

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION. DAILY EDITION. One Year (in advance) \$6.00. Six months, 3.00. By Carrier, per week, 15. WEEKLY EDITION. One Year—in advance, \$1.50. If not paid in advance, \$2.00. Six months, .75. Three months, .40. Telephone Number 38.

THE railroads in Oregon are having a good deal of trouble on account of washouts.

THE chances are very favorable for Judge Chapman to be made the caucus nominee for U. S. senator when the legislature convenes.

THE committee appointed by Mayor Butler to investigate work done by street Commissioner Poissall made their report last night vindicating him.

MR. JONES, Spies and Petersen should see Richey, Parmele & Craig and see what can be done toward that opera house and have a report for the next meeting.

SECRETARY CHARLES FOSTER thinks the pension expenditure will soon reach \$250,000,000 a year. Twenty years ago nobody supposed it would reach \$30,000,000 a year.

JERZY SIMPSON, in spite of the attempted assassination, has to be contented with a meager majority of 1,400. It is plain, the people came very near assassinating him politically.

THE Atlanta Constitution names "the new comet Cleveland." It is most appropriate—none of the fellows know where to find it. "Where am I at?" applies to Cleveland and the comet.

A CANAL through the Isthmus of Panama or through Central America that was operated so as to discriminate against the United States in favor of any other power would soon be subject for action by this government. Where does the discrimination against the United States in the case of the Welland canal differ from this supposable case?

IN 1890 our imports of barely were 11,332,545 bushels. In 1891 imports fell to 5,078,733 bushels, and they would have been less but for the great rush of barley from Canada in September before the new tariff passed. But the fiscal year June 30, 1892, was wholly under the McKinley law, and what was the result? Simply that we import only 3,146,337 bushels, a decrease of 8,186,200 bushels, which represents the increased market of home-grown barley. Is this a benefit or an injury to American farmers?

THE New Orleans Picayune demands the instant repeal of the McKinley tariff bill and a return to the schedule put in force in 1883. It is significant that the best thing the people in the south can find to take the place of the republican robber tariff of 1890 is the republican robber tariff of 1883, which was some \$50,000,000 higher in the aggregate than the much abused McKinley bill. The change is desired because if the bill of 1883 quietly slips back into effect the duty on sugar will be restored. But that duty will not be put back on the schedules in the present generation. No party would dare fly in the face of public opinion by making any changes in the sugar duty, further than taking off the last farthing on refined sugars and making them free absolutely.—State Journal.

THE democratic ringmasters have every reason to bank on the credulity and gullibility of the American voter. The late election proves this, but, there is a limit to this slight-of-hand business and THE HERALD rather thinks the average citizen will call the turn on these political dervishes when he is asked to swallow the very latest Cleveland fake, viz: that Grover Cleveland secured the support of Tammany by attending the Shearman-Murphy meeting some weeks before the New York registration, and notifying those big gun that he had no pledges to make, defying them to do their worst. This story is going the rounds just now of the democratic newspapers. There is not a blind partisan in the country—even among Cleveland's fool worshippers—who is big enough fool to believe that Grover secured the enthusiastic support of Tammany and the big Tammany registration in New York City by notifying that political bandit, that he had no promises to make to them. Oh, no! that story is too thin for an alliance man to swallow.

THE REDEMPTION OF MISSOURI.

The official returns disclose the interesting and gratifying fact that Missouri is no longer a democratic state. Strictly speaking, Cleveland carried it by a plurality of 41,215 over Harrison, but he did not receive a majority of all the votes polled, says the Globe Democrat. There were 268,039 votes cast for him, and 272,305 against him. In other words the figures show an anti-democratic majority of 4,226. This is something that has never happened before in the history of the present ascendancy of the democratic party in Missouri politics; and it has a definite and important meaning. The records of previous elections prove that the margin of difference between the democratic vote and the combined opposition vote in the state has steadily and materially decreased, until at last there is nothing left of it. In 1876 this difference was 54,791; in 1880 it was 19,907; in 1884 it was 30,906; in 1888 it was 2,572, and in 1892 the preponderance of voting strength is on the other side! That is to say, the number of voters in Missouri who are democrats is smaller by over 4,000 than the number of those who are not democrats. It has ceased to be true that a majority of the citizens of the state belong to the democratic party, and henceforth it will be necessary for that organization to do its boasting in a modified, and more or less hesitating manner.

