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
16 to 28-page paper	2c

Foreign rates double.

News or discussion intended for publication in The Oregonian should be addressed invariably "Editor The Oregonian," not to the name of any individual. Letters relating to advertising, 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 Butter 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 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—Fair, with easterly winds.

YESTERDAY'S WEATHER—Maximum temperature, 54; minimum temperature, 42; precipitation, none.

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, MARCH 1, 1903.

"LIBERTY" AGAIN.

Again Senator Hoar breaks out on "liberty" and "consent of the governed." He declares that "if the course pursued by Mabini," the Filipino insurgent, "had taken place in our Revolutionary times, it would have been one of the proud memories of American history."

Fondness for generalization, on theoretical assumption, tends naturally to statements of this description. Our Revolutionary ideals were not absolute truths for all times and circumstances. No postulates of politics are, or can be. Those Revolutionary ideals were suited to the times in which our ancestors were placed, and found their justification in the ability of our ancestors to maintain them. A revolution may be based on the theory of consent of the governed, but no nation can be maintained on that theory. Every nation forces the consent of the unwilling, if it can; just as the United States forced the consent of the seceders of our Southern States, forty years ago.

Every government prefers, no doubt, to have it said that it derives its powers from consent of the governed; but if this cannot be, it will have consent anyhow if it have power; and if it have not power and purpose to enforce consent, it will very soon go out of business. No nation permits its progressive development and large purposes to be arrested by opposition on theoretical grounds. The theories on which we broke away from Great Britain would, if pursued to their logical end, break up this Nation into fragments. "Consent" and "government" are, in practice, antithetical terms. It accords with the purposes of the United States to retain the Philippine Islands, just as it accorded with our National purpose to take Texas and California from Mexico, or to hold our Southern States, through force, to allegiance to the Union.

In dealing with Hawaii Senator Hoar fully accepted these principles. He had no hesitation in voting for the annexation of Hawaii, although it was notorious that there were many people in those islands bitterly opposed to the absorption of their country by the United States. The principle now so dear to the heart of Senator Hoar did not occur to him at that time. The Hawaiian annexationists in the Senate, of whom Senator Hoar was one, did not care what the people of Hawaii wanted, and they refused, though asked to do so, to take any steps to find out what the wishes of that people were. No better precedent could be asked by the advocates of the annexation of the Philippines than that afforded by our action in reference to Hawaii. In both cases the territory is foreign and far removed from our coast line. Both countries are inhabited by an undesirable population, judged by our standards. In one particular indeed the Philippine case is stronger, for there is a necessity in it that was not involved in the Hawaiian case. For many years the people of Hawaii had carried on a government of their own. At the time we annexed it, the country's affairs were administered by a government which our annexationists, undoubtedly a minority, had helped to establish. But we listened to this oligarchy, and with Senator Hoar's help "took in" the country. On the other hand the people of the Philippine Islands never had an independent government; and the only government they ever had, a weak and ineffective one, under direction of Spain, was overthrown by the United States. And unless we govern the islands, at least for the present, there will be no government worth the name. Thus the argument or excuse for our action in the Philippines is a great deal better than for our action in Hawaii, which Senator Hoar upheld. At the most it is no worse to govern the Philippines without consent of the governed than it is to govern Hawaii in the same way.

The doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from consent of the governed is not, never was, never can be, a doctrine of universal application. As proclaimed in our Declaration, it was a doctrine of revolution, not a principle of government. We proclaimed it as a means of separation from Great Britain. But we do not permit any portion of the people under our National sovereignty to proclaim it as a means of separation from the United States. We do not pretend to act consistently either in maintenance of the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from consent of the governed or of the doctrine that all men are created equal. Our Southern States will not allow the negro equal rights as electors; the United States could not permit the Confederates, nor can it permit the Hawaiians or Filipinos, to make the doctrine of consent of the governed the basis of an appeal for independence.

GOVERNMENT IN THE FIELD.

Oregon is not, after all, to go unrecognized in the matter of Government irrigation. Congressman Moody has taken upon his shoulders the responsibility of recommending a field for work under the new National law, and the first step has been taken by the withdrawal of nine townships from all entries except homestead. These are in the Butter Creek region, in Umatilla and Morrow Counties, where preliminary examination has already been made by the Geological Survey and a scheme of improvement roughly determined upon.

