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.....$0.85
Daily, Sunday excepted, per year..... 7.50
Daily, with Sunday, per year..... 9.00
Sunday, per year..... 2.00
The Weekly, per year..... 1.50
The Weekly, 3 months..... .50
To City Subscribers—
Daily, per week, delivered, Sunday excepted.15c
Daily, per week, delivered, Sunday included.20c

POSTAGE RATES.

United States, Canada and Mexico:
10 to 14-page paper.....1c
14 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, subscription 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; 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, 259 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 Washington, D. C., by the Ebbett House news stand.

For sale in Denver, Colo., by Hamilton & Kendrick, 906-912 Seventeenth street; Louthan & Jackson Book and Stationery Co., Fifteenth and Lawrence streets; A. Series, Sixteenth and Curtis streets.

TODAY'S WEATHER—Occasional rain, with brisk to high southerly winds.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 49; minimum temperature, 37; precipitation, trace.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, MARCH 7.

THE GERMAN TARIFF.

The current number of the Atlantic Monthly, under the caption of "A Letter From Germany," discusses the German Tariff and its effect upon the export trade of the United States from the point of view of an able American observer, William C. Dreher. The tariff law recently passed by the German Reichstag is a far more important matter for us than the Venezuelan blockade. This law is important, not so much for the high rates adopted as for the statement made in the debate that henceforth Germany will concede nothing to such nations as are glad to take what Germany gives by treaty without making any concessions in return. The United States having introduced a limitation of the "most-favored-nation" clause, Germany is disposed to act precisely in the same manner. Germany complains of our recent treaty with Cuba now before the Senate for ratification and recalls our reciprocity treaties with various countries under the McKinley law.

When the existing commercial treaties with Austria, Russia, Italy and Switzerland were made, Germany conceded to all other nations entitled to the "most-favored-nation" treatment the same reductions as were made to these countries. The United States thus secured valuable concessions from Germany without giving anything in return. The duty on wheat, for example, was reduced from 32 to 23 cents per bushel; that on corn from 12 to less than 10; and corresponding reductions were made on meats. The Germans complain on the other hand that the United States has interpreted the "most-favored-nation" clause as not forbidding special trade arrangements between two countries. The German agrarians fairly say that we cannot expect Germany to apply to us a more liberal construction of the "most-favored-nation" clause than we have granted her. Under the new German tariff law we must either make a special reciprocity treaty with Germany or we must let our exports take their chance under the general scale of duties.

The outlook for a satisfactory reciprocity arrangement with Germany is unfavorable at present, because, under the reciprocity section of the Dingley tariff act, the list of articles that may be reduced is so meager that there is almost nothing in it that could be offered to Germany as an inducement for granting us trade advantages. No new treaty can be expected before our tariff shall have been revised and the discretion of the Government to reduce duties greatly enlarged. Mr. Dreher says that the German law is sure to force a heavy reduction in our exports to Germany, and when this takes place the pressure of public opinion may bring the Senate to reason. In absence of a treaty our goods will enter Germany under the general tariff, while those of our competitors who get treaties with Germany will come in at greatly reduced rates. American wheat will be subject to a duty of 49 cents per bushel, while that of Russia, Roumania and other competing countries may be reduced under treaty to 35 cents. Our corn has been coming into Germany at less than 10 cents a bushel, and two years ago Germany's imports of it reached 104,000,000 marks out of a total of 129,000,000. During the current year imports have shrunk enormously, owing to our reduced crop of 1901 and consequent high prices, but Germany obtained its deficit from Russia and Roumania. Of course when our corn under the new German tariff pays a duty of 30 cents we cannot expect to compete with the Russian and Roumanian product paying about half that figure.

Germany has left indispensable American articles, like cotton, petroleum and crude copper, on the free list; but there are other countries than the United States ready to supply Germany with wheat, corn and other grains. Germany is not dependent on us for meat, and other countries with good commercial treaties could displace us in the matter of our exports of bacon and lard to Germany. This German law is the direct effect of our unwise policy of shutting up our markets against outside competition, which must ultimately result in abating our present attitude of unconditional resistance to tariff reform. When our own agrarians begin to feel the pinch of lost export trade, the United States Senate will not find it easy to defeat the next reciprocity treaty with Germany that comes up for ratification. The German government has all along stated that the duties fixed in the new tariff are mere counters to be traded off in making new commercial treaties. The tariff controversy is thus left open until these treaties have been laid before the Reichstag and ratified.