It is no answer to say that the republicans are still in a considerable minority, and that the decline in proportion of democratic votes to opposition votes has been mainly helpful to new parties. The significant fact remains that there are more voters in the State who are acting against the democratic party than there are voters, who continue to give their support. That party has gradually lost the power implied by a distinct and reliable majority. It could not carry Missouri today on a square test of strength with the aggregated elements by which it is antagonized. If the anti-democratic votes were polled for one man or one party, they would win the victory; and it is by no means unlikely that they will be so polled in the near future. The figures above quoted pertain to presidential elections, it will be observed, and so their force can not be broken by the convenient argument that they stand for local conditions and accidental influence. They have a deeper purport and represent a more substantial and systematic tendency. When a party holds a State by a plurality only, its tenure is manifestly weak and precarious; and that is what has come to pass with a democratic party in Missouri. A majority of the people are not in sympathy with its doctrines and purposes, and will not contribute to its success in coming elections. They are divided, it is true, into several organizations are all of one mind so far as hostility to the democratic organization is concerned, and in their own way and time they will get together. The Bourbon sentiment is not as strong in the State any more as the sentiment by which it is resisted; and that means the daybreak of redemption.

MR. FREDERICK DOUGLASS is out in a manifesto on the subject of the recent election, in which he expresses the opinion that the colored people of the south will find better protection against outrage under the Cleveland administration than they have found under the administration of Harrison. He pathetically points out that the law should protect the weak against the strong. So it should. But in the cases to which he refers he very badly mixes the elements of strength and weakness. He classes the whites who do the lynchings as the strong, and the negroes who are lynched as the weak. The fact is that the weak in such matters are the unfortunate and helpless women, and the strong are the burly and brutal negroes who outrage them. No law and no administration can ever stand between such brutal crimes and their prompt and terrible punishment. The only way to stop the lynchings is to stop the ravishings.

SOME of the learned astronomers are saying that the earth had the pleasure of hitting the comet a resounding blow in the middle a few nights ago, and that the celestial visitor is now making tracks in another direction on account of the collision. After due deliberation the people have about reached the conclusion that the astronomers know next to nothing about the comet anyway, and that in the future they will consult a good old fashioned almanac when they want to know what is going on in the universe about them. The weary-eyed scientists in charge of the telescopes do not seem to be able to agree in telling about the comet any better than the democrats in outlining their new tariff bill.

A PARTY whose victory is due to the fact that the opposing party simply refused to go to the polls holds power on a frail tenure. This is the case with the democratic party. In proportion to population there are no more democrats in the country now than there were in 1888, while there are just as many republicans as then. No republicans have gone over to the democracy. Their party was beaten down because tens of thousands of its members in every important state declined to vote, and they declined to vote because the party's position on some of the leading issues did not suit them. The party's position will be fixed so that it will suit every republican in 1896.

A SOUTHERN journal, criticising "Mrs. Lease, of Kansas," says: "When Mrs. Lease first visited the south she had only kind words for southern people." Well, it would take more of an angel than the modern woman to continue "kind words to a people" who would soil her best gowns with rotten eggs. If Mrs. Lease had been other than ladylike southern people might find some excuse for their indecency, but they found nothing of the kind to charge against her and the less they remind the public of their own disgrace the better.

THE Cincinnati Enquirer believes in "the spoil," and is grieved that Cleveland after investing \$25,000 cash and getting the prize ticket is not more thoughtful of "the other fellows." The Enquirer says: "It is the new blood that counts. Oh, Mr. Cleveland, there are thousands upon thousands of democrats of all ages, of all sizes, of all degrees of qualification and special fitness who are available."

