existed under the Constitution.

The dictum of Mr. Lodge is utterly without foundation, and it is extraordinary that a man of his pretensions as a student of our political history should have exposed himself to such damaging criticism. The view of Madison was in his reply to Hamilton that a state which had once ratified must remain in the Federal bond forever, and that the Constitution could neither provide for nor contemplate its own destruction. It was on this declaration of Madison, Hamilton, Marshall and Mason that Webster rested his logic in his famous debate with Hayne. His eloquence was all his own, but his interpretation of the Constitution dated back to men who framed and first expounded it. And yet Mr. Lodge, who wrote the life of Webster, reached a conclusion that is without historical warrant and fatal to the justice and logic of Webster's famous plea for the perpetuity of the Union.

THE REVOLUTION IN WARFARE.

An order has been issued for the mobilization of militia and regular troops at Fort Riley, Kan., for the field maneuvers to take place there in September, to continue ten days, during which time the troops will be instructed in every detail of field work. The art of war has been so revolutionized in the last thirty years that books on tactics or strategy written more than fifteen years ago are become out of date, and even within fifteen years great changes have taken place. After the general adoption of musketry and cannon by the armies of Europe there were no revolutionary changes in tactics until the invention of the modern magazine rifle and smokeless powder. It is true that Gustavus Adolphus improved somewhat on the tactical formations of Maurice of Nassau; that Frederick the Great improved something the methods of Gustavus; that Napoleon massed artillery and used it more effectively than any of his predecessors, but Napoleon's infantry tactics were those he had learned in his youth in the first battles of the Revolution.

The French always attacked with a thick cloud of skirmishers covering one or two lines of battalions in columns. This attack in column had succeeded against Prussians, Austrians and Russians, but it never succeeded against the English. The attack in column had the fatal defect that when it charged it presented a small front, and only the first two ranks could fire. The French column advanced generally in column of companies or double companies, with a front of forty, or at most of eighty, and with a depth of nine or eighteen, since the company was always three deep and there were six companies to a battalion. Sometimes a whole regiment or brigade formed one close column. The British infantry always stood firm in line, and 800 men in two-deep line poured 800 bullets per volley into a French battalion of the same strength which could only return 160. The deep column of the French was destroyed by superior weight of fire, and it was impossible to deploy under so terrible a fire.

The fact that with anything like equal numbers the line could beat the column was first made clear by the English under General Stuart at the battle of Maida, in Italy, in 1806. It was proved again at Talavera, and still more at Busaco and Albuera. At Albuera three English brigades drove double their numbers from a commanding ridge simply by their superiority of fire, and at Waterloo the French attacked in column and were repulsed by the English in line. During the twenty years of Napoleon's career it cannot be said that any revolutionary changes were made in tactics. Napoleon's genius for war was manifest in the use he made of his artillery and his cavalry, but his infantry tactics were fatally defective when attacked by first-class infantry in line. From Waterloo down to the Franco-German War it cannot be said that there were any revolutionary changes in tactics. In the Crimean War of 1854-56 the Russians at the Alma, at Inkermann and Balaklava always attacked in column and were repulsed by the English in line. The French attacked in column at Solferino in 1859, but Austrian infantry are not Englishmen.

The revolution in modern warfare was foreshadowed when Prussia in 1866 with the needle gun defeated Austria at Sadowa, armed with obsolete muskets. The coming change was further indicated by our Civil War, when every attack in column by either side upon an entrenched position fairly manned was disastrously repulsed. In the German War of 1870-71 it was made clear that cavalry could no longer charge infantry with effect. Then came the improved magazine rifle and smokeless powder. This compels the radical change in modern tactics. The essence of modern warfare is to advance in loose order and never have too big a clump of soldiers for your enemy to fire at. The battle will be spread over a very large front, and in Moltke's opinion the altered conditions of warfare have rendered it impossible to hope that in a war between France and Germany any decisive result would be arrived at before two years. Moltke explained that a great war hereafter would be excessively prolonged because it must partake of the character of siege operations.