As the term of the present Reichstag expires in June, the treaties will have to be disposed of by the new House to be elected then. The election, therefore, will turn upon the tariff issue, and the Social Democracy will not fail to point out to the laboring population and the poorer classes in the cities that the price of their food is to be raised in the interest of the large agricultural landholders. The Socialists are convinced that the country is opposed to the heavy increase on the bread and meat of the people, and will appeal to the masses next June with the campaign cry of "bread usury." This is the situation that confronts us today under the new German tariff law. Germany, by its enactment, forcibly tells the hidebound protectionist leaders of the Republican Senate that "if a policy of commercial exclusiveness is good for us, other nations may regard it as equally good for them."

IS THE REFERENDUM NULLIFIED?

Attorney-General Crawford's opinion on the referendum uncovers a new source of weakness in that celebrated and vicissitudinous document. In view of the numerous discoveries that have succeeded each other within the past two years, it was fair to suppose that at length we had come into a reasonably accurate understanding as to what the referendum really is. But the hope if entertained was evidently too sanguine. We continue to learn.

It has long been known that measures might be rendered immune from the referendum, provided that they were "necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety," and were so declared to be by the statutory enactment. It is also known to lawyers that the courts have been exceedingly liberal in their interpretation of what public peace, health and safety may be held to include. Nearly everything that comes within the scope of Legislative enactment becomes necessary and vital to the public welfare, provided only that the Legislature so pronounces it. We see here a mark of the disposition of courts to yield questions of policy to the legislative and executive departments of government, so notably evidenced in the United States Supreme Court's rulings in the so-called insular cases.

But the Attorney-General goes one step farther. He rediscovers and gives vitality to the further passage in the referendum amendment which excludes from its operations all acts which are given an emergency clause by the Legislature, without even the trouble to advert to the public safety, health or peace. If the Attorney-General is right, therefore, the referendum is nullified as regards everything except such statutes as are deliberately left by the Legislature open to its operation; and we are simply face to face with a situation precisely tantamount to the old one where the Legislature called in the referendum by specific invocation instead of by equally conscious permission, as now appears to be the proper procedure.

This ruling may be right; but we should say it is not likely to prevail by unanimous consent. Neither the advocates of the referendum nor the private interests affected by legislation unfavorable to them are likely to suffer the inutility of so important an instrument of obstruction as the referendum seems to put into their hands without a struggle. It is perfectly evident that if the Attorney-General's construction of the law were to be resisted, it would unsettle the status of a tremendous mass of legislation. Suppose the new Portland charter, for example, were to be contested on the ground that it is not necessary to the public peace, health and safety, as alleged, and that therefore it is inoperative for ninety days after its passage; it is easy to see into what confusion pending street improvements, for one thing, might be thrown. The cloud of doubt that hangs over this whole matter needs dispersion by something more final than any ruling that it has yet received.

DR. GATLING AND HIS INVENTION.

Dr. Richard Jordan Gatling, whose death occurred in New York City a few days ago, was, notwithstanding the fact that his name was known to the world in connection with a death-dealing implement, one of the kindest and most humane of men. He was a native of North Carolina, where he was born three-fourths of a century ago, began life as a clerk in a store in St. Louis, became an inventor at an early age, and had for some years resided in England, though making frequent and long visits to his native land. Up to the time the Civil War broke out his chief inventions had been a double-acting hemp-breaker and a steam plow. Like many others whose genius—mechanical and military—awaited opportunity for development, Dr. Gatling found in this event a chance to make a name for himself through personal achievement. He was at that time living in Indianapolis, completing a railroad for which he had a contract. Turning his attention, as did every one else, to the war, he soon saw that the methods and implements of warfare were antiquated, and became convinced that, if the whole dreadful business could be hurried, quite a large proportion of the miseries and mortality of war could be saved. With the purpose of compelling to quick results, he set about designing a gun that would make war intolerable. The result was the gun that bears his name. Like most inventors, he met with many disappointments, and it was not until 1864 that he perfected his idea, and not until two years later that his gun was adopted by the Government.

As is usual in such cases, Dr. Gatling's invention made more favorable impression abroad than at home. France, Germany, England, Turkey, Sweden, Russia, Italy and even Japan seized the rapid-firing idea at once. The small arms theories were revolutionized by a gun that could fire from 200 to 600 shots a minute with remarkable accuracy for ranges up to 2000 yards, and hand-to-hand conflicts and close-range battles became the accidents and not the deliberate purpose of military commanders. And when their efficiency was increased so that the Gatling gun would fire 1200 shots a minute without any perceptible recoil, the complete success of the invention was assured. The inventor, however, still continued his efforts to produce death-dealing ordnance, and, though an old man, was constantly up to the time of his sudden death, a week ago, trying to perfect his inventions.