It may be said that the Government was free to go into any and every arid district of Oregon and determine for itself whether reclamation works under the new law were practicable or desirable. So it was, under the terms of the law. But the Government might have spent ten years in gathering the data necessary to warrant an official choice of fields, for the Government will not take responsibility for independent action until it has a definite basis to act upon. In order that Oregon might get any immediate good from the new law it was necessary that somebody should take the responsibility of recommending some definite field of operation. Then department officials would not be subject to hostile criticism from rival localities. Whatever authority should prepare the way by assuming an adjustment of the local claims to recognition, local jealousies, would stand all the criticism for preference of fields. Congressman Moody has been bold enough to take this responsibility and Oregon is thereby the gainer.

But filing simple homestead requirements will not suffice to get title under the National irrigation law. In addition to compliance with the homestead laws the entrymen under the irrigation act must reclaim at least one-half of all the irrigable area of his entry, and before receiving patent he must pay to the Government the estimated cost of providing reclamation facilities, in not more than ten annual installments. The first rough estimate of this cost in the projected Butter Creek scheme is $10 to $12 an acre. Irrigated land at this price is cheap.

If this enterprise shall cost $10 an acre, $2,000,000 will be required to complete it. This sum is greater than is available for Oregon at this time. But the fund for reclamation is constantly growing, and there will be returns from this project even before the full expenditure is made. That will not be until several years have passed. The significance of this action is that it launches the National irrigation movement in Oregon. For this Representative Moody is entitled to all the more credit because of the failure of the Oregon Irrigation Association to make a specific recommendation. The matter will now develop rationally, it is to be expected, and practical results will take the place of vain theorizing. No other state stands to gain more than Oregon by a rational irrigation policy.

A BIG NAVY WANTED.

President Roosevelt is essentially a man of military instincts if not military aptitude, and he wants a big Navy, and wants it in the shortest possible time. In our judgment the President is entirely sound in his conviction that the future safety of this country is dependent largely upon a heavy increase in the Navy at the earliest possible moment. We do not need a great Army, for we shall never be disposed to enlarge our boundaries by wanton conquest. We need a comparatively small but excellently equipped and thoroughly trained Army, sufficiently large to form a nucleus for the assemblage and organization of a vast force of volunteers, should our country ever be threatened with invasion by a great military power, but the prospect of such an invasion is very remote. The quickest and least expensive mode of making war upon the United States would be by a successful naval attack upon our rich seacoast cities. The only effective guard against such an attack would be a powerful Navy and strong seacoast defenses. President Roosevelt knows that a great and effective Army can be assembled in a comparatively short time with a well-appointed standing Army of 50,000 men in existence to leaven the raw lump of our volunteers, while it takes at least three years to build a modern battleship. We need to lay the keels of at least four battleships every year for a term of years to bring our fleet up to the strength that the navy of Germany will have by 1916-17.

Our failure to do this would, in event of a possible war with a strong naval power, furnish us with a new and terrible lesson in the cost of a lack of that preparation for war that is necessary to our National defense. Assistant Secretary of War Sanger, in his recently published report on the military resources of England and the militia of Switzerland, discusses the probability of war and the necessity for preparation as a protection to this country. He points to the awful cost of inadequate preparation found in the case of England in the Crimean War, in the case of France in her war with Germany, in the case of the United States in the Spanish-American War, and in the case of England in the Boer War. All that Colonel Sanger says is true, but his argument in support of the necessity of full military preparation against a foreign foe can be urged with far greater force in favor of thorough naval preparation through the creation and perpetuation of a first-class fleet that shall be at least equal to the projected navy of Germany. We have no need to match the navy of Great Britain, for there is not the remotest danger that the two great English-speaking powers of the earth will ever again come in conflict. We do not need to match the navy of France, but, in order effectively to enforce respect for our flag and all that it implies on this continent, we do need a Navy large enough to make us the third naval power in the world.

We want ships enough for home defense; we want ships enough to maintain our flag on the Pacific coast of Asia. We were not to blame for a state of military and naval unpreparedness at the outbreak of the Civil War, for we never seriously contemplated such a political convulsion, and of course did not provide against it; but we are open to just criticism for our failure during the last twenty-five years to put our Nation in a complete state of naval defense. We are to blame, because modern battleships and modern seacoast defenses cannot be extemporized in sudden emergency, as they could be in the days of wooden ships. The failure of France to keep abreast of England in the matter of naval power really cost France her military supremacy in Europe. It was not the victories of Marlborough that were the beginning of the end of the military glory of France under Louis XIV. It was the English naval victory of La Hogue in 1692 that marks the date of England's supremacy over France on the high seas. The English conquest of North America was won over the French largely because the French navy was universally worsted. It was England's navy that crushed Napoleon, who from Trafalgar in 1805 to Waterloo in 1815 was absolutely without a navy. Napoleon was not responsible for the irredeemable lack of naval preparation on part of France before his accession to power. He could stamp his foot and make armies start out of the earth that would sweep Europe clean with the besom of war, but he could not make fleets start out of the seas on short notice that could quell the thunders of the British navy, because England had 100 years the start of France in naval statesmanship.

