SPECIAL ORDER OF POLITENESS

Japanese Governor Issues a Remarkably Curious Mandate.

APPLIES TO FOREIGNERS

Subjects Cautioned Not to Joke, Talk About Visitors' Dress, Ask Ages or Throw Stones at Their Dogs.

YOKOHAMA, Oct. 31.—Baron Sufu, Governor of Kanagawa Prefecture, in which Yokohama is situated, has for some unaccountable reason seen fit to issue the following curious orders to all citizens, practically demanding for foreigners special treatment, says a special correspondent of The New York Times.

There is no country where foreigners receive more courteous treatment than in Japan. Much may be said of their commercial dishonesty, but no one can speak of their manners and treatment of foreigners except in the highest praise. In this respect they are always polite, modest and discreet.

Study in Mentalities.

These orders are a study in comparative mentality, due to the wide gulf which separates Japanese mentality from our own.

The Governor's instructions are as follows:

Nobody should hang round foreigners on the streets or when the latter are shopping.

Merchants should not overcharge when foreigners make purchases.

In case foreigners are robbed of or lose anything at railway stations or landing places or at shops, railway officials or merchants should take trouble at once to report the matter to the authorities.

Foreigners' dogs when taken out on streets should not be molested by stone throwing or by challenging to fight with other dogs.

Foreigners should be very kindly and courteously treated, and when they come to the government offices the suitable sitting accommodations should be allowed them.

Attention should be paid to the foreign usage in vogue like that foreigners do not uncover in offices and foreign ladies do not uncover even in cases of ceremonies and foreign couples walk together hand in hand. (Uncover means head covering.)

Foreigners being attentive to the prevention of cruelty to animals, care should be taken not to cruelly treat animals. (The Japanese are not cruel. One never hears of cruelty to women or children. The cruelty practised on animals is more of a "jude" trick, tying the foreign up, pulling the tongue out, and twisting it. Nothing like the cruelty which foreigners witness in the Latin countries exists.)

No insulting remarks or jokes should be made against foreigners' costume, manners or conversation. No indecent speech should be uttered against foreigners.

Ban on Certain Words.

Such words as ketojin, akahige, injin, etc., should not be uttered in the streets, public gardens, or any other places. (Ketojin and akahige are contemptuous terms for foreigners. The latter literally translated means "red-headed." Ijin is merely the word for different person.")

Foreigners' residences should not be entered without first obtaining permission from the momban or other employee.

When foreign ladies are present in a train, tram car, or in waiting rooms care should be taken not to place luggage, etc., in a confused heap so as to make it impossible for foreigners to sit down. (All tram cars and railroad coaches are built on the American plan. It is customary for Japanese on railroads to crouch in their natural and most comfortable position rather than to sit in the European fashion. They carry an enormous amount of personal luggage, which they scatter over the seats.)

Nobody should gaze unnecessarily at foreigners' faces.

When entering Foreign Offices care should be taken not to wear muddy shoes.

It should be remembered that foreign missionaries, like Japanese priests, are respected by their countrymen.

Care should be taken not to allow children to throw mudcakes or place any impediments or in any other way obstruct the way where foreigners are riding bicycles, or in any other way taking outdoor exercise.

No libellous or insulting words should be uttered against foreign teachers. Show stalls or amusement halls should not be allowed to display placards with above insulting intent.

It should not be forgotten that foreigners most dislike the Japanese habit of spitting irrespective of places. Fruit peel, tobacco ashes, etc., should not be thrown in trains, etc.

Foreigners should not be pointed at with the finger.

Careful About Smoking.

No tobacco should be smoked at places where it is morally forbidden, or in the presence of foreign ladies. (Japanese smoke everywhere, even in all theaters, in their homes, both men and women.)

When foreign ladies enter a room a seat should be taken after the ladies have sat down.

Those who are studying foreign languages should not accost foreigners, when it is unnecessary, merely for the purpose of practice. (They are an ambitious lot and will brave anything to practice English.)

When speaking with foreigners only necessary matters should be talked about and time should be saved. (It takes a long while to get to the point with the Japanese, and it is often annoying when one tells his guide to answer "Yes" and hears him jabbering away in a foreign tongue for some 15 or 20 minutes.)

Visiting should be made at times convenient to foreigners.