Each combatant would find himself confronted by carefully prepared and elaborately fortified lines, behind which would be arranged forces equal or superior in number to those opposed to them. The invading army would have to take these fortresses, a task that would probably wear out the patience and exhaust the resources of both sides to the struggle. This revolutionary change in modern warfare, the greatest that has taken place since musketry and cannon became the arbiters of battle, is not due to anything save the improvement of firearms in range and rapidity of action, and to smokeless powder. Without smoke there is no screen from the enemy's fire; the magazine rifle will kill for a mile to a mile and a half. Improved artillery is five times more deadly than it was in 1870. To charge in column against an enemy in entrenched position, armed with modern rifles and cannon, would be madness, so modern battles, it is predicted, will be decided by men lying in hastily prepared trenches which they have scooped out to protect themselves from the fire of a distant and invisible enemy.

Even in the days of 1864, under Grant in Virginia and Sherman in Georgia, the men soon learned, with or without orders, the moment they arrived in the enemy's front to dig shallow trenches with their bayonets as a protection against rifle fire or assault. Wars, it is predicted, will be long, tedious, exhausting, expensive, and therefore sure to be infrequent. To illustrate the enormous change that smokeless powder has created in modern warfare, it is calculated that 100 sharpshooters would put a battery out of action in four minutes if they could get within a range of 1000 yards. With the screen of smoke gone, with the range, accuracy and rapidity of fire enormously increased, military operations must be conducted at long range or behind shelter. If the Boers' rude shelters could stand off the British, the French or German lines of entrenched camps would be impregnable to the invader.

At length General Miles has been permitted to carry out his long-cherished idea and depart hence for the Philippines on a tour of Army inspection. He has for some time occupied that most unenviable, not to say pathetic, position in life presented by a man of successful achievement upon a plane of prominence that disturbs his poise. He, like many others, has found that the vocation of playing the hero is much more difficult to pursue than was the doing of heroic deeds. Fitted by Nature for action, General Miles forged grandly forward in our frontier Indian wars and won a place in our military history as a brave soldier and a commander upon whose judgment in active warfare the country could rely. It was only when he fell heir in piping times of peace to the popular and social distinctions that belong to his position as head of the Army that he failed to maintain the dignity of his office. His duties having ceased to be active, he essayed the passive and spectacular role, which being entirely out of his line, he soon developed a childish and vain spirit which brought him public humiliation. Having had his lesson in this bitter role—a lesson that it was, unfortunately, necessary to repeat more than once, and nearing the age when he will be retired upon his honors, it is believed that General Miles will give no further cause for offense to his superiors, the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, but will pursue his inspection of Army matters in the Philippines with unbiased mind, and report his findings with truth devoid of officiousness. It becomes the public to recall, as evidently the President has done, with gratitude and admiration, the great service that General Miles has rendered the country, and draw the veil of silence over the rest.

Andrew White, the slayer of Peter Beauchene, is the stolid, brutal son of an insane father. While the cause of his lawless life may thus be discerned in excuse for his crime, his criminal tendencies cannot be allowed upon this basis. The young man is not insane in the sense that he can be shut up in an asylum for the protection of the public from a sudden freak of murderous intent. He is sufficiently sane to seek his own safety by flight when in danger of detection, and while primarily sinned against through being called into life overburdened by the curse of mental unsoundness, his capacity for sinning against his fellow-man is so great that pity can only intervene to save him from punishment at the peril of human life. He must, indeed, be a dull reader of the signs that Nature sets upon the human face who does not see in the picture of this man the stamp that brutal passion has placed thereon as a danger signal to society.

If a switch is not properly set, no reason appears why a motorman should send his car through it, the Coroner's jury to the contrary notwithstanding. This does not, however, mitigate the severity of the verdict's just censure of the Fulton switch for being defective. Fatal acidents of this sort are not to be discouraged by whitewashing the offending companies, and the Coroner's jury is to be commended for its outspoken utterance.

There is no sadder chapter in the history of a community than that which chronicles the wasted life and pauper death of a degenerate son of a worthy sire. Several chapters of this kind have been added to the history of Portland from time to time, the only consoling feature of which is that which tells of the consignment of a wasted body that once bore an honored name to "the low green tent whose curtain never outward swings."

If the Chicago Record-Herald really desires to know the normal church attendance of Chicago, it should choose some time other than midsummer for the count. Estimates of church attendance when churchgoers are largely out of town are worthless.