Like Alfred Nobel, who invented or discovered dynamite, Dr. Gatling was a man of peace and kindness. He saw in war all of its miseries, and in the destruction of human life through war all of its attendant horrors. Yet he was wise enough to know that the tide of human sympathy—of individual sympathy—was not strong enough to overcome the human tendency to fight out a grievance or to rally the forces of destruction when necessary in support of a principle or in defense of home and country. His idea was to make wars intolerable, and thus make quickly effective an appeal to arms.

Modern warfare is waged upon that idea, and in pursuit of it Gatling and Maxim and Krupp have given invaluable assistance. Nations now hesitate to go to war, being fully aware of its awful destructiveness; but when they resolve to make war, they rally the forces of destruction to their aid with such prodigious energy that wars long drawn out belong to an era that is forever in the past. We may read of the "Thirty Years' War" and the "Seven Years' War," and many of us recall with shuddering horror the anxieties, the sufferings and the losses of the Civil War through the four years in which its bitter strife was waged. But the war of the future will be a sharp, quick game—evaded by all the arts of diplomacy, but when these fail, pushed with all the concentrated power that invention and the discovery of explosives have given to the world, to a swift conclusion. The men whose genius made modern warfare thus distinctly to differ from the slow processes that in former times prolonged the strife until nations were slowly bled to death, or were exhausted by siege and indecisive battle, will come to be regarded as the benefactors of the race, though their names are known through death-dealing ordnance and missiles of destruction.

SIDE LINES OF PROSPERITY.

Everybody likes to enjoy the fruits of prosperity, but not everybody is willing to face the obligations that good times put upon us. We like to receive higher wages and higher prices for what we produce, but we are not so glad when our rents go up and more money is exacted for bread and meat and raiment. We like to see municipal improvements active and to have the town shipshape and neat in all respects. We take pride in maintaining state institutions in a creditable manner, in keeping public order and in providing aids to development and expansion. Some of us, however, do not relish the idea of being compelled to contribute to the expenses of all these benefits, and particularly since the conditions call for increasing drafts on the public treasury and increasing levies on private purses. The average taxpayer takes the ground that it is more blessed to receive than to give.

The general necessity for close scrutiny of public expenditures is taken by the undiscriminating taxpayer as warrant for howling when he has to face an advance in the sum charged against him for public purposes. He does not howl because he is hurt, but because he thinks there is opportunity for it. He does not take into consideration the general obligation to prepare in time of prosperity for adversity. He prefers the other proverb, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." All this is very natural as human nature is constituted, and as human affairs are organized, but indulgence of the trait is not always wise. Parsimony is an evil no less to be dreaded than extravagance.

It so happens that there is a material advance in the taxes paid by Portland property-owners this year. Taxpayers do not like it. They howl. Unable to point to specific extravagances, they wonder what becomes of all the money and think it a great mystery that there should be additional demands on the public treasury, quite unmindful of the fact that every business establishment, every household, is obliged to pay out more money for any given service in these days of bulging prosperity than in times when business depression and pinching poverty ruled. There is no mystery about it. Money is freer in all channels. We voluntarily go in our pockets for more than a third of a million dollars for the Lewis and Clark Exposition. Who would have tolerated the idea for a moment seven or eight years ago? The taxpayers, with commendable cheerfulness, agree to put half a million more into the enterprise. Imagine such a measure passing the Legislature of 1895! We tax ourselves for parks and libraries now; formerly this would have been regarded as intolerable extravagance. Our population is fast increasing, and this brings necessary increase of the cost of administering the government, in providing and caring for roads and streets, and water, fire and police service. Therefore it is only reasonable to expect that the contributions required of the property-owner should increase. He can pay the sum demanded today easier than the smaller sum required in less prosperous times. And these matters are only relative, after all.

In Portland extensive street improvements are planned, and nobody will say they are not needed. For a long time we have been at a halt in the matter of street work. Bridges have gone to decay and tumbled down, and those that are maintained are very expensive. The available repair fund has not been able to meet the demand upon it. Under the new charter the city will be required hereafter to keep new streets in repair for a period of years, but that provision does not apply to improvements made before the charter went into effect. The duty of determining the kind of improvement that shall be made on the streets is now vested in the Common Council. The property-owners have no voice in that matter, but by two-thirds remonstrance they can defeat proceedings by the Council. The Council now has the power to declare what districts are benefited by improvements and to assess the cost accordingly. Heretofore the abutting property has been obliged to bear all the burden, and in the case of trestles or bridges it sometimes happened that the cost of the improvement amounted to confiscation of the property. This distribution will result in a nearer approach to equity, all the property benefited paying its share of the cost of improvement. This method will not diminish the expense of improvements, but will distribute it more equitably.