NEBRASKA has in congress a representative named Omar Kem. He must not be confounded with Omar Khyam, who sang a wanton lay of ruby wine. The second Omar does not sing of wine much, but as to the relation of a bushel of corn to a pound of pork on the hoof he is said to be no mean authority.—San Francisco Examiner.

MR. CLEVELAND has started on a hunting expedition to evade the pressure of office-seekers. A hunting trip may do as a temporary expedient, but nothing short of a whaling voyage will accomplish the desired result.

THE pay which Louisiana will get for rolling up her big majority for Cleveland will be the loss of \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 in sugar bounties which the democratic party will abolish. She gets what she deserves.

A GOOD many democrats are in favor of lengthening out the presidential term to six years. The republicans, however, who are confident that the future is with them, think that the present term is long enough.

THE city of South Omaha has to heads to its police department at present and lively times are expected before the matter is settled. It is now in court.

GEORGIA REJOICES.

The Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of the 17th has its first page full with a glowing report of a great state meeting, opened by saying: "The streets of Augusta went democratic by 30,000 majority last night," and then describing the grand procession of 10,000 or more, with banners of strange device. Here are some of them: "A large picture of a negro betag whitewashed by Watson, and the inscription, 'Your whitewash is Too Thin.'" After this a large cannon, "The Third Party Destroyer of the First Ward."

These being interpreted to mean a white man's government and the solid south for free trade. King Cotton's chariot was great and gaudy. This was fit and natural, but a cotton mill beside this display of free raw material would have made the show complete. "Shake Riggers" counted 300 medical students, bore skulls and held aloft "transparencies galore," of which the first was: "Medical Students bid for Tommy's Corpse—the M. D.'s in line for Democracy." Grovetown delegation marched proudly under the startling cognomen, "Hell Raisers from Columbia" and the "Old Bloody Six Hundred" was on hand.

The Hon. Boykin Wright spoke with fervid eloquence of our great national hero, Grover Cleveland, bearing aloft the banner of democracy, with "tariff reform on its folds." Major Black spoke in a like strain and also said that people should remember they were citizens of a free republic, and continued: One message tonight, and I utter it with all the emphasis of a profound conviction, let this proud hour of victory and triumph be still more glorified by a spirit of magnanimity. [cheers.] It is better to heal than to wound; it is better to build up than tear down; it is better to cultivate friendship than enmity; it is better because it is diviner to love than to hate.

This word for peace must have sounded strangely to the "Shake Riggers" and "Hell Raisers."

Another speaker said that the democrats were in full power and "must take the responsibilities as well as the offices." Between the lines this reads: Keep the south so id and push for free trade.

Evidently it was a day for rejoicing democrats, and they did their best.

SO WE find dialect, as a branch of literature, worthy of the high attention and employment of the greatest master in letters—not the mearest mountebank. Let no impious faddist, then, assume its just interpretation. He may know everything else in the world, but not dialect, not dialectic people, for both of which he has supreme contempt which same, be sure, is heartily returned. Such a "superior" personage may even go among these simple county people and abide indefinitely in the midst of them, yet their more righteous contempt never for an instance permits them to be their real selves in his presence. In consequence, his most conscientious report of them, their ways, lives, and interests, is absolutely of no importance or value in the world. He never knew them, nor will he ever know them. They are not his kind of people, any more than he is their kind of people, any more than he is their kind of man; and their disappointment grieves us more than his.

MANY of the truly heroic ancestry of "our best people" grew unquestionably dialect of cast—not alone in speech, but in every mental trait and personal address. It is a grievous fact for us to confront, but many of them wore apparel of the commonest, talked loudly, and doubtless said "thisaway" and "thataway," and "Whatchy doin' off" and "Whur'y goin' at?"—using dialect even in their prayers to Him who, in His gentle mercy, listened and was pleased; and who listened verily unto this hour to all like prayers, yet pleased; yea, haply listens even to the refined rhetorical petitions of those who are not pleased.—James Whitcome Riley, in the December Forum.