When accosting foreigners such vulgar words as "oi" should not be used. ("Oi" is merely a word for attracting attention, such as "Say" or "Hello," and is not considered polite.)

Foreigners' ages should not be asked, except in case of absolute necessity.

When cleaning the teeth or nostrils in the presence of foreigners handkerchiefs should be used.

Streets should not be watered too much. This should be confined to what is sufficient to lay the dust.

When meeting foreign funerals respect should be paid, and derisive remarks or insulting words should be avoided.

The idea should be eradicated from the mind that foreigners always give money to beggars for the mere asking. (There is less begging in Japan than in any country. Filial piety and the clan system provide for the old and needy.)

Cautioned About Graft.

Fixed prices should be marked on staple products at all places.

Placards should be posted at those places where foreigners frequent, showing distance, etc., in European languages, to noted places in the neighborhood.

When foreigners accost Japanese the latter should not avoid speaking on account of ignorance of foreign language. In such cases attempts should be made in Japanese to let the foreigners know what they desire.

Collars, cuffs, handkerchiefs, shoes, etc., should be kept clean.

When walking with foreigners foot steps should be taken in uniformity.

When foreigners look at their watches it should be remembered that they have other pressing business to attend to.

The Governor has also issued instructions concerning Chinamen, ordering the people not to utter insulting words about Chinamen's costume; not to sell toys of Chinamen's heads fastened on sticks with the queue; not to use insulting words when Chinamen worship in temples; not to touch the Chinamen's heads; not to cry "chanchan, tekunama, kaitai," etc., against Chinamen, and also to prevent Jinrikishamen and coolies from insulting Chinamen.

Third Church Boys Win.

The Third Presbyterian Church boys' football team yesterday defeated Sunnyside Church by the score of 32 to 0. The game was played on Ladd Field and was witnessed by a large crowd of enthusiastic admirers of the youngsters.

TAG-DAY SCENES AS PHOTOGRAPHERS CAUGHT THEM

I AM TAGGED FOR CHARITY FOR BABY HOME

EVEN THE CHINESE BOUGHT TAGS

"BUY A TAG? WHY, SURE."

THE YOUNG MAN COULDN'T RESIST A PRETTY GIRL

VICTORY CLAIMED BY BOTH

Varying Opinions Emenate From Headquarters in Chicago.

CHICAGO, Oct. 31.—At both Democratic and Republican headquarters in this city today statements summing up their respective views on the coming election were issued. John E. Lamb, in charge of the Democratic headquarters here, in the absence of Chairman Mack, made public an estimate in which he claimed 235 electoral votes safe for Bryan, placed 110 votes in the doubtful column, and admitted that 78 votes, or six states which he named, were safely Republican. Mr. Lamb's view of the safely Democratic states would give the election to Bryan by 295 electoral votes, against 188 for Mr. Taft.

William Hayward, secretary of the Republican National committee, in a signed statement, admitted the existence of only four doubtful states in what he designated as the Western division.

"In my judgment," said Mr. Hayward, "there are but four doubtful states in the Western division — Nevada, Colorado, Montana and Missouri. By this I don't mean that we have no chance in Oklahoma, but not as good a chance as in the four states just named. Of these Colorado and Montana are reasonably safe for Mr. Taft. The prairie states west of the Missouri River, as well as Wyoming, Utah and some of the mountain states, and all of the Pacific Coast states, are and have been surely Republican since the beginning of the campaign. There has never been any real doubt in the minds of any one about Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota or Iowa. Mr. Bryan will certainly lose his own state. Personally, I have never had any doubt of Indiana and have not now."

Mr. Hayward's statement in closing claims New York, Ohio and West Virginia, and states that the doubt experienced concerning Maryland and Kentucky is all in favor of a Republican victory.

In Mr. Lamb's statement the following states alone are admitted to be safely Republican:

Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and Vermont.

The following he places in the doubtful column:

California, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

CLASS COLORADO AS IN DOUBT

Both Parties Claim State—Factions Divide Republicans.

DENVER, Oct. 31.—Colorado is properly classed as doubtful in forecasting election results. A hot contest has been waged between Republicans and Democrats for the five Presidential electors, three Congressmen, state officers, four members of the Supreme Court and the Legislature, which will elect United States Senator Teller's successor. It is not anticipated that the Prohibition and Socialist parties, which likewise have tickets in the field, will develop greater strength than at previous elections.