One of the great causes of municipal expense is in building and maintaining streets. Much complaint is just now made on this score. But we must have the streets, and that means that we must pay for them. This we should be willing to do. It is time that we were putting these matters in proper order, for the town is growing fast and its growth must be recognized. It is not meet that these improvements be railed against at a time when, if ever, they can well be afforded. This is a time for rapid advance in all lines. No money should be wasted, but a healthy public sentiment cries for proper advancement in municipal comforts and reasonable increase of taxes is the means through which such advancement comes. The conditions of prosperity must be recognized in all their phases, not merely in the phases that bring cash to our individual pockets.

An anomaly of the present situation as regards taxation of stocks and bonds is the deference which Assessors have to show to millionaires in order to get their consent to be taxed. Recently in New York, for example, Mr. J. P. Morgan was allowed to fix for himself the amount of his tax on personalty. He is believed to be a multi-millionaire, but is rated at much less than a million, because, if he chose, he could "swear it all off." He objects that the property represented by his "secrities" is already taxed and it is unfair to try to tax also his title to it. Still, rather than be called a tax-dodger, he will pay on an amount fixed by himself. This is a very general practice. The financiers are more than a match for the guileless Assessor. What can the latter do? If he tries to have his way, the capitalist "swears" he is a non-resident or that his debts are so much and must be deducted, or that his property is in some way exempt. If the taxpayer feels that he is about to be treated with unfairness, he is sometimes capable of meeting it with subterfuge and equivocation. His idea often is that he will try to get "substantial justice" and "swear" anything that will secure it. The law does not always work equitably in practice, however fair in theory, and this tends to demoralize the mobile-minded capitalist. "In effect," says the New York Journal of Commerce, "the personal property tax has come to be a severe exaction upon trust estates and upon honest men of moderate means, and a roaring farce so far as the great bulk of the wealth of the community is concerned. Unless it can be brought down to a definite basis of assessment that is enforceable with some approach to equality, it should be completely swept away."

The Ottawa Chronicle finds fault with the proposal that the Canadian Commissioners to be appointed on the Alaska Boundary Commission should be impartial judges when the American Commissioners are, it is alleged, all partisans. It is regretted that the American Commissioners are not Judges instead of politicians, but if Secretary Root, Senator Lodge and Senator Turner are to serve, Canada, it is held, needs representatives to push her interests. It is suggested by the Baltimore Sun, however, that possibly the Chronicle is too hurried in this matter. Our Commissioners are perhaps partisans when making speeches before elections, but they are probably capable of acting impartially when put in a responsible position, and supplied with maps, documents, etc. If it is the policy of the Administration to review the Alaska boundary controversy in a conciliatory spirit, the three Commissioners just named are capable of taking that fact into account. All three have expressed strong views against the Canadian contention, but they are probably open to evidence and argument, especially in view of the very amicable relations now existing between the parties to the controversy. In a word, our Commissioners are live men and able to concede something in order to gain something. From a practical point of view it may be noted that the Senate would not have ratified the Alaska boundary treaty if the American Commissioners had been geographers or Judges. Political necessity dictated the actual appointments. Still, this does not mean that the sessions of the commission will necessarily be without satisfactory results.

Next Sunday morning the Methodists of Oregon will be asked to contribute to the fund for the payment of the debt of Willamette University. Of the total debt of $35,000, all but $8000 has been subscribed, and it is proposed to raise the latter sum by subscriptions which shall amount to $1 per capita upon the membership. Oregon Methodists have decided, through their conferences, to stand by this pioneer institution, of which not only they, but members of other denominations, are justly proud. The debt was incurred largely as a result of a destructive fire and the decreased support caused by the hard times. It now hangs as a cloud over the institution, and has prevented the school from securing endowments which it would have received if there had been no incumbrance. The debt will be paid, and it is to be hoped that Oregon Methodists will not put off until next month or next year what may as well be done next Sunday.

A committee of five has been appointed by the president of the Grant Monument Fund Commission to raise, as soon as practicable, the $150,000 necessary to complete the monument on Riverside drive. This sum will be required to complete the monument as originally designed. A triumphant figure of "Victory" is to be placed on top, and there are to be four emblematic figures in bronze, one at each corner; four equestrian figures are to be erected over the facade, and a splendid equestrian figure of General Grant is to be placed in front. The monument, when completed, will be a splendid testimonial of a patriotic people to the work of America's greatest soldier, and an enduring tribute to his memory.