WILL BE HIS OWN PREMIER. A cabinet post under Mr. Cleveland in his new term is not likely to afford great honor or satisfaction to its incumbent. The chances are that he will be his own premier, with all that the phrase can be made to imply, says THE GLOBE Democrat. Strictly speaking, cabinet officers are mere clerks to the president. The cabinet has no regularly defined or necessary place in the constitutional scheme. That instrument makes no mention of it, but provides that the president "may require the opinion in writing of the principal officer in each of the executive departments upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices," although he is under no obligations to be guided by these opinions. Cabinet meetings are secret, and no record is kept of what transpires at them. The duties of cabinet officers are

highly important, but their posts nowadays do not bring great honor in a political way. Even the post of secretary of state has ceased to be a stepping-stone to the presidency. When a man accepts an office in the cabinet he takes himself off the presidential track for the time being. National conventions do not go to cabinets any more for candidates. A cabinet officer is a sort of servant to the president. The latter appoints him and directs him, and can demand his resignation at any time without being called to account for it by any person or body.

Undoubtedly Mr. Cleveland will assert his authority to the full over the men whom he selects for his ministerial council. He will go into power by a larger majority than any other president has gained since Grant. Moreover, it may be said that, to a considerable extent, he created the issues and marked out the lines on which the victory has been gained. His free trade message to congress in 1887 formed the chief issue on which the campaign of 1888 and 1892 turned. The defeat of the former year he finds amply compensated for in the brilliant triumph of the present year. It is, in a large degree, a personal victory, and it is entirely probable that he views it in this light. The extent of his majority proclaims that the people believe him to be better than his party. He has been commissioned to run the administration to suit himself, and as he hardly looks for a third term in any contingency, he may be relied on to obey the command with the nearest practicable approach to literalness. He will be the boss of his party as no other president has been since Jackson. Over the entire executive department of the Government he is likely to exercise a despotic sway that will completely efface his cabinet officers and other subordinates, and largely detract from the glory and prestige attached to their posts.

SHEARMAN CALLS FOR ACTION.

THOS. G. SHEARMAN, the noted free trader, who stumped the country for Cleveland and Stevenson, has written a letter to the New York Evening Post in which he takes a strong position for an extra session to repeal the McKinley law. He says that the great danger which now lies in the path of the new administration is not radicalism, but blind conservatism. "Already," he says, "there may be seen the usual phreas for moderations or very slight modifications of the tariff, and for a long postponement of the day upon which any reform shall take place." Now that the victory is won and the officers are certain there is a class who want to let well enough alone. Mr. Sherman proceeds to take issue with these cowards who are afraid to use their victory and afraid of the logic of their own platform. Says Mr. Shearman:

If nothing is to be attempted before the assembling of the new congress in December, 1893, it is certain that the new tariff, whatever it may be, will not be enacted until June, 1894; and if the nonsense which is now gravely brought forward as to necessary delay in its taking effect is to be respected, no change would really take place until January 1, 1895. The result is obvious to any man who can see. The new industries which the McKinley bill was intended to create will not be created. The importations will be restricted by the enormous duties; the people will be heavily burdened by useless taxation and will gain none of the relief which they might have gained if the McKinley bill had been left alone by increased, although unnatural, domestic production.

MR. SHEARMAN cites the history of the tariff of 1846. The free traders carried the election of 1844. Instead of meeting the question promptly, the democrats began to temporize and postponed carrying the will of the people into effect until 1846. So afraid were the democrats of their issues that they postponed the taking effect of the tariff law until after the congressional elections, or until the first of December, 1846—more than two years after the verdict of the people at the polls. Mr. Shearman says that the suspense caused commercial depression, and so enraged were the people that the democratic majority of sixty in the lower house was wiped out and the control of that body given to the Whigs and two years later the Whigs carried the presidential election. To show the bad effects of postponement Mr. Shearman cites the period of resumption. The resumption bill was passed in 1875. February but was not allowed to take effect until January, 1879. The four years of suspense were four years of terrible commercial depression. The months of suspense in regard to the tariff, he predicts, will have the same effect.