Under the successors of Louis XIV the French mind was so indifferent or unequal to the construction and support of an efficient navy that Napoleon, with all his genius, could not repair the blunder. He found the French navy utterly demoralized by unbroken defeat. Nelson's victory of the Nile dissipated Napoleon's dream of following the trail of Alexander to India; Nelson's victory of Trafalgar made the laurels of Austerlitz lose their finest bloom in Napoleon's eye, for he knew that without a navy France would see all her ports and those of her allies blockaded; all her merchant marine destroyed, her foreign commerce extinguished. Because of Trafalgar Napoleon's power began slowly to die of concussion of the spine. This lesson of the fatal consequence of the want of naval statesmanship ought not to be lost on the United States. We may never have a great war with a great naval power, but if we do we shall surely be worsted if we do not imitate the statesmanship of England and be ready with a Navy that is at least numerous enough to defend our important seaports, from Boston to New Orleans, from San Francisco to Portland. We are secure from invasion beyond the fringe of our seacoast, but to secure this fringe, upon which is situated all our cities of vast wealth, we need complete seacoast defenses and a Navy that is inferior only to that of Great Britain and France.

NOBILITY OF PURPOSE.

Bishop Spalding, of the Roman Catholic Church, in a recent lecture said:

> It is not what you have, but what you are, that entitles you to say that you have succeeded. To succeed means a life of toil, a life of self-denial, and then the reward comes from one's inner consciousness, which is the whisper of God.

This conclusion of Bishop Spalding is the ultimate measure of history, whatever may be the transient estimate of the passing hour. We measure Cromwell, Hampden, Franklin, Washington, Lincoln, by this standard. We measure them by the moral dignity and purity of their purpose, and by the success they reached in nobly struggling in the direction of its attainment. And we really in the last analysis measure smaller men in the same way. We inquire not how much they died possessed of in material possessions or titles, but what they were, stripped down to their moral and spiritual purpose in life.

The other day E. P. Clark, one of the ablest members of the editorial staff of the New York Evening Post, died in Brooklyn. The country at large did not know as much of Mr. Clark as it does of the various charlatans who have made much money in quack medicines, in "yellow kid" journalism, or have obtained large notoriety as expounders of the lunatic philosophy of dishonest money. Nevertheless, Mr. Clark was all his days a powerful force in affairs, because his hand was always on the side of clean and sane politics. He was an able writer, but, what is far more important, he knew what he was talking about, for he never put his pen to paper until he had, so far as possible, mastered the bottom facts. Through the Evening Post he was the unflinching advocate of civil service reform, tariff reform, ballot reform, honest money and the gold standard, but some of his best service to the country was wrought through his ceaseless denunciation of our enormous pension roll, which he desired to see purged of some of the injustice and extravagance with which it has been padded by reckless legislation. Up to the time of Mr. Clark's attack upon our inflated pension roll, the press of this country had been generally silent concerning it, but Mr. Clark's criticism was effective, because it was bottomed upon significant facts and figures.

Mr. Clark was a force on the side of sound politics during life, and his memory is a force on the side of sound politics, now that he is dead. From the very outset of his career in journalism he always was true to his purpose, which was not primarily to seek riches or fame, but to do his whole duty in his profession on the side of nobler manners and purer laws. He allowed his popular reputation to take care of itself; he never gave it a thought; his ambition was to be a force for political reform at every opportunity to the last hour of his working life. He had no sympathy with the cynical theory of life that it is never worth while to care what happens in public affairs unless it happens to you. The important, the supreme thing in life to him was the obligation of every man to do his duty, his whole duty, without stopping to consider the chances of victory or defeat. He never shirked, never surrendered; he felt he was responsible for standing by his guns in every good fight. When his duty had been fully done he was not daunted by defeat or tempted to desert his flag at the next fight. And he was right, for he stood for that intelligent, forceful, unbought, unterrified minority that has ultimately "won out" in every great battle for human rights and good government in this world. He belonged to that indomitable breed of men who are of the stuff of the stout knight who said:

> I'm something hurt, but not yet slain,
> I'll but lie down and bleed awhile,
> And then I'll rise and fight again.