Enviable as is the New York Herald's reputation for early and accurate news, its forecast of the Anthracite Commission's findings is probably nothing more than a shrewd guess, readily enough determinable from expressions of the court as the hearing proceeded. The result is inevitably to be a mixed one, favoring the miners as to wages, but unreservedly condemning the boycott. Labor will get much of value from this decision, and nothing that is worth more than its lesson in the futility of violence and conspiracy.

The ideal remedy for costly fires in sky-scrapers is to permit no inflammable construction above the third story. Toward this we are all working as fast as we can, though complete acceptance of the ideal is, of course, impossible in all cases.

Return to the Old-Time Practice.

Pittsburg Gazette.

In Washington's time the rules of the Senate provided that "in case of a debate becoming tedious four Senators may call for the question." If we return to the practice of Washington's time means by which oligarchical rule is maintained will be removed. So long as public indignation expends itself upon chimerical projects of reforming the Senate by amending the Constitution of the United States the oligarchy will be practically secure against disturbance.

THE UNEMPLOYED IN LONDON.

Justin McCarthy, in the Independent.

The newspapers have been telling the public the most glowing stories of the great and picturesque celebrations of King Edward's coronation as Emperor of India at the durbar in Delhi. At the same time the Londoner who has read these splendid narratives finds his attention arrested as he passes through some crowded part of the metropolis by an immense procession of the unemployed with its melancholy banners, parading through miles of thoroughfares and appealing with contribution boxes for the help of the beneficent to keep them from actual starvation. Only yesterday a friend was giving me a grim and harrowing description of the sight which he saw on his return to London, after a short absence, when he was passing Westminster Palace, where the houses of Parliament meet. He found the ordinary traffic of the streets interrupted by the march of this suppliant army. The procession appeared to him to stretch out for indefinite length, and a large force of police was kept busy in the continuous effort to prevent the ranks of the procession and the ordinary traffic of the streets from getting into inextricable confusion. There was no attempt whatever at disorder on the part of those composing the procession, but no one needs to be told that such a movement in the near neighborhood of Westminster Palace is likely to create a bewildering interruption to the business of the streets. Many of the passers-by made spontaneous contributions to the boxes, which were carried in mute appeal by those who took a directing part in the procession. The day was bitterly cold, and the condition of the weather itself made a new appeal to the charity of the benevolent.

These processions of the unemployed have been very common during the present Winter. The ranks are greatly swelled by the numbers of men who went out to South Africa to serve in the campaign there, and have now returned to find that their former places in the world of business and work have been filled up. Many among the higher and wealthier classes are coming forward generously for the relief of the present distress, and Queen Alexandra herself has shown, as she always does show at such a time, the most noble example of active beneficence. But it seems to me a sad and pitiful sequel to the South African campaign.

The Lee Statue.

Richmond Times-Dispatch.

The Times-Dispatch has never enthused over the proposition to place a statue of General Lee in the Capitol at Washington, although we have had no special objection to it. Our only objection, as stated more than once, is that we do not consider it any great honor for General Lee's statue to be placed in Statuary Hall in company with the statue of Brigham Young, and others even more objectionable, whom it is not necessary to name, nor do we wish to give the Northern people any grounds for believing that the people of Virginia are desirous of forcing the Government to "recognize" the South's hero. We do not claim for Virginia any rights or privileges that are not enjoyed by other states of the Union, but we claim for her the same rights and privileges that other states enjoy, and there must be no discrimination against her. We claim that she occupies in the sisterhood of states a position quite as honorable and important as that of any other state; that she is entitled to all the rights and immunities of statehood, regardless of the fact that she seceded. She has the same right to occupy her niche in Statuary Hall that New York, or Pennsylvania, or Ohio, or any other state has to occupy theirs, and she has the right, under the act of 1864, to put into this niche a statue of Robert E. Lee, or "Stonewall" Jackson, or Jefferson Davis, or any other man whom she delights to honor. And when Congressmen from other states undertake to interfere or to dictate to her, it arouses our resentment and our indignation, and we feel like telling them to mind their own business. Virginia raised no objection when other states put their distinguished sons in the niches assigned to them, and other states must not raise objection when Virginia exercises her privilege. There is some little state sovereignty left, and Virginia claims all that belongs to her.

The Meaning of the War College.

Philadelphia Record.