A factional fight between the supporters and opponents of United States Senator Simon Guggenheim is expected to help the Democratic state and legislative tickets, especially in Denver. Republican Chairman John F. Vivian and Democratic Chairman Charles B. Ward each claims the state for the entire ticket of his party by 15,000 to 20,000 plurality, but independent estimates indicate that the plurality for either Taft or Bryan is not likely to exceed 5000.

Republicans Claim Oklahoma.

GUTHRIE, Okla., Oct. 31.—Although Democratic State Chairman Thompson claims that Oklahoma will go Democratic by a majority of 40,000 and that the Democrats will elect a Legislature that will name United States Senator Thomas P. Gore to succeed himself, J. H. Morris, the Republican state chairman, said tonight: "I am confident of winning both National and state tickets in Oklahoma."

The Republicans do not give out any figures.

Nevada for Bryan by 4100.

RENO, Nev., Oct. 31.—Judge J. P. Somers, chairman of the Democratic state central committee, said tonight:

"Information which we have carefully compiled enables me to state that the Democrats will carry the state by not less than 4100 majority for Bryan. We predict the election of the entire state and Congressional ticket and will not lose a single one of the 14 counties."

Heart disease kills 124.9 persons out of every 100,000

ENDS IN DARKNESS

New York Taft Parade Over Seven Hours in Passing.

GREATEST ONE IN HISTORY

Beginning at 10 Yesterday Morning as Daylight Demonstration, Ended as Torchlight Procession Before It Finally Disbanded.

NEW YORK, Oct. 31.—Darkness had fallen tonight before the end of the giant Republican parade which began at 10 o'clock this morning filed by the reviewing stand up town and disbanded, passing into history as one of the greatest of its kind ever held in this city. Beginning as a daylight demonstration in honor of Taft and Sherman, it came to a close as a torchlight procession. It took seven hours and 35 minutes for the army to pass before the reviewing stand.

Vice-Presidential Candidate Sherman was cheered enthusiastically as he rode near the head of the procession in a carriage. Rear-Admiral J. R. Colnlan was the parade marshal. Mr. Sherman was accompanied by Secretary of State Root, Secretary Cortelyou also marched in the parade.

I wish to state some reasons which lead me to believe that Mr. Bryan's election to the Presidency would be followed by general and long-continued business disaster and that a long period of stagnation and distress would ensue, such as we experienced between 1893 and the election of Mr. McKinley, in 1896.

Whatever may be the development of our industrial system in the future, no considerable productive enterprise goes on under the present system without the use of capital as well as labor. I believe that thoughtful men, generally, realize that the effect of labor unions in securing fair and steady wages and just conditions for labor is beneficial to the whole community, the employer as well as the employed. It is equally clear that stability, certainty and a natural, even development of law, administration and social conditions are important for the welfare of the whole community, employed as well as employers, because these are necessary to enable investors to forecast the future and form a reasonable judgment as to whether if they put their money into productive enterprises they will reap a profit or will lose what they put in. Threats of violent changes make it impossible to form a judgment as to the future course of business, still more threats of changes which present the probability of loss, check investment, and, therefore, check production immediately. The essential feature of all business depressions is loss of confidence in the future.

Means Loss of Confidence.

I cannot doubt that the election of Mr. Bryan would destroy the confidence necessary to the continuance of industrial and commercial enterprises; and I think that his election would justly destroy confidence.

Any change of government from the administration of a party whose principles and practical workings are well known to action it is practically easy to forecast, to a new set of men who belong to another party and whose course in office is a matter of conjecture, in itself tends to create doubt and hesitancy, and the possibility of such change always keeps many business enterprises in suspension before every Presidential election.

The possibility of Mr. Bryan's election, however, involves much more than this ordinary doubt. He advocates a great variety of measures, which would bring about at once powerful centralized government in Washington completely destructive of state sovereignty, and it appears probable, therefore, that if the Democratic party is put in power with Mr. Bryan as President he will be able to try in actual administration and legislation the views which he has expressed.

Careful observation of the Senate leaves little doubt that if the people of the country were to give their approval to Mr. Bryan by electing him President and by supporting him with a Democratic House, a sufficient number of Senators elected as Republicans would yield to the pressure of the Bryan policies backed by the force of that popular indorsement to give effect to almost any measure which he might propose. Mr. Bryan has publicly declared that he expects this, and I think his expectation would be justified.

