

PAUPERS AND PAUPERISM.

There were 73,045 paupers in almost-homes in this country in 1890, certainly not a diminishing percentage of population. It is not surprising to find male paupers somewhat in excess of the females, the actual difference being 8437 in numbers. No explanation entirely satisfactory has been given why there should be so many more male than female paupers, unless it be that of greater proportionate dispersion and improvidence of men between the ages of 20 and 50 years.

Between the ages of 10 and 19, too, the males were found predominant. Between 20 and 29, between 30 and 39, and between 40 and 49 there was a slight excess on the side of females. For the next five periods the males are again in greatest numbers, the percentage of excess being, between 50 and 59, 11.03; between 60 and 69, 22.68; between 70 and 79, 37.44; between 80 and 89, 19.59; between 90 and 99, 10.24. When it comes to 100 years and over the women again pre-empt themselves and show an excess of 12.82, thus being in 1890 65 male and 88 female paupers over 100 years of age, or as alleged to be, as the persons so quoted were all ignorant, mostly negroes, who possibly did not really know their ages. There seems to be a diminution of paupers under the age of 40, but not so great as the friends of destitute children may have concluded from the number of homes and asylums for children that philanthropy has provided.

But there is an increase of aged paupers, says a Chicago exchange, chiefly in the west where child paupers are fewest, and it is strange to find that in the south where aged paupers are fewest there is the greatest percentage of child paupers. There is something gratifying to national pride in the tables of the census bulletin to figure their formidableness as groups of figures. The percentage to population is very low, for a dependent class, and proves that bodily infirmity and the helplessness of immaturity, the cause of pauperdom almost exclusively in this country, do not show discrepant results under a system of government that gives every willing and sound bodied person an opportunity for self-support.

The increase of paupers has not been great as compared with our increase of population, and it is also favorable to the conditions here that the majority of the paupers are foreign born or of foreign parents. A right restriction of immigration would doubtless enable civic and county authorities to show a great reduction of paupers in this country in the next decade.

THE BRITISH PRESS.

The British press has settled the Chilian question in a manner highly satisfactory to most Britons. It has denounced the president of the United States as a political trickster, the United States people as a conglomeration of bullies, the United States minister to Chili as a gasconading Irishman. The effect of all this in the United States, so far as it will have any effect, may be to make Mr. Egan "solid" with some who have not approved of his appointment. It may be said in his behalf that a gentleman who, as minister, has made himself so very offensive to the British people must have been prudently zealous for the United States interests.

British citizens resident in the United States do not vote at presidential elections, otherwise Mr. Harrison might expect a strongly organized opposition in the next convention. The causes of the bitterness of the British press toward the United States, and its professed sympathy with Chili, are easily discernible. "The jingling of the guinea," to quote the Laureate, is at the bottom of them, as an eastern exchange well says. The British do not care a continental cent about Chili, but they care a great deal about their commercial ascendancy in that republic. They have fostered Chilian ill-feeling toward the United States and have encouraged Chilian insolence by unofficial and insincere promises of aid in the event of war. They know that henceforth, whether the event of the present misunderstanding be peace or war, the United States residents in Chili are sure to be more respectfully treated than formerly. They know that the "certain inalienable rights" of our citizens henceforth will be maintained when they sojourn in Chili as well as when they remain at home. These things are the cause of British trouble. The ill-natured snarling of the London press will not cause a change of a hair's breadth in our policy toward Chili. Nor will it take a single vote from the president in convention or at the polls.

THE FERNDALE WRECK.

Another vessel has been lost on the Washington coast and a score or more lives sacrificed either through the stupidity or negligence of the master in charge. On last Saturday the British ship *Ferndale* was dashed to pieces in the vicinity of Gray's Harbor, and of the entire crew but three succeeded in reaching land alive. The loss of this and other vessels emphasizes the statements made last Tuesday by Mr. Pimmsol, before the royal labor com-

IN BUSINESS AT THE OLD STAND.

Portland has always battled for her own selfish interests, irrespective of the effect upon different portions of the state. Years ago, when the O. S. N. Co. was pouring untold wealth into the lap of the metropolis and "bleeding" most unmercifully the Inland Empire, the metropolis had no word of sympathy for the over-taxed producer, and later on, when the project of opening the Columbia river to the commerce of the people was agitated in congress and appropriations were made for a canal and locks at the Cascades, the leading paper of the northwest condemned the scheme and in fact stated it was a "waste of public money." Again, when the Northern Pacific unjustly claimed a land grant from the general government, the Willamette, over which the company had failed to construct a foot road, the Portland board of trade convened in solemn council and passed resolutions requesting congress not to forfeit this land. At that time she expected to be the great transcontinental terminus of the railroads leading to the north Pacific coast, and an opener, forfeiture of unearned lands were antagonistic to her interests; but a "change came o'er the spirit of her dreams," and the N. P. R. had its outlet on Puget Sound. Then she looked to the "great river of the west," and endorsed the action of Eastern Oregon for liberal appropriations for the Cascade locks and other improvements to the navigation of the Columbia. But we would be willing to forgive and forget these acts, if to day she manifested an unselfish interest in building up and developing the resources of the entire state; but this is not the fact. Last summer when the press of the interior were loudly clamoring for an extra session of the legislature for an appropriation to construct the portage railroad from this city to Celilo, Portland was apathetic in the matter, and her business men even contributed funds for the construction of the road on the Washington side. But, by reason of being an inland-seaport, an inconvenience has been suffered by the metropolis, and now she is urgent in demanding a special session. This demand is explained by the following in an editorial in the *Telegraph* of yesterday:

The ship *Scottish Isles*, if we are correctly informed, arrived in Astoria a few days ago under charter, her time being nearly up, but having eight days to go to Portland and comply with its contract. Of course it wanted to come, and come at once, but there was no boat there to bring it up. This is a damnable and disastrous fact to mention, and if we were running a paper on the Sound as those people run them, it might not be done, but we are running a paper that tells "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," commercially as well as politically.