It was not merely the cornerstone of a new public building which was laid at Washington on Saturday last on the grounds dedicated to the future War College; it was the foundation of a new, a more perfect and a coherent system of military defense which was celebrated there. The War College, an adjunct to the lately authorized general staff, is to be a high school of instruction and also a repository of accumulating experience in the organization, equipment and mobilization of the available land forces of the United States, regulars, National Guardsmen, militia and volunteers. The day selected was appropriate to the occasion; it was Washington's birthday, celebrated for the nonce a few hours ahead of time because the 22d fell this year on Sunday. But the military reorganization now begun is in accord with the advice of George Washington to the Nation, which the Nation has for more than 100 years neglected to heed; hence the appropriateness of associating the foundation of the War College with the natal day of our greatest commander and first President.

The Devouring Steel Trust.

Cleveland Leader.

The steel trust continues to show signs of a deliberate and comprehensive policy of absorption of all other concerns in the same line of business which are of much importance. Needless to say its purchases and its policy will lead bold and ambitious men to establish new iron and steel mills for the purpose of selling them to the big trust at a fat profit. If that sort of thing goes far enough there will be grave trouble ahead for the greatest of the industrial combinations.

He Never Blamed the Booze.

New York Sun.

He took a bottle up to bed,
Drank whisky hot each night,
Drank cocktails in the morning,
But never could get tight.
He shivered in the evening,
And always had the blues,
Until he took a bowl or two—
But he never blamed the booze.

His joints were full of rheumatis,
His appetite was slack,
He had pains between his shoulders,
And chills ran down his back.
He suffered from insomnia,
At night he couldn't snooze;
He said it was the climate—
But he never blamed the booze.

His constitution was run down—
At least, that's what he said—
His legs were swelled each morning,
And he often had swelled head.
He tackled beer, wine and whisky,
And if they didn't fuse
He blamed it to dyspepsia—
But he never blamed the booze.

He said he couldn't sleep at nights,
And he always had bad dreams;
He claimed he always laid awake
Till early sunrise beams.
He thought it was malaria—
Alas, 'twas but a ruse—
He blamed it unto everything—
But he never blamed the booze.

His liver needed scraping,
And his kidneys had the gout;
He swallowed lots of bitters,
Till at last he cleaned them out.
His legs were swelled with dropsy,
Till he had to cut his shoes;
He blamed it to the doctors—
But he never blamed the booze.

Then he had the tremens,
And he tackled rats and snakes;
First he had the fever,
And then he had the shakes.
At last he had a funeral,
And the mourners had the blues,
And the epitaph they carved for him was—
"He never blamed the booze."

TIME FOR AN INCOME TAX.

New York World.

Commenting upon J. Pierpont Morgan's declaration to the Tax Commissioner that if required to take an oath he would "pay nothing," but if the Commissioner was willing to accept his "personal statement" he would "pay on a $400,000 assessment," because he "does not want to be looked on as a tax-dodger," the Times very properly says:

> A tax is either lawfully due and collectible, in which case the city may compel payment, or it is not a just due, in which case the city should not accept payment. The cost of government is not defrayed from gratuities.

The London News, as quoted in the World on Sunday, had a report from this city that Mr. Morgan's income for last year was $40,000,000, and that he "expected it would be more." If this is correct, Mr. Morgan voluntarily offers to pay taxes upon a personal assessment representing only one-tenth of his yearly income.

The reputed income is very possibly exaggerated, but it is certainly in Morgan's case, as in that of our other very wealthy citizens, many times in excess of his total assessment on both real and personal property.

The most obvious moral from this incident and the state of facts which it represents is that it is time for the state or for the United States to levy an income tax, as is done in every civilized government in the world that maintains a just and scientific system of taxation.

Under our crude and shamelessly unequal system the Federal Government collects its revenues mainly from the necessaries of the people, without the slightest reference to the two cardinal bases of just taxation—(1) benefits received, and (2) ability to pay—while the state and city tax real estate at its full value and permit eight-tenths of personal property to escape altogether.

In a country where the people rule, when they have a mind to, this outrageous state of affairs cannot much longer endure.

Sustains the Property Right in News.

New York Sun.

The property right in news, which has been abundantly sustained during the last few years, receives fresh confirmation in a decision by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. The Massachusetts case was one in which the plaintiff claimed that the defendant had no property right in certain information which pertained to certain building operations in the city. The court held that any one gathering news or information at some expense and furnishing it daily to subscribers, orally or in writing, under a contract by which they agree to hold it in secret confidence and for use in their own business, has a valuable right of property which a court of equity will protect against those seeking to obtain it from the owner without right and to his damage. The court further held that the giving of such information to customers is not such a publication of it as to constitute its dedication for use by the public and to deprive the owner of the right to control its use. The decision is very thorough, and it must be very discouraging to news pirates.