Destructive Effects.

The substantial question before us, therefore, is what would be the effect upon the productive enterprises of the country to know that Mr. Bryan's views were to be made effective by the entire force of the National Government.

I need not spend time over Mr. Bryan's devotion to the free coinage of silver. He has admitted that from his platform this year, because it no longer affords a popular issue in the face of the logic of events which has disproved every prophecy upon which he staked his reputation for political wisdom in his campaign of 1896. But he has not abjured it.

The business man of the country will not forget that under our laws it would still be possible if Mr. Bryan were President and a time of stringency were to come, to completely destroy the single gold standard by executive action and to bring on a trial of a law for the free coinage of silver, almost in favor of the initiative and referendum, and he has never abjured that, although he has omitted it from his platform because he has seen that the American people shrank from destroying the system of representative government under which they have grown so great and under which a larger measure of liberty and justice has been attained than under any other form of government the world has known.

He has repeatedly and formally declared himself in favor of the Government ownership of railroads and he stands by that declaration.

Flays Banking Scheme.

He refrains from pressing it now because it would not help to elect him, but he holds to it. He does not believe in the regulation of railroad rates or in the laws to prevent discrimination in rates. He believes those laws to be futile and sure to fail of effect. He would like to see the National Government become the owner of all the great railroads of the country and an executive officer, under his direction as President, controlling their operations with the enormous horde of Federal officers necessary for their administration and with the tremendous power over every state that such a control would give to him, skilled politician as he is.

He proposes in his latest platform a bank deposit guarantee scheme under which all the National banks of the country shall guarantee the payment of the deposits of all the other National banks.

For the use of persons in parts of the country where savings banks are not accessible the Republican party proposes to establish postal savings banks through which the Government will take charge of their savings and keep them securely. Mr. Bryan's scheme does not touch this class of people or provide for the safety of this kind of deposit. It relates to the business banks, through which the business people of the country transact their business. A bank deposit is in effect a loan of money by the depositor to the bank, to be repaid at such time and in such amounts as the depositor indicates by drawing checks against the bank. We now have a free banking system under which any group of men who can raise $25,000 can start a bank and invite deposits; that is, can ask people to lend them their money to be repaid in the way I have described. As matters stand now, ordinarily no man undertaking to start a bank will get any deposits [illegible] will get business people to lend him their money, unless he is [illegible] reputation in the community. Business people will not intrust their money to unknown or unfavorably known adventurers. As a result our banking is as a rule honest and conservative and the losses by depositors are exceedingly small.

Affords No Protection.

But, however, Mr. Bryan's scheme were to be adopted, any set of scoundrels who could raise $25,000 could start a bank and could borrow money on the credit of the entire banking capital of the United States; for the [illegible] would know that it made no difference to them whether the men who asked for their deposits were incompetent or reckless speculators or dishonest rogues, because if their deposits were lost in speculation or stolen, nevertheless the other banks of the country would pay them. Furthermore, the business of banking is conducted under widely different conditions in different parts of the country. Bank money can be loaned at 12 per cent in Oklahoma; in New York, Boston and Philadelphia 4 per cent is a good rate. Some bankers are content to get only 4 per cent with the good security that can always be had with a low rate of interest, while other bankers prefer to take the chance of a very high rate of interest together with the risks that always accompany high rates of interest. Under Mr. Bryan's scheme the conservative, cautious, safe banker who is content with 4 per cent would have to bear the risks incurred by the 12 per cent banker, while the latter would take the 12 per cent profit, if all went well. Under Mr. Bryan's scheme the sound, conservative bankers of the country would have no control whatever over the risks which would thus be imposed upon them. The burden of these risks would not be imposed upon the stockholders of the banks alone, but upon the great body of the depositors and borrowers from banks—the men who are engaged in conducting the legitimate business of the country; for under the competition of our free banking system, the margin of banking profit is ordinarily very narrow, and any burden imposed upon the banks comes ultimately out of the depositors in reduced interest paid to them for their deposits, and out of the business men who borrow money from the banks in the increased rate charged against them for loans.

This scheme would require all the sound banks of the country and all the legitimate business transacted through them to indorse, out of sight and unseen, all the future obligations that may be contracted by an indefinite number of unknown persons.

Radical View on Rates.