WHY THE CREEDLESS CHURCH FAILS

Chicago Inter Ocean.

Bishop Vincent in his sermon at the University of Chicago on Sunday squarely took issue with those who think the abolition of parties in the state and of sects in the church would speedily bring in the millennium. "Sects," he declared, "are good things. They indicate that the church is at work seeking to know more of the truth."

Neither churches, nor states, nor individual men can go forward until they map out, however roughly, the road they would travel. Such road maps are creeds. They may be full of errors. Made by finite men, they cannot show all the roads to infinite truth. But they show at least some ways by which men who have soberly thought upon the great problems of human life believe truth may be reached. They express such men's best opinion of the fundamental principles of man's conduct here as affecting his fate hereafter.

Belief in fundamental principles of some kind is evidently necessary to efficient action of any kind. Without such belief there can be no achievement. "The man of principle," as Bishop Vincent well said, "will arrive at the greatest results. No great truth was ever arrived at without sticking close to principle."

The bishop might have gone further and truthfully declared that without defined principles—maps of his intended road—no man ever did good for himself or others, or ever will. For in that condition a man is simply an unloosed force, lacking both road and goal, and his strivings are more futile and less responsible than those of the wind which bloweth where it listeth.

It is easy for any of us to say "I will be virtuous." But until we formulate the principles by which we will act we can never assure even ourselves that we have attained the desired condition, let alone convincing others that our example is worthy of imitation. And, no matter how virtuous our lives, until we or some one for us formulates the principles by which we have made life what it is, as an example it is utterly worthless. And as soon as we begin to formulate principles we have a creed, whose followers become a sect.

Every religious organization really has a creed to begin with. Its members may say, and with all honesty, that they have none save an aspiration and resolution to virtuous living. Then their creed is their confidence in their leader—their belief that his practice and precept point the way to salvation. If they proceed to reduce his words and his life to a definite system—make a map of the road along which he points—then their church endures according to its merits. But if they fail to formulate such system their church comes to an end with its founder.

From the viewpoint of abstract ethics the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth showed no vast superiority over those of Socrates. But the followers of Jesus reduced his teachings to a creed, and they lived. The followers of Socrates went no further than a general aspiration to virtue, and his doctrine faded with those who knew the man in the flesh. Here is the difference between the teacher of virtue and the founder of religion. The influence of one perished with him. The influence of the other endures according to its content of infinite truth.

That is why the creedless church ever has failed and ever will. It leaves no map of its road for the guidance of future generations. Having failed to formulate whatever truth it may possess, it passes from life with its leader.

DIVINELY APPOINTED MR. BAER

Chicago Record-Herald.

President Baer, of the Philadelphia & Reading Company, has sent the following hopeful message to a religiously inclined correspondent who had interceded for the coal strikers:

The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for, not by the labor agitations, but by the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of the country, and upon the successful management of which so much depends. Do not be discouraged. Pray earnestly that right may triumph, always remembering that the Lord God omnipotent still reigns and that his reign is one of law and order, and not of violence and crime.

One would have to be well acquainted with Mr. Baer to know whether this message were the cant of a conscious hypocrite or merely the symptoms of a stupefying attack of self-righteousness, but in either case it is a string of false ideas and false sentiment.

If the blasphemous reference to the Deity had the significance which the writer imputes to it then not only the pious Baer but every successful Croesus would be among the Lord's anointed, not matter how unscrupulous his methods and depraved his morals.

The reference to law and order is equally unfortunate. Mr. Baer is an active member of one of the most persistent and offensive law-breaking organizations in the country. By its very existence it breaks the laws of the State of Pennsylvania and of the United States. Though the disorderly striker should be suppressed, what is his influence toward anarchy compared with that of the plutocrat, who is an anarchist by divine right?

But perhaps the most amazing thing about the message is the insensibility it reveals to the industrial and political movements of the time. Self-righteousness is common enough among all classes, the obstinacy of Mr. Baer is peculiar to a few extreme individualists of the let-things-alone school. All the rest of the world knows that such property interests as this man's are laden with public obligations, whose fulfillment is not a matter of his will but of the public's. His message will merely intensify the demand for the public control of monopolies.