That is the story of the intelligent, indomitable minority that Hampden led against a tyrant King; the story of the intelligent, indomitable minority that Franklin organized and arrayed against tyranny long before victory was in sight. The philosophy of Hampden, who was rich and secure, the philosophy of Franklin and Washington, who were rich and secure, was really that of Bishop Spalding, that while wealth is good when honestly won and nobly enjoyed because nobly employed, nevertheless "a wise man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," a bit of wisdom worth cherishing in an age of increasing tendency to measure all things by the standard of money. The philosophy of Bishop Spalding was held and inflexibly enforced in action by this dead journalist, who believed that success was good only when the aim was high and squarely attained, but knew that mere defeat can never rob a true man of the rich discipline of difficulty, of the ennobling endurance of failure and disaster that does not come through fault. The man who does his best and fails of victory has no need to despise his present or despair of his future, but the man who has done his worst and seems to win has a present the wise man will despise and a future pregnant with spiritual death and shame.

This is the philosophy of Bishop Spalding, and the practice of it by this rare journalist made him known and honored in his profession, for this had been his creed from the outset of his career. He had worked in every leading journal of the land, from Chicago to Springfield; he had always done his work with exceptional ability, but the memorable thing about the man was his high purpose and inflexible devotion to the flag of political reform, no matter what party carried it. The man was content to know and feel that through the New York Evening Post he was always permitted to draw his arrow to the head for the cause of political reform; he knew he was a political force for good throughout the land through the vantage-ground he held, and he did not worry about widespread personal fame, much less vulgar notoriety. When a gifted comrade died in the harness prematurely, he did not hesitate to help the bereaved family and to ask other good men and true to help them. It is easy to say of such able workers, who are not anxious for public recognition, that they are part of the great army of "the illustrious obscure." Somebody has called them "the unnamed demigods." It was George Eliot who said, "The growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with us as they might have been is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life and rest in unvisited tombs."

"THE NEW CREED."

Ella Wheeler Wilcox is an exponent, but in no sense the originator, of the "new creed" which has been somewhat extensively promulgated in her name in recent months. She herself makes no claim as the discoverer of the doctrine of cheerfulness, optimism, unselfishness, purity, kindness, good will, good deeds and good thoughts, which is widely heralded as the "new thought" in religion. On the contrary, she admits that the so-called "new thought" is as old as the universe, and declares that, so far from being at variance with God, humanity is essentially the expression of his love, and, further, that thinking, reasoning beings must look within themselves for "salvation" from ignorance, which is the other name of sin.

Heaven, in this old-new creed, exists right here on earth, for those who obey the law of love and who follow this obedience with a reverent belief that it will continue to exist in some other sphere after the spirit leaves its temporary tenement. Hell, too, exists here for those who choose to make it, and in the declaration that "every thought is helping either to pave the golden streets of our heaven or touch fire to the brimstone of our hell," Mrs. Wilcox merely reiterates in strong language the belief of thousands of reverent and just persons in all ages of the world.

"As we know, so shall we reap." This, says Mrs. Wilcox, is an epitome of the "new thought." Its leading phases existed in India centuries ago, but it became so mixed with superstition (even as Christ's simple truths have been mixed with the absurdities of orthodoxy), that it failed in its highest purpose among the Orientals. It is refreshing to note that Mrs. Wilcox does not claim this presentment as a "discovery" and seek to appropriate it to her own profit and glory. Her application of the "new creed" to human affairs is not altogether practical, as for example when she urges everybody to discard their old clothes as a help to hope, happiness and prosperity, boldly assuming that means whereby new apparel can be purchased will be forthcoming.

At such absurdities the world can afford to laugh, or it may quietly disregard them as impracticable, while it commends the further contention that, so far from being "poor worms of the dust," "miserable sinners" plodding in grief and uncertainty through "a vale of tears," men are capable of making practical application of the principles of spirituality to their busy, every-day lives, and mingle with them the simple philosophy of faith, hope and charity as elements in their "salvation." Let us be glad that Mrs. Wilcox did not, with a great flourish of saintliness, proclaim the old ideas that she enunciates as a new discovery and seek to cover them with letters patent. We are indebted to her, not for the promulgation of a "new creed," but for a reiteration of the simple truths of one as old as the needs of humanity—as simple as its plaint for love and light.