For years we were at the mercy of a pilot boat at Astoria. By hard work, and with great loss of time and money, we are running a pilot boat in the hands of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, quite naturally thinking that its own corporate interests, being identical with those of the state, would be sufficient to protect Columbia river commerce; but it has been a severe lesson. The people of the state, during the last fall and this winter, have lost many tens of thousands of dollars because of the lack of the ferry service. The English divine is dead, and the tabernacle which echoed his sermons, will be silent to his voice. He was a Christian in the true sense of the term, and at the news of his death, Christendom will uncover his head, and say "Peace to his soul and may he rest in Russia."

The ramine still prevails in Russia, and our picaresque congress has failed to make an appropriation to carry the denotations of corn and flour to that country.

HE WAS BURIED ALIVE.

Under the above caption the *Chicago News* of the 13th inst. contains the following concerning the late John W. Cowdys, a successful and prominent physician of Bellevue: "Dr. John W. Cowdys was up to a few months ago, a physician of the name of Rock Island. One night he was called to the bedside of a patient on 2d avenue in that city, where, while attending the patient, he was suddenly overcome by apoplexy, and expired, the result of heart trouble. He was taken in charge by his relatives and friends, and, according to the story, returned to his home in Rock Island, and the next day the doctor was buried. Meanwhile, a telegram had been sent to his brother at Omaha, but he was away from home at the time, and upon his return he found it impossible to find the body. Shortly after the doctor's death one of his sons had a dream that his father had been buried alive and had turned over in his coffin. This was reported to the police, but he did not for a time disclose his suspicions. After about a month the Nebraska brother came to look after matters pertaining to the doctor's death, and, being anxious to see his dead brother, he arranged for the body to be disinterred. It is given out that a group of immediate friends, including a Davenport physician, were to assemble at a certain place and view the remains, but they never arrived, for the reason that the brother secured a permit from the cemetery authorities for the disinterment, and then he and the grave-diggers proceeded to the sacred spot. The body was disinterred, and it was found that it was buried in a hole, and that it had been buried alive for a month or more. It is said there were only three persons present, the two diggers and the brother, and the cover was taken off. It was then that the ghastly horrors of the grave were unfolded to the human eye. The brother gave a shout of horror and a groan of agony at the sight of the coffin, which lay in the box with the sides kicked out and the doctor's foot protruding. He then knew what had happened, for the brother had been buried alive and afterward died in all the agony that can come to a person upon awakening in the grave. Being anxious to know the result in his entirety, the coffer was taken out of the grave and the lid of the coffin removed. An awful sight met their eyes, for there lay the dead doctor in the dried blood, and the body was in a state of putrefaction. It was then that the brother was struck by the truth, and returned to where the friends had met and informed them of the true state of the case, and that the relative returned to Omaha. It is said, and the friends took it for granted, that the matter was satisfactory to the relatives. He did not know how the visiting brother was acting. The matter has rested, and the relative returned to Omaha."

Mr. M. L. Olmstead, a well-known attorney, residing in Baker City, is being spoken of as a candidate for the position of judge of the supreme court of this state. The gentleman has lived in Oregon a number of years, is a successful lawyer and if nominated by the Republicans would be elected. The trouble is that Eastern Oregon is liable to have too many candidates before the next Republican convention, and should the nomination of congressmen be given to this part of the state, it cannot in reason expect anything more.

The Dallas *Item* pertinently inquires if it is not about time to drop the "professor" from the names of country schoolmasters. Yes, it is overtime, not only in regard to the country schoolmasters, but a good many who follow the same calling in cities.

The Dallas *Item* pertinently inquires if it is not about time to drop the "professor" from the names of country schoolmasters. Yes, it is overtime, not only in regard to the country schoolmasters, but a good many who follow the same calling in cities.

TELEGRAPHIC.

The Governor on the Portage Road SALEM, Ore., Feb. 2.—Gov. Penney said to a reporter today that the statement in the Washington dispatch of February 1 to the Oregonian, that he had written to Speaker Crisp and other Democrats in the house to defect by all means any project for a boat-railway scheme, is absolutely without foundation. He said his whole offense, if any, was in his persistent refusal to pass an appropriation for a portage railway, and in that matter he had the support of the legislature of Oregon, as that body at its last session had repeatedly passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed it, and had subsequently passed a concurrent resolution asking for such appropriation. As to his receiving no reply from the chief of engineers he expressed no disappointment. That gentleman in January, 1898, recommended a portage road, and in December, 1899, opposed