Mr. Bryan in his Lincoln speech of October 12 attacked Governor Hughes for vetoing the 2-cent fare bill in the State of New York, and held up that veto as a reason why the Republican party should not be continued in power.

He knew, as the whole country knows, that when Governor Hughes vetoed that bill he procured the passage by the Legislature of New York of a bill providing for a Public Service Commission charged with the duty of inquiring into the reasonableness of railroad rates, what rates would enable the railroad companies to pay their expenses, maintain their roads and rolling stocks and still make a reasonable profit; and to regulate rates in accordance with the facts ascertained; and he knew that the ground of the veto of the 2-cent fare bill was that the bill was passed by the Legislature of New York without any inquiry whatever into such facts, but as a purely arbitrary act of power fixing the rate without any reference to the question whether it would amount to confiscation of railroad property or not. Mr. Bryan's disapproval of Governor Hughes' course, therefore, was an approval of a practice under which the people who travel upon the railroads of the United States shall fix their own fares by legislative enactment in accordance with what they wish to pay, without ascertaining or caring whether the fare so paid will furnish a reasonable return to the railroad to enable it to pay its labor, buy its materials and return any profit whatever to the capital invested.

Mr. Bryan proposes in his latest platform that all articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products shall be placed upon the free list.

Fallacy of Free Trade.

Examine this for a moment. The great evil of trusts lies in their driving out of business their smaller competitors, and after these are driven out, putting up prices. The driving out of business is practically always done by unfair and oppressive means. Indeed, it can be done in no other way except in cases where the trust controls the whole raw material of manufacture, for wherever the raw material of manufacture can be obtained and competition has a fair chance, the moment prices are put up competition increases and the trust control decreases. The Republican plan of dealing with trusts is to go after all the big concerns which are driving out competition by unfair practices, to compel them to stop and to punish them if they do not stop, so as to give the smaller competitors a fair chance. The whole railroad rebate system, for which so many punishments have been inflicted within the last few years, is an illustration of one of the unfair methods by which big concerns have been driving smaller concerns out of business. The essential idea of this method of dealing with trusts is to give the little concern a fair chance against the big concern.

Mr. Bryan's plan is that as soon as it is discovered that some manufacturing concern has got what he calls control of some article, the article shall be put on the free list, taking off all protection, whatever and ruining both the trust and all its competitors at the same time; for, as a general rule, American manufacturers cannot pay American wages and compete in our markets with European manufacturers paying European wages, without some protection. The necessary effect of such a proceeding would be to close the American manufactories, throw the American workmen out of employment and compel our people to make all their purchases of the particular article concerned in Europe. This would not merely be ruinous to the competing American manufacturer as well as to the trust, but would be most disastrous in its effect upon mercantile trade.

Blow to Business.

I shall not argue the question of protection and free trade here, but I suppose that the most earnest believers in the ultimate advantage of free trade would not dispute that the immediate effect of withdrawing protection would be to close a great multitude of American manufactories, turn the workmen employed in them into the street and render the capital invested in them valueless. It is with that immediate effect upon the business of the country that I am dealing now, and that would be the effect of Mr. Bryan's election.

Mr. Bryan's platform proposes that any manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce—and all the large ones are engaged in interstate commerce—shall be required to take out a Federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent of the products in which it deals, and that these licenses shall require all the concerns which hold them to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms after making due allowance for cost of transportation. All the leading concerns making or dealing in any of the tens of thousands of particular kinds of articles made and sold in this country are to be subject to this limitation.

I will not dwell upon how the facts are to be determined for the purpose of enforcing such a provision. That must necessarily be by some executive officer in Washington, for manifestly it would be impossible that the courts should perform such an enormous task relating to all the great business of the country. I will not dwell upon the tremendous centralization of power in Washington which would be involved in this; but I point to the fact that such a proposal would destroy the right of private contract on the part of the great producers and merchants of the country, and would impose upon all business the same limitations which are properly imposed upon common carriers in the performance of their public duty of transportation, for which they have received franchises from the public. Under such a provision no great manufacturer or merchant could make prices to his customers to suit the conditions and requirements of his trade. No matter how important it might be for him to reduce his stock; no matter how great might be the necessity of making sales to raise money for the continuance of his business; no matter how important it might be for him to keep his workmen employed, he could not shave prices for the purpose of securing an advantageous contract below the prices at which he had sold to somebody else in some other state.

