

VALLEY RECORD.

The People's Paper.

N. A. JACOBS. L. A. KAISER.
JACOBS & KAISER,
Editors, Publishers and Sole Proprietors.
Office in McCull's Hall, upstairs; stairs on
north side of Masonic building.
Entered in the Postoffice at Ashland as
Second Class mail matter.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT—
GROVER CLEVELAND.
OF NEW YORK.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT—
ALLEN G. THURMAN,
OF OHIO.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS—
W. H. EFFINGER, of Multnomah.
W. R. BILYEU, of Linn.
E. R. SKIPWORTH, of Umatilla.

ASHLAND, ORE., THURSDAY, OCT. 25, 1888.

POLITICAL NOTES.

THERE is a general disposition among Republicans to put the Senate tariff bill on the ice.

"FOGHORN" WATTS has spoken three times in New York City for the Republicans. Cleveland is safe.

CHARLES says the Senate tariff bill decreases the revenue by increasing taxation. The Government gets less and the trusts more, while the people have an extra burden.

THE New York Tribune calls Carl Schurz "a loquacious adventurer" and styles Patrick Ford "a conspicuous patriot." It makes a great deal of difference how you look at a thing.

THE Old Roman seems to be having a regular old-time triumph in Indiana. GOVERNOR HILL drew a bigger crowd in Indianapolis than Blaine and Harrison combined.

THE Senate bill, which removes the internal revenue tax on spirits "used in the arts" fails to tell us whether "painting the town red" is a fine art or not.

THE Senate tariff bill puts 50 articles on the Free List. If this is not Free Trade, what is the other name for it? Remember that Ben Harrison said that "it is not the length of a step but the direction of it that is important."

No doubt the putting Chinese matting on the free list was intended as a special compliment to Harrison.

BLAINE has changed his style of campaigning from a defense of trusts to an attack upon Cleveland. The contrast is a strong campaign card for the Democracy.

It is doubtful if Edison's new talking machines will ever supersede the old reliable sewing societies.

THE man who answers all political arguments with a proposition to bet, usually has more money than brains, and frequently has very little of either.

SOME of our contemporaries are quoting Blaine against Blaine. This is idle. The authority is poor in either case, and the refutation has fully as good a character as the statement. This is a campaign of ideas.

NEGRO Democrats do not get much mercy from their race in Indiana. One was badly carved at Indianapolis, the other day, for expressing his opinions. In Arkansas an affair of this kind would have been a Southern outrage.

THE Mills bill, which Mr. Blaine says seeks to "destroy the tariff of 1861," is 11 per cent. higher in the average than that tariff was, provides for higher duties in every schedule and covers more articles. Yet republican demagogues call it a free trade measure!

IMMEDIATELY after the result of the Republican National Convention had been announced there was a manifest disposition of the rank and file to escape from the Harrison leadership and get under the sheltering wings of Blaine. But the Blaine wings have proved an insecure shelter. Mr. Blaine's blunders are more hurtful and provoking than Mr. Harrison's platitudes. Between the two, the Republican devotees, like motherless chickens, find no comfort in any place.

THE Republican wrangles at their recent primaries held at the Republican committee rooms at San Francisco which resulted in the butchering of several men, may lead to a vendetta at the polls in November as the political wounds of the two factions are as near healed as the wounds of the flesh in the bodies of Kelley, Christianson and others.

SENATOR ALLISON is responsible for the Senate tariff bill. He really is a radical tariff reformer, and the bill does not represent his views thoroughly, and for that matter, neither do the Mills bill thoroughly represent Mr. Mills' views. When the Republican party wants a real leader, it may take up Allison, who is really the financial brain of the Senate.—[Ex.]

UNDER the war tariff from 1870 to 1880 the number of men employed in the factories of the country increased 25 per cent. At the same time the number of women employed increased 64 per cent. and the number of children 58. A policy that drives the wives and children of laboring men into factory life to provide means of subsistence for the family is not one that commands itself to the workingmen of the country.

WHEN he was Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine reported, after investigation, that "undoubtedly the inequalities in wages of English and American operatives are more than equalled by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor." After traveling through England on the top of Millionaire Carnegie's tally-ho, he comes back to America to tell American operatives that they are only paupers, clothed and fed by high taxes.

THE value of goods produced in the country is over \$600,000,000 yearly. The value of wool or potatoes is no greater. The product of all the carpet mills, cutlery shops, glass works, silk mills, potteries, and the output of all queries is not so great in some instances by one-quarter. Yet the Senate tariff bill puts eggs on the free list! Following the usual style of Republican argument, one might ask why the Republicans put Northern eggs on the free list while retaining heavy duties on Southern rice and sugar? The question is just as fair, and a little bit fairer, than if wool is substituted for eggs and the industry directed against the Mills bill.

"TRUSTS."

FROM VALLEY RECORD.—In my last two communications I pointed out, to a certain extent, the evils attending the formation of the modern combinations, corporations and capital called "Trusts," we will now try to suggest the remedy.