If the territories of New Mexico and Arizona should be united and admitted to the Union as a single state, it would be in point of size one of the giant states of the Union. It would be the largest of the states, except Texas, which would exceed it by about 27,000 square miles. From the territory of the new State of Arizona twenty-three states as large as Maryland could be carved. It would be about the size of the combined states of Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia. Out of this enormous area might be taken about ten kingdoms each almost as large as the ancient Kingdom of Scotland. The population of the new state would be only 315,000—not much more than one-half that of Baltimore city. If it were peopled as densely as Belgium, it would have a population as large as that of the entire United States and England combined, and 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 left over. If its arid acres could be irrigated and brought under cultivation, it could produce enough bread and meat to feed all the people in the world.

There are some inanimate things that, as agents of modern life and its demands, nobody wants for neighbors. One of these is a gas supply tank; another is a coal oil depository; still another is a powder or dynamite magazine, and yet another of different sort is a garbage crematory. Yet all of these things are necessary adjuncts of civilization and its processes, and each must have a location—if not close in, at least not so far away from business and residence centers as to render them useless for the purposes that called them into existence. In this stress the guardians of the city have done their best to adjust matters, but, in the nature of things, this best is not altogether satisfactory. We must all take our chances in life, and those who think that their risks are wantonly increased by municipal stubbornness or political favoritism in some of these matters may find comfort in the fact that persons have been known to live to a good old age near gas tanks, and other presumably dangerous and highly objectionable places, while many whose homes were in the sweet, green country, far from the menaces of modern improvements, have been cut off before their prime. While the doctrine that "what is to be will be" is not altogether satisfying to the man who believes in himself, it is well to lay hold of it, as the best that one can do, when circumstances beyond his control compel a man to abide in the shadow of gas or oil tanks with their pent-up possibilities, or to the windward of a garbage crematory or stockyards, with their unpent odors.

The Chicago Department of Health estimates that 200,000 residents of Chicago are suffering from ailments of a grave character caused by privation and exposure resulting from the coal famine. "Already," says the Chicago Bulletin, "these ailments are reflected in the enormous increase of deaths among those at the extremes of life—the young and the aged, in both of whom the powers of vital resistance are at the lowest. Since the first of the year there has been an increase of nearly 20 per cent in the number of deaths among those under 5 years of age over the number in the corresponding period of last year, when this death rate was about normal. Among those over 60 years of age the increase is much greater—24 per cent last week over the week previous, and 36.7 per cent over the normal rate of the corresponding period of 1902. This excess of increased death rate among the aged is caused chiefly by the effects of cold and exposure in hastening to a fatal termination many of the chronic diseases, the sufferers from which under ordinary conditions might have survived for many years." To this may be added the statement of a medical contemporary, that "from all parts of the country come reports of the increase of sickness and death due to the scarcity and expensiveness of coal. The hospitals in Eastern cities are overfilled because patients are unable to get coal at home and are thus forced into the hospitals."

Having heard so much about the "new woman," it is a relief to hear something of the "new man." This individual was presented in a very attractive light by Dr. Mae Cardwell at the Woman's Club recently. Instead of the man with toil-bowed frame and gnarled hands at 50—old before his time—who was the product of the industrial conditions of 100 years ago, the nineteenth century introduced the "new man," who by the aid of machinery and modern improvements generally kept and keeps himself young through all his years, besides materially increasing the length of these. It is absurd, of course, to think that the "old woman" would be a fit companion for him. Hence the "new woman." In conjunction with this development is noted the reversal of at least one declaration of the Scriptures. It is no longer "the woman beguiled me," but "the man made it necessary for me." Who shall say that this did not open the door for all the other heresies that are combined in the make-up of the "new woman"? Independence, wage-earning, book learning, professional life and even speaking out in meeting may have followed in this train. Who can tell?

Senator Brownell publishes, or allows to be published, the following telegram:

> Hon. George C. Brownell, Salem, Or. Now is the time. If you can help me it will be appreciated. H. W. SCOTT.
>
> Received by Brownell at 10:15 P. M., Friday, February 20, 1903.

This telegram was sent to Mr. Brownell in response to his own invitation. He had visited Mr. Scott a few days before, and proffered his support, when it might be available or should be wanted. Mr. Scott answered that he had no intention of becoming a candidate; whereupon Mr. Brownell said that many were desirous of using Mr. Scott's name and requested Mr. Scott to notify him if the time came when he could be of service. At a late hour it was decided by the Multnomah delegation to submit Mr. Scott's name. Therefore, in pursuance of Mr. Brownell's invitation and request, he sent the above telegram. On his own account he cares nothing about the publication of it. To the judgment of the public he leaves Mr. Brownell; about whom, however, there is likely to be much more to say.