Happy Republicans.

Chicago Chronicle.

Mr. Watterson's dislike for Grover Cleveland is so great that he has no hesitation in saying that as between him and Mr. Roosevelt he would vote for the latter. There is reason to believe that many other Democrats are of the same opinion.

On the other hand, there are Democrats who are so much opposed to Mr. Bryan that as between him and Mr. Roosevelt they would prefer Mr. Roosevelt.

Unless all appearances are deceitful a majority of the Democrats of the country are more inclined to vote for a Republican than they are to vote for some Democrats.

This is a delightful condition of affairs for Mr. Roosevelt and for the Republicans generally. If they can manage to preserve the status quo they will not be called upon to overexert themselves in the next Presidential campaign. Democrats who cannot tolerate each other are not likely to be very troublesome to anybody but themselves.

The Men of Old.

Richard Monckton Milnes (Lord Houghton).

I know not that the men of old
Were better than men now,
Of heart more kind, of hand more bold,
Of more ingenuous brow:
I heed not those who pine for force
A ghost of Time to raise,
As if they thus could check the course
Of these appointed days.

To them was life a simple art
Of duties to be done,
A game where each man took his part,
A race where all must run;
A battle whose great scheme and scope
They little cared to know,
Content, as men at arms, to cope
Each with his fronting foe.

Man now his Virtue's diadem
Puts on and proudly wears,
Great thoughts, great feelings, came to them,
Like instincts, unawares:
Blending their souls' sublimest needs
With tasks of every day,
They went about their gravest deeds,
As noble boys at play.

DISENGENUOUSNESS OF SHAW.

New York Times.

Secretary Shaw's speech at the Republican "rally" held in his Vermont birthplace exhibits him as a man quite destitute of ideas, content to follow the dusty, beaten track of narrow partisanship, and one not above employing the old tricks and deceptions of party stump speaking to fool the farmer in the old way and strengthen the Republican hold on power by protectionist arguments that have grown stale by two generations of repetition and are as void of truth now as when they were first employed.

Secretary Shaw ranges himself with Senator Aldrich, Senator Hanna, Congressman Grosvenor, and the American Protective Tariff League against any meddling with the tariff. He makes phrases, to be sure, intended to inspire his hearers with the belief that he is not opposed to a readjustment of the tariff, but his whole argument shows that he is opposed to it. Here is his position:

Whenever Congress reaches the conclusion that the friends of protection are strong enough to conservatively modify certain schedules, so as to meet changed conditions and at the same time successfully resist the efforts of the opposition to revise the entire tariff law, thus paralyzing business for a season, I shall be in favor of it.

That is the doctrine of Dingleyism forever. If the "friends of protection" are not strong enough now to revise where revision seems good to them and to resist successfully the efforts of the reckless Democrats to upset the whole structure of protection, when in Heaven's name will they be strong enough? Republican revision of the tariff is always a matter of tomorrow, and tomorrow never comes. General Grosvenor, to whom the Dingley act is inerrant gospel, could indorse every word spoken by Secretary Shaw at Morrisville.

The comments of Governor Cummins, of Iowa, upon Mr. Shaw's speech would be mighty interesting reading. The Secretary says as plainly as language can say it that Governor Cummins' Iowa platform is a hollow fraud, a piece of canting hypocrisy and false pretense. Its statements, he says, "are academically correct." "Is there any one who is not 'in favor of such changes in the tariff from time to time as are advisable'? I am willing the jury shall be polled on that proposition. So say we all. It also declares 'in favor of any modification of tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly.' And, again, we all say, 'Aye, sir,' to the proposition."

Secretary Shaw accepts this "academically correct" platform in whole and in part. Yet Secretary Shaw goes on record as opposed to "the dangerous experiment" of any attempt to revise the tariff at the present time. If the Republicans of Iowa in their platform declarations meant what Secretary Shaw says they meant, then they stand with him as opposing tariff revision. But their platform has been accepted at its face value, according to the natural meaning of its language, as a declaration "in favor of any modification of tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly." We must leave Secretary Shaw to settle with Governor Cummins the issue of honor and good faith that has been raised between them by the Secretary's speech.

Colonel Woodruff and the Antis.