Would Choke Business.

Manifestly to enforce this, it would be necessary that merchants and manufacturers should file schedules of their prices and then be subject to prosecution if they sold at any different prices. There is no manufacturer or merchant who will not recognize the impossibility of conducting the business of the country under any such system.

Now, I ask you to consider the effect upon the business of the country by putting in control at Washington a man who has the will and the power to do all these things.

What manufacturer will have the confidence to risk money in the purchase of raw material and of machinery, and payment of wages for manufacture if a majority of the people put into power a party which believes in withdrawing all protection from manufactured articles and in putting all such articles as some executive officer in Washington is moved to declare under trust control upon the free list, so that at any moment the product of manufacture may be subjected to unrestricted foreign competition?

What merchant will have confidence to risk money in the purchase of stocks of goods from foreign or from American producers if some executive officer in Washington is liable at any moment to destroy their value by the removal of the duty under which they were purchased and has power to prevent their owner from selling them according to the needs of his business to such customers as he can find and at such prices as he can get?

Who is to put money into the extension and equipment of railroads necessary for the conduct of the business of the country if we put into power in Washington a party whose all-powerful leader in the President's chair proposes to take the property over into the hands of the Government at the Government's own valuation and is in favor of limiting the rates to be charged for its use by perfectly arbitrary legislation adopted without any regard whatever to the cost of transacting the business or to the rates necessary to produce a profit?

Risk too Great.

Who is to have confidence to put his money into the banking business when it is to be subject not merely to the risks involved in the judgment and integrity of the men whom he selects to manage it, but to be made a guaranty for the credit of all the unknown men who may find it useful for their schemes of speculation or dishonesty to go through the forms of taking out a charter under the free banking system?

What confidence would there be in any business under a government with the will and the power to destroy the gold standard and inaugurate the free coinage of silver, and threatening the destruction of our old and well-considered methods of representative legislation by the adoption of the unknown and untried system of the initiative and referendum?

Nor are these specific proposals in themselves the only causes for the destruction of confidence which would be found in the election of Mr. Bryan. The character and quality of the man indicated by them is such that no one can tell what new patent remedy he may seize upon at any time to meet the political exigencies of the moment, or do away with conditions which cause dissatisfaction among any part of his followers.

The business world distrusts a man of that temperament and justly distrusts him, for he can do infinite harm. The news of his election would bring doubt and distrust to the mind of every man having money to invest in American enterprises. It would prevent all new enterprises. It would reduce the activity of all existing enterprises. Lack of confidence, contraction, business depression, business failures, the stopping of interest and dividends reduction in the expense of salaries and wages, more and still more workmen out of employment, reduced purchasing power of the people and a reduced market for farm and factory products—all these in necessary succession would be the inevitable result of endowing this dangerous apostle of half truths, with the tremendous power of the National Government to rule and to ruin.

Control of Courts.

But the courts!

Would not the courts set a limit upon Mr. Bryan's interference with the conduct of business? Cannot the business men of the country rely upon the courts to protect them in their constitutional rights?

To that I answer, first, that very little capital will be invested upon the understanding that it will be lost unless the investor defeats the National Government in litigation. Investments already made may seek to protect themselves by litigation, but investments not yet made will never be made at all on those terms.

I answer in the second place, that the possibility, indeed the probability, of Mr. Bryan's control of the courts presents the most serious danger which would follow his election. He has already given us evidence by his public utterances that he would, if he could, re-constitute the courts in such a way that they should answer to the demands of what he deems to be public opinion. If elected President he will have an opportunity to re-constitute the Supreme Court of the United States, which stands as the great and indispensable bulwark of constitutional right. When the next President is inaugurated four of the present Justices of the Supreme Court will have passed the age of retirement. One will be 76, a second 74, a third 71 and a fourth 70 years of age. Before the next Presidential term is finished a fifth will lack a few days of being 72 and a sixth will be in his 70th year. It is practically certain that the President elected in November will have the appointment of a large proportion of the members of the court to fill the vacancies which will occur, and it is highly probable that he will have the appointment of a majority of the members of the court. What protection would constitutional rights have from the court constituted by Mr. Bryan?