Filibustering With Documents.

Chicago Tribune.

If an old man like Senator Morgan sets out single handed to delay, by talking against time, the ratification of a treaty he is honestly, though unreasonably, opposed to, one may admire his heroic obstinacy and wonder how long the legs and lungs of the veteran will hold out. It is quite another matter when Senator Quay comes to the aid of Senator Morgan with a pile of documents and makes the reading clerk spend an hour in reading the constitution of Colombia, which he claimed was pertinent to the canal treaty, the subject under discussion. Of documents which "Senatorial courtesy," if appealed to, may decide are pertinent there is a large stock. There are enough ponderous documents available to keep the reading clerk busy until the 4th of March.

It makes no particular difference so far as the Panama treaty is concerned what the obstructionists may do at this session. If action on it is not had there will be an extra session of the Senate. That much is certain. But a legislative body which allows documents to be read by the hour while the wearied talker against time is getting his wind is in a fair way to become ridiculous.

Good Riddance to Congress.

New York Press, Rep.

This Nation has not had many Congresses whose opportunities were fairer than those of the body expiring in confusion to do things both useful and honorable. It has lacked any which failed more miserably. It has been in conflict with the President; it has been a betrayer of the public. For nobody it has done so much as for interests and influences which are dangerous to the general welfare and destructive of Republican institutions. For the dying Congress there are no mourners among the people of the United States. Good riddance when it is gone! May we have better deeds from and a sweeter memory of its successor!

Germs and the Bootblack's Booth.

New York Medical Journal.

Not a few of the bootblacks of New York ply their trade in enclosed spaces. This, of course, is desirable from several points of view, but it seems probable that such booths must harbor a good deal of dust arising from the dried mud removed from customers' foot gear, and consequently more than their due proportion of micro-organisms. It is to be presumed that something might be done to remedy this drawback—by some such device, perhaps, as an ordinance requiring the preliminary cleansing to be done with wet rags, the rags to be regularly destroyed or sterilized.

Tariff Reform Sentiment Growing.

Peoria Journal.

Even in his Democratic views on the tariff Mr. Ingalls would be able to command a large support from the Republicans of the West, who are disgusted with the refusal of the Republican leaders to revise the sacred schedules of the tariff. There is not a particle of doubt as to how Western Republicans feel on this, and it is strange the Republican leaders are apparently unable to realize the strength of this sentiment, so strong that it almost led to open disunion until the Western Republican Congressmen retreated from the position that they had taken earlier.

Stanzas.

Henry Timrod.

"It was my heart, dear friend, that sung,
And that imperfect strain
Revealed the gloom, but not the grief,
The darkness, not the pain—
If heaven depended on my song,
I could not sing again.

"I have nor will nor skill to woo
The poet's golden dower,
The breath that swept my spirit was
A feeling, not a power—
And the breeze that bore its fragrance off
Hath withered up the flower.

"Then ask me not for verse again,
Or seek some other token—
I sung my last and only song
When my one grief was spoken—
The heart is aye the poet's lyre,
And mine is almost broken."

The Crawfish and Others.

New York Sun.

devreshо reve uoy svaH
,yarg ,hsifwarc eht tahT
drawrof og ot redro nI
?yaw rehto sht seoG
,yas ,dnA
devreshо reve uoy evaH
shw elpoep emoS
yltcaze drawrof oG
!nd ehsifwarc sht sA

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The drawbridges are always open widest when one is in the biggest hurry.

It seems to be easy for the Washington authorities to capture men who are not the Olympia murderer.

Portland has started cleaning house for 1905. It's to be a long, tedious job, but the end justifies the inconvenience.

After a systematic exploration of the different strata of the Forum, Professor Boni, the Italian archaeologist, believes that he has discovered the Necropolis of primitive Rome, dating as far as the eighth century B. C.

Hawaii Territory is considerably wrought up regarding the proposal to establish county government. The real end in view is statehood, but the Hawaiians think it is useless to apply for that before they have county and city government well established.

For longevity of its pioneers and statesmen, commend us to Nebraska. That state has had 13 Governors since it was admitted into the Union in 1867, and 11 of them are living. Politics is apparently a more healthful occupation in Nebraska than in any other state in the Union.

Something is wrong somewhere. Brownell didn't say a word about the martyred Lincoln, the glorious flag still waving "char," or the "patriotism" of the grand old soldiers. These are usually mighty fetching arguments—and they are safe. And they have done the business thus far.

