

Entered at Portland, Oregon Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.

Subscription Rates: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, six months, \$2.75.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, three months, \$1.50.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one month, \$0.50.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

By Mail or Express: Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00.

tendent a Czar in the educational affairs of his county—a Czar whose head would rest as uneasily as does that of the Czar of Russia.

PALTRY CRITICS.

The Goss Bay Times has a very humorous bit of sarcasm in connection with a recent editorial utterance of The Oregonian to this effect:

It is not too much to say—for it is the truth, absolute truth—that Portland is known and Oregon is known chiefly from the fact that they are the home of The Oregonian.

If there were any honesty in these critics, they wouldn't do work of this paltry kind.

THE FARMER A CAPITALIST.

The farmer has always been thought of as a laboring man, and to a great extent his work has been classed as unskilled labor.

Mr. Bryan prints in large type, at the head of the first page of his latest Commoner, this significant statement:

No man who is financially connected with a corporation that is seeking privileges ought to act as a member of a political organization, because he cannot represent his corporation and the people at the same time.

"HOLDING THE NIGGER DOWN."

Blamo for the race war in Atlanta, beginning September 22, and continuing five days, has been laid at the door of sensational afternoon newspapers.

Some twelve women had been attacked by negroes in the two months preceding the outbreaks.

San Diego—B. E. Amos. Long Beach, Cal.—B. E. Amos. Pasadena, Cal.—A. F. Horning.

San Francisco—E. C. Grear, Ferry News Stand, Hotel St. Francis News Stand, Washington, D. C.—Ebbitt House, Pennsylvania avenue.

Philadelphia, Pa.—Byron's Theater Ticket office.

CORLAND, MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1906.

THE HEARST CAMPAIGN.

We take it that Alton B. Parker will not vote for Hearst.

McClellan, nor any of the hitherto great and influential Democrats of Tammany, or of the other political parties, nor their friends.

But one strains his ears in vain to hear of the grand jury's indicting the editors of the inflammatory publications.

The question of ministers' salaries, like that of the salaries of teachers, is one that will not down.

The secular and religious press alike agree that the clergy are underpaid.

The Charleston News and Courier, the old reliable journal of South Carolina, has a remarkably good article on the "mob" in South Carolina.

In one of his recent speeches Hearst said: "I believe that the protective principle is valuable in itself, but it is always reasonably extended and rigorously abused."

It is timely to inquire whether the Vancouver tragedy would have occurred if there had been a soldiers' cantina at the harbor.

As it is to be expected that the Kaiser has a similar bureau in his palace at Potsdam.

Rough Riders Are Kept on Tap. Omaha Bee.

Mr. Roosevelt ought to have little trouble in getting together his regiment of Rough Riders.

Omar! What Crimes Are Committed in Thy Name!

They say when you want to hire a Filipino to work he will say "manana."

All the rubbish about the "new spellings" having been cleaned up and swept out, we shall now go on spelling in the old familiar way.

The Hon. "Joe" Bailey is having a tough time in Texas.

While it may be true that Mrs. Platt has been convicted as to tariff or citizenship, still she declines to stand Platt.

Senator Bailey thinks any Congressman has a right to make all he can on the outside.

Bryan's speeches nowadays are noiseless, compared with those of Hearst.

THE MAN BEHIND MR. HEARST.

The Versatile and Ingenious Brisbane, and His Career.

World's Work.

Arthur Brisbane, the working editor of all Mr. Hearst's newspapers, is one of the most versatile writers in America.

He talks off editorials on economics, babies, matrimony, politics, and every conceivable subject.

The Tacoma News, speaking of "differentials" against Portland, mentions the "risks of a hundred miles of narrow winding (river) channel."

Mr. Bryan prints in large type, at the head of the first page of his latest Commoner, this significant statement:

No man who is financially connected with a corporation that is seeking privileges ought to act as a member of a political organization, because he cannot represent his corporation and the people at the same time.

San Diego—B. E. Amos. Long Beach, Cal.—B. E. Amos. Pasadena, Cal.—A. F. Horning.

San Francisco—E. C. Grear, Ferry News Stand, Hotel St. Francis News Stand, Washington, D. C.—Ebbitt House, Pennsylvania avenue.

Philadelphia, Pa.—Byron's Theater Ticket office.

CORLAND, MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1906.

DO NOT CLAIM TOO MUCH.

Deed of the Hungry Goat.

The Dallas Optimist.

In 1880 the population of Omaha was 86,516, and during the ensuing few years the city had a remarkable growth.

These "boomers" in 1892 claimed 150,000, and when the Federal census was taken in that year they saw that it would be an awful blow to see into the census table with a population of 80,000 or 90,000, after claiming double that.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

DEED OF THE HUNGRY GOAT.

The Dallas Optimist.

In 1880 the population of Omaha was 86,516, and during the ensuing few years the city had a remarkable growth.

These "boomers" in 1892 claimed 150,000, and when the Federal census was taken in that year they saw that it would be an awful blow to see into the census table with a population of 80,000 or 90,000, after claiming double that.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.

Why in 1900 was the population of Omaha found to be only 102,553, or a decrease of 37,997, or 27 per cent, as against a claimed and padded increase of 30 per cent during the preceding decade.