I call as a witness upon this question Samuel Gompers. On the 12th of this month he published an open letter, addressed to "Men of Labor, Lovers of Human Liberty," in which he said:

"The facts are that the judiciary, induced by corporations and trusts and protected by the Republican party is, step by step, destroying government by laws and substituting therefor a government by Judges, who determine what, in their opinion, is wrong; what, in their opinion, is evidence; who, in their opinion, is guilty, and what, in their opinion, the punishment shall be. It is sought to make of the Judges irresponsible despots, and by controlling them, using this despotism in the interest of corporate power."

The letter then described an unsuccessful appeal to the Republican party, and proceeded to say:

"Labor's representative then went to the Democratic party. That party made labor's contention its own. It pledged its candidates for every office to those remedies which labor had already submitted to Congress. The standard bearer of the Democratic party, Mr. William J. Bryan, entered fully into the essence of this struggle and declared that the real issue in this campaign is: 'Shall the people rule?'

"The Republican party and its candidate stands for upholding and further extending into our country a despotic government vested in the judiciary.

"The Democratic party and its candidate stands for government by law vested in the people."

Mr. Gompers is Mr. Bryan's chief ally in this campaign. The circular was issued in Mr. Bryan's interest for the purpose of attracting to him the labor vote. Unless it is denied, and it has not been denied, this is to be taken as an authentic statement of Mr. Bryan's attitude towards the courts.

Refuses to Pass Bill.

The particular occasion of these declarations was the refusal of Congress to pass a bill which withdrew from the courts the right to restrain by injunction any boycott whether secondary or otherwise, however arbitrary, destructive and unjustifiable it might be, by means of a provision limiting injunctions to the protection of property rights, and enacting that:

"No right ... to carry on business of any particular kind, or at any particular place, or at all, shall be construed, held, considered or treated as property, or as constituting a property right."

It is too plain for argument and is the law that the manufacturer's right to use his machinery, the merchant's right to sell his goods, every man's right to use his property and carry on his business is a property right which constitutes the chief value of property, and that the legislation thus demanded, to withdraw this right of property from the protection of the laws would be class legislation of the most dangerous and offensive character. To this, according to Mr. Gompers, Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party have assented.

But the declarations of the circular go beyond the occasion which calls them forth, and set forth the true attitude of Mr. Bryan and his Democracy toward the courts. In their view it is not the Constitution as interpreted by the courts; it is not the rules of law and the existing statutes as interpreted by the courts; but it is the will of the people at the moment, expressed in some other way than through the courts, which is to govern; and for the courts to render their decisions and issue and enforce their decrees in accordance with their opinion as to what the provisions of the Constitution and the laws are, is despotism, unless that opinion agrees with the present wish of what Mr. Bryan and Mr. Gompers choose to call the people, as interpreted by them.

Blow to Americanism.

This means the destruction of our judicial system. It means a subservient Venezuelan judiciary in place of an independent American judiciary. It means the sweeping away of all the protection that American constitutions have thrown about the rights of property, the fruits of enterprise and the liberty of the individual. It means that if Mr. Bryan has the opportunity to reconstitute the Supreme Court he will make it the instrument of its own destruction and an accomplice in the surrender of that great judicial safeguard against the momentary influences of popular excitement, which has been the chief element in the security, the stability and the progress of the American Republic.

REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS

Leroy H. Smith and wife to Beatrice Grenier-Stejer, S. ½ of N. E. ¼ of N. E. ¼ of N. W. ¼ of Sec. 30, T. 2 N., R. 1 W. ..... $ 1

Fred A. Chamberlain and wife to J. W. DeLano, lot 5, block 7, Mt. Tabor Villa Annex 400

Hills G. Hughes and wife to George O. Reynolds, lot 7, block 62, Irvington 1,350

S. A. Brown and wife to W. E. Dunsmoor, lot 3, block 4, Terminus Add. to Albina 500

Louis Goldsmith and wife to Christina Becker, lots 3 and 4, block 18, Goldsmith's Add. 7,500

Rose City Cemetery Association to Arthur L. Lynch, lot 20, block 42, section "D," said cemetery 50

George D. Barton and wife to Jennie Vickery, lot 10, block 3, Ideal View 275

Title Guarantee & Trust Co. to Beacon Investment Co., lots 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10, block 17; lots 13 to 17, block 18; lots 11 to 14, block 19; lots 4, 5 and 6, block 20, Rossmere 6,400