Army and Navy Journal.

Colonel Charles A. Woodruff, Subsistence Department, United States Army, who acted as counsel for Brigadier-General Jacob H. Smith before the court-martial which recently tried that officer in Manila, has written a letter from the Philippines to Captain Bert F. Parsons, of U. S. Grant Post, No. 327, G. A. R., of Brooklyn, in which he expresses gratification with the support given to General Smith by many Grand Army posts in the United States. In the course of his letter, Colonel Woodruff says: "Can it be that there are people in America who have a kindlier feeling for the semi-civilized bands in this country, who murder our soldiers and assassinate or torture natives who are supposed to be friendly to us, than they had for our erring brothers from '61 to '65? I cannot for a moment imagine that any fair-minded, right-thinking person can entertain such an idea. Some of the hardships that our troops have gone through out here surpass anything that we experienced in the Civil War, and the officers and men engaged in these operations deserve the highest commendation. The fact is that our troops in these islands, both regulars and volunteers, have reflected credit upon our people, upon our civilization and upon our American manhood." Unfortunately, however, it will take something more powerful than the truthful and eloquent testimony of a high-minded soldier like Colonel Woodruff to shame and silence the malicious slanderers of the Army here at home.

PERSONS WORTH KNOWING ABOUT.

The new Archbishop of the Catholic diocese of Glasgow, Scotland, Rev. Dr. Maguire, has been the mainstay of the archdiocese for several years, having been appointed auxiliary bishop to the late archbishop in 1894, when Dr. Eyre became enfeebled through old age. Dr. Maguire is said to possess superior administrative ability.

George C. Thomas, of the Philadelphia banking house of Drexel & Co., has made a gift of $100,000 to the Church of the Holy Apostles of that city, to be used for a new parish house and school building. Mr. Thomas is a prominent member of this Episcopal church, is superintendent of the Sunday school, and has always taken an active interest in guild work.

Menelek, Emperor of Abyssinia, has forbidden the sale of intoxicants in any part of his dominions, and the culprit who infringes the law is liable to the heaviest penalty. It is said that the Emperor felt compelled to take these stringent measures by reason of the lamentable excesses to which many of his nobles gave way. The Emperor is himself a total abstainer.

M. Baron, the French actor, recently accepted a railroad pass, and as the French law requires that all such billets shall have a picture of the holder upon it, Mr. Baron had himself photographed as Mephistopheles. In this character he is better known than as a private individual, and both the railway and the government officials are content to regard the law as fully complied with.

The largest prelate in all Christendom is the Catholic bishop of Armidah, Australia. His name is Dr. Terregianni, and he was the head of the Capuchin monastery at Peckham Rye when promoted to this diocese 20 years ago. He is a man of enormous physical bulk, and is said to weigh nearly 300 pounds. Once when officiating in his cathedral he was fired at by a lunatic. He escaped uninjured, the bullet passing through his vestments.

King Victor of Italy has a passion for coin collection, and has the most valuable assortment in the world aside from that of the British Museum. The King's passion for numismatics began at the age of 12, and was inspired by his English governess, Miss Lee, who collected coins on her own account when in Rome. His collection has some 24 cupboards in one of the rooms of the Quirinal, and not even the cares of kingship can keep him away from them.

Strenuosity seems to have invaded the pulpit as well as politics. Last Sunday, Rev. William Sweet, of Everett, Mass., during his sermon at the First Presbyterian Church, at Passaic, N. J., to an audience made up of the city's wealthiest citizens, gave an excellent illustration of his methods. For the first 10 minutes of his sermon all went along calmly. Then he threw a vase of flowers, a Bible and a pitcher down among the congregation. The worshipers only smiled, and the pastor quietly resumed his sermon.

Captain Crawford J. Smith, of Philadelphia, late master of the British steamer Corunda, has received from President Roosevelt, representing the United States Government, a handsomely inscribed gold watch and chain in recognition of the fact that he rescued the crew of the American bark Ella, which foundered on January 17, 220 miles south southeast of Bermuda. When the captain fell in with the disabled vessel a terrific gale was raging, and no seaman on the Corunda would volunteer to go to the assistance of those aboard the Ella. Then the Corunda's officers and men manned a boat, and all hands were taken from the sinking craft.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The fair site will be chosen September 12. But don't give us away.