While fully realizing the difficulty of providing a full and adequate remedy for the prevention of these combinations, or if not their prevention then for their regulation, we certainly think there is a method by which they can be prevented from attaining their objects, viz. to crush opposition, production and control the market.

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

Looking back through the common law, we find that it has ever been its policy to limit the time during which a person may lock up his personal or real estate. In several states, for example, trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits cannot be continued for a longer term than three years, or in any grant or bequest, and the term of twenty years from the death of the grantor, that is to say, only after such disease during the minority or minority of the children that might be left, with allowance for the period of their education, all other trusts for the accumulation of rents and profits are void. But then, the common law decisions holding that personal property may be placed in trust for the purpose of carrying on business in the name and under the management of trustees? In a New York case decided in 1873 the court said: "A trust in personal property, which is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character is valid when the trustee is competent to take, and a trust is a lawful purpose." "Modern trusts of personal property are not affected by the statute of limitations, which applies only to trusts in real property."

A POINT FORCIBLY MADE.

Hon. Roger Q. Mills, in his speech at Boston on the 24 inst., said:

"I saw the other day the illustration of the truth of the fact. A working man in a mill said to the manufacturer: 'I don't believe you pay me enough. I have got a wife and children, and can hardly support them on the wages you are paying me—only \$1.25 a day—I think you ought to pay me \$1.50 a day.' The manufacturer replied: 'I can get my laborers from Germany, from France and from England, and if you don't like that pay you may stop work.' 'Well,' said the workman, 'if that is the case, I suppose I have got to take the \$1.25 a day.'"

After his week's work was at an end and he had received his week's wages, he said to the manufacturer, "I'm getting cold. What will you charge me for a pair of those blankets I have been working on?" "Five dollars," said the manufacturer. "Why, I can buy those blankets in England, or in France or Germany for \$3 a pair, and I won't take your blankets. I will send over and get a pair." "Oh, no, you can't do that," said the manufacturer, "there is a tariff of \$2 a pair, which adds to the \$3 makes the price to you \$5. That is for my protection." So the workman paid his \$5 and took the blankets. And then started off for home, thinking, poor fellow, how strange the tariff is.

Sax Diego, Oct. 14.—During a performance at Sells' circus to-night, Bogardus, Jr., while firing eighteen seconds, missed the target and sent a bullet through the leg of Miles Silverthorn, 13 years old. It is a bad wound.

It is with a considerable degree of interest that we are watching the progress of Oregon and learn that "between Milwaukee and Portland, in 1850, there was much rivalry, each striving to outdo the other." To-day the former has a population of 200 and the latter 600.

A farmer at Hood river shipped sixty sacks of potatoes weighing about 100 pounds each to Portland. The potatoes sold for forty cents per hundred pounds. The freight was thirty cents per hundred, the drayage two cents and commission two cents, which with six cents for the sacks, consumed the entire proceeds of the sale.

A few days ago Pat McGinnis, a horse thief and the murderer of Deputy Sheriff Lockwood of Grant county, Oregon, made an attempt to poison the only eye-witness to his horrible crime, in a coffee-house at Astoria, in Astoria's coffee. Medical aid was summoned and the Indian's life saved. It was with difficulty that McGinnis was saved from the hands of lynchers.

T. P. Spitzer, the San Francisco drummer, has brought suit for \$250 in Seattle against the O. R. & N. Co. for failure to awaken him at Port Townsend while a passenger on one of their steamers and taking him back again to Seattle.

An exchange says that one reason why Washington Territory is building up faster than Oregon is on account of its miserable business and the other territory is as assessed at about forty per cent of its value and all manner of indebtedness taken out. There it is assessed at full value and no indebtedness is taken out. As a result the rate of taxation there is about half what it is here.

In a session of the Oregon legislature it requires 144 knives, 120 waste paper baskets, 252 ink and pencil erasers, 4320 steel pens, 48 ink stands, 180 ivory folders, 122 manila caps, 200 lead pencils and 24 gallons of ink.

Major Brockenborough, special land agent of the government, informed the writer that he had selected Druse as the location for the office of the new land district created in South Eastern Oregon, the site of the old agency, not far from the site of the old agency of the Malheur reservation and is near the Geographical center of the district, but as most of the land matters of the district are in the Harney Valley it would be better to locate the office in that locality. He would be a more satisfactory site. R. J. Slater of this city, is a candidate for the appointment as receiver of this office with strong backing.—(Pendleton Tribune).

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

Major Brockenborough, special land agent of the government, informed the writer that he had selected Druse as the location for the office of the new land district created in South Eastern Oregon, the site of the old agency, not far from the site of the old agency of the Malheur reservation and is near the Geographical center of the district, but as most of the land matters of the district are in the Harney Valley it would be better to locate the office in that locality. He would be a more satisfactory site. R. J. Slater of this city, is a candidate for the appointment as receiver of this office with strong backing.—(Pendleton Tribune).

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn. Since the incident the witness has been gradually fading and his friends expect him to die at the allotted time.

In a recent murder case at Baker, Oregon, a Chinaman was sworn the second time by cutting off a finger and he was carried out. The Chinese claim that he will die in a month or six weeks, as others have done who swore falsely when so sworn