THE reasoning of Mr. Shearman is correct. The republicans of the country heartily endorse his position. Let the ax fall on the head of the McKinley bill at once. Let it be repealed, dug up root and branch. And it ought to be done as soon as possible. It will not do for democrats to let well enough alone.

PROF. VAMBERY ON THE PAMIR QUESTION.

Prof. Vambery, of Buda-Pesth University, is a well known writer on historical and geographic questions, and has more than once come to the aid of England in matters of geographical character, such as the Inter-Ocean. In August, 1891, for instance, he visited England, and was, of course, received with the distinction suited to such a valuable ally, and in September of the same year he promptly came forward in England's behalf in regard to Persia, and though admitting that Russia, in seizing Ashurada was but acting in accordance with the terms of the treaty in 1813, took occasion to point out instances of "Russian greediness" and to predict what Russia would do if England did not check her.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Russian statement of the Pamir question, as contained in article to the semi-official Turkestan Gazette last September, comment upon which recently appeared in the Inter-Ocean, should call forth a counter-statement from Prof. Vambery. As the question of ownership or rights in the Pamirs may at any time precipitate the long expected struggle between Russia and Great Britain in the East, Prof. Vambery's counter-statement may be looked upon as a semi-official rejoinder on the part of England to the statements of the Gazette article. Prof. Vambery writes with a fuller knowledge of the Pamirs than perhaps any other European, as, in addition to his familiarity with oriental languages, including that of the Kirghiz of the Pamir, Vambery traveled in Khokand for months and speaks with the authority of personal knowledge and observation. Yet, granting all these facts, it must be admitted by impartial observers that he does not make out his case for England, and certainly does not overthrow what he calls the "shallow reason adduced to justify Russia's claims of ownership of the Pamirs by pretending that this high tableland belongs to her by right of direct inheritance from the late Khanate of Khokand."

To show the untenableness of Russia's claim Professor Vambery goes into a long and learned disquisition as to the origin of the name Pamir, which, however interesting in itself, has nothing to do with the claim advanced by Russia. It is interesting, of course, to know that the name Pamir was first mentioned by two Chinese pilgrims in 518 A. D.; that Marco Polo speaks of a plan he calls Pamier, and later mention is made of it in 1693; and that the work probable means "a plan, a sterile tract of country," but these facts, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, clearly "have nothing to do with the case." Professor Vambery, however, admits that Nadali, or Mehemet Ali, Khokand's greatest ruler, from 1821 to 1843, "whose conquests extend in all directions, may have laid claim occasionally to certain portions of that high tableland in order to have a control over the Kiptehaks and other branches of the Kirghiz and to attack the Chinese, with whom he was frequently at war," but as to de facto possession and Russian rights he declares them to be "problematical."

To most readers, other than English, Professor Vambery's admission, together with the facts of Russian predominance of Northern Asia since the disappearance of Independent Tartary from the maps, furnishes very strong presumptive evidence, indeed, in favor of Russia claim to hereditary ownership of the pamirs, Professor Vambery makes a further admission that "there is no doubt that certain portions of the Pamirs are trequented by Kirghiz coming from the Alai—i. e. Russian subjects." As, according to all authorities, there are not perhaps more than 1,500 inhabitants proper of the Pamirs, it is extremely improbable that these few miserable half-frozen and half-starved contest the right of lordship with the wandering Kirghiz. On the whole, therefore, Professor Vambery's counter statement does not dispose of Russia's claim of hereditary ownership, and the Pamir question is not, as most people have been led to believe, a question of "Russian greediness" as much as it is of British aggressiveness.

THE New York Morning Advertiser does not approve of the proposed long distance race from Nebraska to Chicago to celebrate the opening of the world's fair. It says: "A more cruel form of sport was never devised than this long distance racing. It simply means extreme cruelty to animals and establishes no claim to endurance on the part of the men. If the cowboys of Nebraska are aching for fame, let them leave their bronchos at home and walk to Chicago."

ENGLAND gives the Prince of Wales \$300,000 per year for wanting to be king. It is a fat job.

Try the "Crown" cough cure. Brown & Barret guarantee it.