The cost of living, to some of us, is no higher. Our salaries are just the same.

The hop season will soon open and growers will dance to the music of 20 or 25 cents a pound.

Tracy and Merrill have worked more of a reform in the penitentiary than the officials could have done.

The Standard Oil Company formally denies that it owns the world. This company is too utterly modest.

But why should Alger's fluke as Secretary of War incapacitate him for Senator? The Senate is an asylum for wise men.

Theoretically that was a terrible naval battle off New England. Let us rejoice, therefore, that real battles are always practical.

The American girl whom the German Crown Prince wished to marry is said to be a dream, but the Kaiser has waked things up.

A Venezuelan warship poured hot shot into a rebel fort for two days, but nothing more was accomplished than to make hot-air reports for the newspapers.

Nearly a million people are on the pension roll. That is to say, almost one person in 75 draws a pension. Except for wars, some people would be hard up for a living.

A German newspaper urges intervention in Venezuela, not boorish intervention, but the gentlemanly kind; the kind that will hold up and rob Venezuela without rudeness.

The "Wild West" is passing away into history so fast that the "Wild West Show" is getting to be as big a novelty on the Western shore of America as on the Eastern.

Puget Sound ports lay claim to the largest lumber shipment ever made from the Pacific Coast. They are thinking of their gab and hot-air cargoes, for they have shipped plenty of such.

Don't worry about who is to be United States Senator. The Legislature contains some men of independent minds. About 99 of them will have something to say—that is, more or less of the number.

It is getting to be a regular occurrence for shepherds to be attacked and shot by murderous rivals on Eastern Oregon ranges. Evidently the bounty on coyotes should be removed and placed where it will do more good.

Foster said Roosevelt was coming out this Fall. Our own Binger Hermann did not tell definitely when the President was coming, but, as Foster is contradicted, our own Binger is a prophet not without honor in his own country.

The Governors of four states will attend the laying of the corner-stone of the Lewis and Clark monument. The occasion might also be used for breaking ground for the exposition, provided a site can be chosen by that time.

Those criminals who held up a citizen on Third street need the extreme limit of the law, and even that limit is too lenient. Highway robbery is hardly short of the crime of murder, for if it does not end in murder, the fault lies not with the highwaymen.

It is estimated that there are 400 square miles of coal deposit in Coos County. Yet all the coal heretofore produced there has been worked out of two square miles of territory. The standing timber of Coos County is estimated at between 7,000,000,000 and 8,000,000,000 feet.

Evidently "Hell-Roaring Jake" Smith left the roar in the Philippines; or did the roar come from the sentimentalists, who would combat savage treachery with passive lenity? But civilization does not put itself at such disadvantage. It is lenient only when it has no resistance.

And now Secretary Shaw favors gradual revision of the tariff. Things are going along differently than once upon a time. Then, high tariff barons ran the dynasty and Hanna was grand vizier. Now the scepter has departed from the dynasty and the people have inherited their own.

Emperor William is trying to write poetry. His esteemed progenitor, Frederick the Great, made himself ridiculous trying to write poetry, but he was a man immeasurably beyond the present Kaiser. Therefore, if Frederick the Great and the Kaiser try to write poetry together, who is the better man?

Those of us whose admiration for Jim Hill's talents has made us fear that he was right in everything, now see that talents don't cover everything. Jim Hill has declared that the Pacific Coast doesn't need the inter-oceanic canal. It is probable that a man of Jim Hill's big mind would be right in this question if, forsooth, it did not profit him to be wrong.

The Czarowitz, the Grand Duke Michael Alexandrovitch, is engaged to marry the Duchess Cecile Augustine Marie, second daughter of the Grand Duchess of Anastasia of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. Empress Tsi An, of China, has ordered Wang Chi Chua to use his best endeavors to compass the death of Kang Yu Wei, Governor of Kwang Province. Some news we receive with the intensest interest and satisfaction.

Inventor Edison declares that the achievement of aerial navigation is too far off for practical projects at present. This is disputed, however, by flighty Santos-Dumont, who came over to America to sail his airship around the statue of Liberty in