

**ALLEN ON FINANCE.**

Former United States senator, and present district judge, Honorable William V. Allen, has quite recently, with a blunt brevity of less than seven columns, promulgated his present political faith and personal prejudices.

This statesman boasts of a large library and diligent study. And upon the question of metallic money he holds that:

"It is the fixed legal ratio enacted between the coins which governs the relative value of the metals in bullion!"

But less industrious and, no doubt, more superficial investigators declare that:

"It is the relative value of the metals in bullion which governs the relative value of the coins."

In other words, Allen, Bryan, and all other advocates of the free coinage of silver in unlimited quantities at the ratio of sixteen to one claim that opening the mints of the United States to such coinage would raise the bullion value of silver all over the globe to a dollar and twenty-nine cents an ounce while it now languishes at about sixty cents.

In case of disastrous drouth the same statesmanship will favor legislation making two pecks a bushel and thus advance and exalt the corn crop of the Northwest. It will also fix a legal ratio between shoulders and hams regardless of the kind of porkers out of which they are manufactured.

**FORESTRY IN CALIFORNIA.**

Addressing the American Forestry Convention in Los Angeles, last night, Gifford Pinchot remarked that California takes more interest in its forests than any other state in the Union except New York, and he added that California can and should formulate a forestry policy. Very true. There are reasons why California should be more interested in forestry than is even New York, because our forests are more extensive and bear a more direct relation to the general welfare, inasmuch as the preservation of the summer flow of our streams is requisite to the prosperity of the agricultural interests and is dependent upon the mountain forests.

It is estimated that the United States, exclusive of Alaska, contains 500,000,000 acres of forest, of which seven-tenths lie on the Atlantic slope, one-tenth on the Pacific slope, one-tenth on the Rocky Mountains, and one-tenth in the Mississippi valley. This is the estimate of the Department of Agriculture. But it is deceptive, since the forestry area on the Atlantic coast, though very large, contains only a limited amount of good timber. The Pacific Coast, which is credited with only one-tenth of the total forest area of the country, has perhaps one-third or even one-half of all the

first-class timber still remaining in the United States.

A splendid start has been made toward preserving the forests of the West by the establishment of the forestry reservations, a work which has all been done since the memorable act of 1891 was passed. Of the 31 forest reservations, 8 are in California, 3 in Oregon, 3 in Washington, 1 in Alaska, 2 in Arizona, 5 in Colorado, one divided between Idaho and Montana, one between Idaho and Washington, 2 in Montana, one in New Mexico, one in South Dakota, one in Utah and 3 in Wyoming. These forestry reservations combined contain an area of more than 40,000,000 acres, of which about 9,000,000 acres are in California. So it may be seen that California is easily first among the states in forest interests. The great Sierra forest reservation contains over four million acres, while the Pine Mountain and Zaca Lake reservation contains over a million and a half acres.

But in setting aside this vast forest territory, thereby saving it from destruction by the lumberman, merely a beginning has been made in developing a forestry policy. It depends upon the work of educated specialists to carry the policy forward, but in it they need to be supported by an intelligent public sentiment, such as is fast being awakened in California.—Oakland Enquirer.

**EASTHAMPTON, MASSACHUSETTS.**

Three ravenous republicans were after the postoffice in Easthampton, Massachusetts, which is an educational and commercial center of one of the western counties and noted for large republican majorities. The strife was warm, exciting, exasperating and strictly within the McKinley party. But The New York Post says:

"A democrat appointed by Mr. Cleveland had served so satisfactorily that his reappointment for another term was asked for in a very strong petition, representing a large majority of the voters, and nearly all the business interests, including all of the manufactories, Williston Seminary, the banks, and almost all of the merchants. But after the bars were taken down in the classified service by the president's order, the professional politicians in the republican party insisted that no democrat should stay in any place from which he could be ousted. Mr. Gillet, the republican congressman from the district proposed that the question should be submitted to a vote of the republicans of the town, the democrats not being recognized as having any rights in the matter. Such a vote was taken last week. There were three republican candidates, but the strongest of them fell far short of the democratic incumbent, who came near having a majority over all of his opponents, and his reappointment is now assured."

Comment is not needed.

**EDITORIAL DRIVEL.**

"A Southern journal, quoting The World's statement that 'Spain could not convey to us any rights in the Philippines which she did not possess,' asks:

"Will the esteemed World tell the American people who did possess the 'rights' it speaks of if Spain did not possess them?"

"The answer is very easy: The native inhabitants possessed the right to govern themselves, or to give their consent to being governed, which is included in the natural and inalienable right of all men to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

"Our authority for this opinion will be found in the Declaration of Independence of the United Colonies of North America, proclaimed on July 4, 1776. It is sustained and clinched in the joint resolutions of congress, adopted on April 18, 1898, declaring war against Spain. The very first of those resolutions proclaimed that—

"The people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent."

"Did the 'rights' of Spain in the Philippines rest on any different basis than her 'rights' in Cuba? Had she oppressed and robbed the Cubans? She had done the same to the Filipinos. Was her 'possession' of Cuba limited to the coast cities and to a few fortified and garrisoned towns? Her occupation of the Philippines was even more limited and precarious.

"The cases are exactly parallel, on the basic question of rights. Beyond this it is undeniably true that the Filipino army rendered our forces more service in the capture of Manila than the Cubans did in the capture of Santiago, and that the Filipinos are, in the opinion of Admiral Dewey and other capable judges, better fitted for self-government than are the natives of Cuba.

"Whatever rights Spain had forfeited in Cuba she had lost likewise in the Philippines. Whatever rights the people of Cuba had were possessed also by the inhabitants of the remoter islands."

The above is unmitigated rot. Neither the Cubans nor Filipinos have any rights whatsoever unless mighty enough to affirm and maintain them. The Declaration of Independence would not have had an iota of value and would have been historically forgotten had not the fathers had the might to make their declaration good in independence. The degeneration of their sons is of far more interest than the question of rights in other people. The Americans who have forfeited their rights to machine politics.

F. S. BILLINGS.

While the weak may be pitied all weakness is to be condemned.

Intelligent self-love is conservative; unintelligent is destructive.