If payment is to be made of the claims of Indian War Veterans, it should be done promptly. The reason for this is obvious. The claimants are old men, and those of them who need the money need it badly. Furthermore, some of them will not need it long. No doubt the pension idea has been cherished by some of them during past years to their financial detriment. That is to say, much of their endeavor in the way of economy and thrift has perhaps been sapped by the idea, vigorously pursued by pension agitators, that each would in due time receive a pension. However this may be, old age is upon these Indian fighters of a past era, and in many instances it is accompanied by poverty. It is a condition, not a theory, that must be dealt with here. The money that has been appropriated should be distributed among the beneficiaries as soon as is legally practicable.

If the Ministerial Association of Salt Lake City puts the sectarian issue of Mormonism ahead of the moral and legal issue of polygamy in its contest against Reed Smoot for a seat in the United States Senate, it will fail, as it ought. Whether Mr. Smoot is a Mormon or a Presbyterian in his religious beliefs makes no difference with his qualifications for Senator. A Mormon apostle has as much right to be Senator as a Methodist bishop, so far as his religious convictions go. But when it comes to violating moral and statute law it is different. The brethren would better give up a sectarian fight.

Chief of Police Hunt is giving careful attention to the details of his department. He has made some radical changes in the distribution of his force, and in methods and rules for its government, looking to a greater efficiency. The public looks on hopefully and awaits results anxiously.

EASTERN PRESS OPINION.

The Ticket Test.

Denver Republican.

Cole Younger says he will run a Wild West show. His scale of prices will determine whether he has lost his ability as a hold-up.

Publicity Didn't Prevent.

Springfield Republican.

It is reported from St. Paul that the Standard Oil trust, on losing a local suit for damages to the amount of $10,000 on account of injuries caused by gasoline, at once advanced the price, and in nine days collected from the local public enough extra to pay all the costs. Here we have publicity, but not necessarily the preventive.

America's Champion Egotist.

Rochester Democrat-Chronicle.

Once in a while Mr. Bryan's disguise of philosophic contentment slips from him and he stands as a "bad loser," a soured and disappointed man so eaten up with self-conceit that it is utterly impossible for him to believe that he could be beaten squarely on his merits in a Presidential race. This happened when, at Wilmington, the other day, he said: "A Republican should not be horrified with Addicks for buying the Senatorship when the Republican party bought two Presidential elections." You see this egotist actually believes that his merits are so transcendent and conspicuous that only blind partisanship or bribery could induce any man to vote against so singularly fit a candidate for the Presidency. Mr. Bryan will probably live his life out entirely unaware of the fact that many, indeed most, of his fellow-citizens, regard him as a rattle-pated wind-bag without a single qualification for the high office for which accident made him a candidate.

Not an Administration Victory.

Kansas City Journal.

The legislation enacted cannot be looked upon strictly as a victory for the Administration. Attorney-General Knox, speaking undoubtedly for the President, in his speech delivered some time ago at Pittsburg outlined a very severe campaign against the trusts. It will also be remembered that it was officially announced at the last session of Congress that Mr. Littlefield had been selected to prepare a bill embracing the President's views as to trust legislation. The idea and suggestions both of the Attorney-General and the gentleman from Maine have been disregarded, so it is very probable that these measures which have been enacted do not carry out in every particular the programme originally planned by Mr. Roosevelt. Publicity, however, which was the main feature of that programme, has been amply provided for, so there is every reason to believe that no further attempt will be made through this Congress to restrict or control the operations of those great combines of organized wealth called trusts.

As to Mr. Ware.

Kansas City Journal.

There may or may not be real basis for the story from Washington with respect to friction between Secretary Hitchcock and Pension Commissioner Ware. However, the friends of Mr. Ware in Kansas know that he is possessed of independence to an unusual degree and that there isn't a power in existence, either political or otherwise, that can scare him or make him eat dirt. He went to Washington very much against his own inclination, because he was urged to take the thankless job vacated by Clay Evans. He carried with him a grim determination to run the pension department in accordance with business principles. Those who know him best were fully convinced at the time that he would clash with the politicians who ceaselessly invoke this department for favors of an uncertain kind. But it was presumed that President Roosevelt wanted just this kind of a man at the head of the Pension Bureau, and that he would sustain Ware in his efforts at reform. And, until it is known in Kansas that the President is not standing by the Commissioner, little credence will be given to rumors of his retirement.

They Want Your Money.

Rochester Democrat-Chronicle.