C. H. Piggott to Union Guarantee Association, lot 10, Linn Park; lots 17 and 18, subdivision "L," in Patton tract; lots 20 and 21, block 41, Tremont 1

Title Guarantee & Trust Co. to H. T. Estabrook, lots 11, 12, 19, 20 and 21, block 23, Berkeley 755

William G. Thompson and wife to John S. Winslow and wife, east 50x60 feet of lot 5; 16x60 feet off southeast corner of lot 6, block 2, Garrison's subdivision of East Portland 2,150

S. C. Priestley and wife to Matilda Dunn, lot 8, block 11, Foxhall Add. 225

Multnomah Cemetery Co. to Noah Robertson et al., northwest ¼ of lot 4, block "D," said cemetery 80

J. S. McKinley and wife to Frank Merrill, lots 1, 2, 3, tract 1, subdivision of tract 1, Northern Hill Acre Tracts 500

Peter Knox and wife to Walter A. Goss, lots 3, 7, 8, block 72, Albina 1

Portland Investors Co., Inc., trustee, to May Petty, 20 acres of the Ernest and Elizabeth Giese donation land claim 2,500

Mary A. Bowen to Susanne Klingsporn, lots 23 to 26 and north 10 feet of lot 22, block 44, Peninsular Addition No. 4 1,000

D. Alexander and wife to William G. Gosslin, et al., north ½ of southeast ¼ of southwest ¼ of section 10, township 2 north, range 2 west 400

O. O. Hall and wife to Frank N. Leahy, lot 25, block A, Holladay Park Addition 1,200

Frederick Delarade to Victor Land Company, lots 11, 12, block 57, Peninsular No. 4 Addition 10

T. K. Abbott and wife to David P. Bradley, et al., land beginning at southwest corner of lot 14, block 7, Paradise Heights Tract 1,250

T. S. McDaniel and wife to Bertha A. Hebard, lot 7, block 2, Stratford-Sydney Addition 450

B. Glidner and wife to Willard N. Jones, lots 11, 12, and south ½ of lots 7, 8, block 8, St. John 10

Thomas H. Kendig and wife to Chas. W. Johnson, north ½ of lot 20, block 1, Smith's subdivision and addition 125

Kate Green to J. W. Ogilbee, west ½ of southwest ¼ of section 26, township 1 south, range 2 east, except 10 acres in northwest corner.. 25

Joseph Regner and wife to F. B. Henry, lots 2, 3, block 2; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, block 3 Regner's Addition to Gresham 500

John Rodemich and wife to Max Asmus et al., lot 7, block "N," in M. Patton tract 600

Arleta Land Co. to J. Polonsky, lots 1 and 2, block 3, Elberta 500

W. L. Coxe and wife to L. and Caroline Swarts, lot 25, block 1, Maplewood Add. 500

Irvington Investment Co. to Jennie M. Brown, lot 13 and south 10 feet of lot 14, block 32, Irvington 1,200

Multnomah Cemetery Co. to F. D. Hamrick, lot 18, block "E," said cemetery 6

W. B. Rust and wife to Max H. Ohm, lots 1 and 2, block 21, Arbor Lodge Add. 450

A. P. Fuchs to R. W. Budd, lots 3 and 4, block 15, Ina Park Add. 600

F. B. Rutherford and wife to H. E. Noble, east 126 feet of lot 4, block 8, Third Electric Add. 1,350

John Frann and wife to Fred Loacher, S. W. ¼ of Sec. 23, T. 1 N., R. 3 E. 2,000

Moore Investment Co. to John R. Lawpaugh et al., lots 15 and 16, block 28, Vernon 900

Ary A. Versteeg and wife to F. M. Versteeg, lot 14, block 30, Woodlawn 10

Charles C. Smith and wife to George W. Proctor, lot 3, block —, Wilson's Add. 10

J. O. Goltra and wife to A. B. Hood, land beginning at southwest corner of lot 7, block 73, Stephens' Add.. 1,800

J. O. Goltra and wife to Edward Manning Ward, land beginning at southwest corner of lot 7, block 73, Stephens' Add. 2,000

Total $44,033

LAWYERS' ABSTRACT & TRUST CO.
Room 6, Board of Trade bldg.
Abstracts a specialty.

Have your abstracts made by the Title & Trust Co., 7 Chamber of Commerce.