It was unkind of J. Pierpont Morgan to ignore his friend Carnegie in that library matter. If Andy had known of J. Pierpont's intention to erect a $300,000 library adjoining his residence he doubtless would have added a tidy sum on satisfactory assurance that J. P. would maintain the institution becomingly.

The Mexican Aerial Navigation Company has been organized under the laws of Mexico, with a capital stock of $500,000. It is now constructing an airship, which will have a capacity of 50 passengers and 2000 pounds of freight. The first trip will be between Mexico City and Washington, D. C. This round trip, it is said, can be made in four days.

Senator Pettus, of Alabama, is said to have paid the minimum price for his present seat in the Senate. It was $1 to the Secretary of State for certifying to the Senator's unanimous election. He bought a new suit of clothes to celebrate his re-election, and when chaffed about his dudishness he said he thought he was entitled to a new suit every six years.

A bill has been introduced in the Nebraska Legislature providing for compulsory voting in cities. The bill levies a voting tax of $3, a receipt for which shall be given by the Judge of election when each man casts his ballot, the receipt to be accepted by the County Treasurer in payment of the tax. The only alternative to paying the amount is a sworn statement declaring physical disability on election day.

It is told of Lord Falkland that when he was writing, and in doubt whether a word were perfectly intelligible, he used to consult "one of his lady's chambermaids (not the waiting woman, because it was possible she might be conversant in romances), and by her judgment was guided whether to receive or reject it." Nor was Falkland writing for the crowd; he was at work on treatises for the learned.

"A Fashionable Mother" of New York adds something to the discussion relative to large and small families. She says that to have a large family is now the correct thing, and that there are several reasons for this. One which is everywhere admitted to be potent is, she says, that if a woman socially ambitious sends her daughters to a school where the parents of the other scholars are socially prominent, the mother's social position is improved by this contact and she derives benefit from her children in this manner. She further says that to be the mother of attractive daughters naturally enhances the value of the mother in society. While the letter of the fashionable mother may not add materially to the psychology of the subject, she has struck an original note which gives those interested something of the practical side of the question.

The most amusing thing in politics just now is the candidacy of W. E. Sharon to succeed W. M. Stewart as Senator from Nevada. Stewart is a Populist. His present term will not expire until 1905, and he is entirely willing to continue to sacrifice himself on the altar of his country—so willing that he would accept Republican votes rather than remain in that desert state. Bill Sharon, in shying his castor into the arena, announces that it would be the pride of his life to wipe up the earth with old Bill Stewart, and continues:

> In that event (the nomination of Stewart by the Republicans) it will be a labor of love on my part to fight that old fraud and traitor to every interest of the people of this state. Whether I am the man who will be satisfactory to my party or not, I am determined Stewart shall no longer misrepresent a state and its people where he has no common interest and does not even pay a poll tax.

Sharon himself sends out his challenge from San Francisco, which is deemed proper headquarters for Nevada Senators.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

Jim—Money makes the man. Jam—Granted; but man makes the money.—Baltimore Herald.

Old Inhabitant—I can remember when hogs ran loose on Broadway. Young Inhabitant—They ride on the cars now.—Puck.

A.—That's Jones's daughter with him. She's just about to be married. B.—Who's the lucky man? A.—Jones.—Punch.

"I suppose," he said, "it would be useless for me to ask you to be my wife." "It would," she replied, "if that's your style of going about it."—Chicago Record-Herald.

"We are going to throw these eggs at the tragedian." "How old are they?" "About six weeks." "H'm! It's a pity to spoil such good eggs on such bad acting."—Chicago Daily News.

Miss Backbay—Of course, you are familiar with Kipling and Stevenson in Chicago. Miss Wabash—Can't say that I am. Pa has an account with Bargen & Sellers, and I do most of my shopping there.—Philadelphia Press.

"Do you think there is any danger of America being dominated by Europe?" "No, sir," answered Mr. Meekton, with extraordinary emphasis, "not so long as eminent Europeans continue to marry American girls."—Washington Star.

Brown—What we call baggage the English call luggage. Which word do you think the more appropriate? White—Considering how trunks are treated by the railroad men, I should say the right word is chuckage.—Boston Transcript.

Mr. Bacon—I see they will not put a picture of any artist in the Louvre in Paris until he has been dead 10 years. Mrs. Bacon—What's to prevent an artist from lying about it and saying he's been dead 10 years when it's only five?—Yonkers Statesman.

Physician—The truth can no longer be hidden, madam. I am obliged to tell you that your little son is—er—weak-minded. That is—well, it must be said—he is an idiot. Mrs. Highupp—How fortunate it is that we are rich. No one will ever notice it.—New York Weekly.