Considered as a business venture, a "turf exchange" is probably no better and no worse than the average of money-making schemes that are founded on betting. But when a turf exchange man advertises his ability to bet on the winning side nine times out of ten, invites you to get into the game, and promises fabulous profits on every dollar that you place in his hands, it is safe to decline the invitation. In the first place, he has no sure system of winning. In the second place, if he had such a system, he would operate it for his own gain instead of dividing the profits with others. That "stands to reason," does it not? As a matter of fact, the rascal is after your dollars, and if he gets hold of them you are likely never to see them again. Several concerns of this kind have recently collapsed and left their customers in the lurch to the extent of hundreds of thousands. This turf-exchange industry is the latest development of "get-rich-quick" frauds, and it has roped in many victims. It is just at present under a cloud; but probably a new snare will soon be devised for a class in which the birth rate is reputed to be one every minute.

Confederates and Slave Pensions.

Washington Star.

Those Confederate veterans in the South who at their meetings are passing resolutions favorable to the ex-slave pension scheme show a singular lack of judgment in dealing with an important question.

It is natural for these men to feel sympathy for the ex-slaves. There is likewise a temptation to play politics. These veterans are all Democrats, and an impression is abroad that a Graeco-Roman tussle is in progress between the President and Mr. Hanna for control of the Republican organization. Mr. Hanna laughs at the story, but it continues to circulate, and particularly in the South. Naturally Democratic sympathy is with Mr. Hanna, on the principle that it is always best to cheer on a movement which has for its object making trouble in the camp of the opposition.

But the indorsement of this measure by these Confederate posts is not qualified. They are not asking that it become a law because the Republicans are in power, but are committing themselves to it as something meritorious in itself. To the extent of their influence with their own party they are also committing the Democracy to it. That is a foolish performance. The ex-slaves are not going to be pensioned by the Government, and men, North or South, who attempt to play politics with the proposition will injure themselves, and, to the extent of their ability, the party to which they belong.

The Kiss Killers.

Chippewa Herald.

> "Have you read," asked Hiawatha,
> "How the daffy legislators
> Have been jumpin' onto kissin'?
> Have you seen the resolutions
> Introduced by them to throttle
> Or discourage osculation?
> Years ago, when Minnehaha
> Was a maiden fair and graceful,
> I was often at the wigwam
> Of her dad, the arrow-maker,
> And you bet your Uncle Dudley
> Just improved each shining moment—
> Like a bee, I sipped the honey
> From her rosy lips, and never
> Overlooked a bet, that's certain!
>
> "Now I'm growing old and hardened,
> But I have sweet recollections
> Of the good old cosy corner
> In the arrowmaker's wigwam,
> And I don't begrudge to others
> What I once was very fond of.
> I'm not like those hoary-headed
> Senators who can no longer
> Feel a thrill of exultation
> When their lips collide with others.
> And who would therefore abolish
> Osculation altogether.
> Never! Here's a health to kissing!
> Here's to Ella Wheeler Wilcox!"

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Idaho and Kansas would better pair on the Reed Smoot issue.

That's a good idea, to have anaesthetics as a part of the equipment of every train. Why not also have a priest along to administer extreme unction on the spot?

If Colorado puts $10,000,000 of gold bullion into a reproduction of the state capitol for display at the St. Louis exposition, it is safe to say she will not reproduce a legislative session therein. She will expect to get the gold back.

Peary is said to be firm in the belief that a fund of $150,000 will enable him to reach the pole. But a good many times that sum have been spent in the efforts of other explorers, and the pole is yet unattained. And of what use would it be if the pole had been reached?

While Colonel Arthur Lynch, the member of the British Parliament recently convicted of high treason, has been in prison he has received all parliamentary documents with great regularity, the same as the other members. Though serving a life sentence he still has a standing as Galway's representative in the lawmaking body at Westminster.

Judge George Shiras, who has just retired as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, gains $2500 a year by the passage of the bill increasing the salaries of the members of that tribunal. He wished to retire some months ago but the death of Justice Gray delayed the acceptance of his resignation. Meantime the increase of salary became effective and he will receive $12,500 a year during the remainder of his life.

> The number of wives of Reed Smoot, tra-la,
> Has nothing to do with the case.
> He's a Mormon apostle to boot, tra-la,
> And we dearly delight him to hoot, tra-la,
> And though we're too timid to shoot, tra-la,
> We'll talk him a merry old race,
> We'll talk it right up to his face.
>
> His religion we do not approve, tra-la,
> It doesn't accord with our views.
> We should like it if he were to move, tra-la,
> But it doesn't exactly behoove, tra-la,
> That we charge what will be hard to prove, tra-la,
> When an easier course we may choose
> And the papers will handle our news.

That reputable Southern sentiment does not support Pitchfork Tillman is evidenced by the following disclaimer in the Atlanta Constitution:

> It is a long, long while since the odious days of reconstruction, and the political methods made necessary by the perpetration of a governmental outrage have lapsed into vague memories of the older generation. But when Senator Tillman even gloats and glories in shoeguns and tissue ballots, he is guilty of an anachronism of Southern sentiment which is worse than an intrusion upon the present era of good feeling. It is a positive affront to modern enlightenment and modern progress.

A Business Concern was managed by a Republican and the stockholders quarreled often as to the Way he ran it. One Day a Democrat came along and said:

"Why don't you fire that Bum Republican Boss, and give the Job to a good Man. You let Me have the Place and I'll show the Hired Help how the bossing Act is properly done."

The Stockholders took the Democrat at His Word and gave Him the Scepter and for the first few Days He did so much managing to the square Inch that He made the stockholders Dizzy and their Eyes stuck out like the Door Knobs.

Moral: A new Broom always sweeps clean.

The most notable astronomical event of the year will be the opposition of Mars, which will occur on the 28th of this month. On April 1 the distance of Mars will be a minimum, being then only 59,000,000 miles. The opposition is so circumstanced, however, that astronomers will have some favorable conditions for studying Martian problems. The northern polar cap will be visible, and doubtless many observations of it will be made by numerous native observers. The satellites of Mars, discovered by Professor Hall at the Naval Observatory, will probably be beyond the reach of that telescope in the present position of the planet, but they may be visible to the more powerful telescopes of the Lick Observatory. It is not known what observations of Mars, if any, are contemplated at the Naval Observatory. Many problems are now studied by astronomers with large telescopes, of which the measurements of satellites is one. Other lines of study relate to the diameter of the planet by night and by daylight, and drawings of the numerous markings noted upon the surface of our sister planet.

The accident which befell Lord Rosebery's notes at Plymouth has set people discussing the practice of various speakers in regard to the preparation of their speeches. The most inveterate writer-out of speeches was the late Lord Derby; the manuscript of one of his most statesmanlike discourses being picked up from the floor, where it had fallen, was found not only to be freely sprinkled with "Hear, hear," "Laughter," and "Applause," but also to contain a passage beginning, "But I am detaining you too long (cries of 'No, no,' and 'Go on')." Sir William Harcourt used to declaim his great orations in the country from sheets of manuscript written within and without. Mr. Gladstone used to make fairly full and extremely distinct notes, but his splendid dexterity in the use of them made his hearers forget their existence. Mr. Bright used to say that the right way was to prepare a certain number of "islands"—meaning neat and pointed sentences—and that one should then trust one's self to swim out by extempore effort from island to island, reserving always the best island for the peroration. Mr. Asquith's speeches, "faultily faultless, icily regular," always strike one as being, like Macaulay's and the late Lord Sherbrooke's, learnt by heart and delivered from memory.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

Cook—Well, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Mr. Bouncer—No, it isn't. It's in the digesting.—Detroit Free Press.

Miffkins—My wife has been the making of me. Biffkins—Well, I don't think much of her ability as a manufacturer.—Chicago Daily News.

Mrs. Outtown—I understand that you have an old retainer. Mrs. Subbub—Yes, indeed! Bridget has been with us three weeks.—Harper's Bazar.

Timid Lover—Your parents seem to have gotten over their dislike for me. "Yes. When we first met they were afraid it might lead to something."—Life.

Johnny—Say, pa, what is classical music? His Father—Classical music, my son, is music that you can't whistle, and wouldn't if you could.—Brooklyn Life.

"Yes," said the great scientist, "this specimen was put away in alcohol when that article of commerce was worth a king's ransom." "So?" remarked the visitor. "Well, I should say, for a dead one, it seems to be in high spirits."—Baltimore News.

"I understand that you have shown great courage in the service of your country." "I spec's I has." "Were you in the Army?" "Yes, suh. But I doesn't count dat. What I's kin' o' lookin' foh a medal foh is acceptin' a 'p'intment as Pos'master."—Washington Star.

Husband—Don't you think that you are rather unreasonable to expect me to take you to a ball, stay awake until 4 o'clock, and then get up at 8 to go to my work? Wife—I may be a little unreasonable, but it's perfectly brutal of you to mention it.—New York Weekly.