

THE DAILY GLOBE

PUBLISHED EVERY DAY AT THE GLOBE BUILDING, CORNER FOURTH AND CEDAR STREETS.

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATE.

DAILY (NOT INCLUDING SUNDAY). By the month, mail or carrier, \$4.00. By the quarter, mail or carrier, \$11.50. By the year, mail or carrier, \$48.00.

SUNDAY ADVERTISING.

For Single Copy, Five Cents. For Three Months, Mail or Carrier, \$1.50. For Six Months, Mail or Carrier, \$2.50. For One Year, Mail or Carrier, \$4.50.

TODAY'S WEATHER.

Washington, Aug. 18.—Indications.—For Minnesota: Fair; warmer in northeast and north; south winds.

TIMES ARE STILL HARD IN MINNEAPOLIS.

Bathing suits are worn more decorately than last season.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE SAYS THAT THE CANADIANS LIKE THE NEW TARIFF.

They are more easily pleased than the Democrats of this country are.

IF BEN PERLEY POORE HAD BEEN ALIVE, THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN NO OMISSION OF THE COLON IN THAT SENATE BILL.

It is a doubt as to whether diamonds are taxed or free.

BERLIN MUSIC DEALERS HAVE BEGUN TO SELL MUSIC BY THE POUND.

None of them will give any more of this kind of music, as there are but few "light" operas written by the Germans.

IT IS SUGGESTED THAT A GREAT MINERAL SPRING, WITH PEARLS, WATERS, ALGAE, KOLB, TILMAN AND MR. LEASE AS END MEN, WOULD PROVE THE BIGGEST DRAWING CARD OF THE CENTURY.

NO ONE NEED LINK UNDER THE CAPTION "HOW SPONGES ARE GATHERED," WHICH HEADS AN ARTICLE NOW MAKING THE ROUNDS, FOR AN ACCOUNT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION.

IT DOESN'T MATTER IN THE LEAST THAT THE GORMAN BILL FIXES A DATE THAT IS PAST ON WHICH IT WILL TAKE EFFECT; IT WILL BECOME A LAW ON MIDNIGHT OF THE DAY THE PRESIDENT SIGNS IT—IF HE SIGNS IT.

ASSESSOR JOHNSTONE IS REPORTED PLEASED AT THE PROSPECT OF A COMMERCIAL UPHEAVAL.

With a business boom property in the next year or two may bring 75 per cent of what he has assessed it at.

"SOME THINGS THAT I SAY MAY BE WORTH PRINTING,"—BENJAMIN HARRISON IN NEW YORK INTERVIEW. WELL, BEN, RUSTLE UP AND SAY THAT, AND THE GLOBE WILL TELL YOU FRANKLY WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE.

EVERYTHING POINTS UNERRINGLY TO ONE THING—A GREAT MINERAL SPRING, WITH PEARLS, WATERS, ALGAE, KOLB, TILMAN AND MR. LEASE AS END MEN, WOULD PROVE THE BIGGEST DRAWING CARD OF THE CENTURY.

GEORGE GOULD'S MIDDLE NAME OUGHT TO BE THIRTEEN. HE DISAPPOINTS THE BRITISH TO EXPERIMENTATION ALMOST EVERY DAY.

He lost the Victoria cross yesterday when he had a chance to show off before Queen Victoria.

SENATOR PEPPER IS NOT MUCH GIVEN TO FACILITY OF THOUGHT OR STATEMENT, BUT HE NEVER SAID ANYTHING APTER OR TRUER THAN WHEN HE DESCRIBED TOM HORN AS A MAN OF TALENT WHO HAD NEVER LEARNED TO LEAVE HUMANITY THE BETTER FOR HIS HAVING LIVED.

WE MISS FROM THE RESOLUTIONS OF THESE FREQUENT REPUBLICAN CONVENTIONS ANY EXPRESSION OF DISAPPROBATION OF THE INTERFERENCE IN POLITICS OF OATH-BOUND SECRET SOCIETIES PROSCRIBING MEN FOR THEIR RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS.

CHICAGO IS THE HOME OF A BIGGER CRAZE THAN GEORGE FRANCIS TRAIN. A FELLOW IS GOING TO START FROM THE GARDEN CITY WITH HIS WIFE, A CENTRAL RAIL WHEELBARRROW AROUND THE BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES. IF HE SHOULD LOSE A WHEEL OF HIS VEHICLE, HE OUGHTN'T TO HAVE TO GO FAR TO GET ONE.

SIX DEMOCRATIC SENATORS GO ON RECORD AS SAYING THAT IT IS INEXPEDIENT TO HAVE ANY FURTHER TARIFF LEGISLATION AT THIS SESSION. WE EXPECT TO FIND AMONG THEM THE NAMES OF BLANCHARD AND GORMAN AND SMITH, MURPHY AND OGDEN, BUT WE CONFESS THAT FINDING LOGS IN SUCH COMPANY STUMPS US.

THE CHICAGO HERALD OF YESTERDAY HAD A CARTOON THAT BITS THE SITUATION IN THE CENTER. HARRISON AND MCKINLEY AND FEED ARE TEASING THE TOM-TOM OF PROTECTION, WHILE THE WAGE EARNER STANDS LOOKING TOWARD THE MORNING, WHERE THE SUN OF "FREE TRADE" IS RISING. THE LEGEND IS: "CAN THEY FOOL HIM AGAIN?"

THE TEXAS DEMOCRATS DECLARE IN FAVOR OF THE FREE USE OF GOLD AND SILVER, WITH THE proviso that "the dollar unit of coinage for both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value." This, if somewhat vague, is a vast improvement on the National Republican Club League's demand for the "restoration of silver to its fullest use and highest position by act of law."

MICHAEL AND THE MILLENNIUM.

Rochester Post.

The St. Paul Globe blandly suggests to the state Democrats that, in their state convention, they should "insist upon a full, frank report" by Michael Moran, the Minnesota member of the Democratic national committee.

Mr. Moran should be required to give all "business transacted by him as a member of that committee, including a statement of all recommendations for federal appointments made by him, with the names of the persons recommended, and the reasons therefor." If such a report could be drawn from Mr. Moran, the millennium would indeed be at hand.

Always in the Lead.

The St. Paul Daily Globe was recently sold at receiver's sale to the Kitson estate. The Globe has had an eventful past, in the way of change of hands, yet it always maintains its place among the foremost dailies in the Northwest.

THOSE WHOSE HE HAS BELIEVED.

In the People's church there is a memorial window in memory of the late Waldor Emerson, placed there, as the inscription states, "by those whom he has helped." Could a roll be made of the men and women of forty or more years, in this and other countries, looking back on the books which they are conscientiously exercising a strong formative influence in the development of their character, would join in the sentiment of those who placed this memorial window, the roll would be one that which there could be neither a nobler, or more enduring tribute to the philosopher of Concord.

No writer of modern times—certainly no American writer—has so touched the deeper thought of men and women as Emerson. He came to the young of his generation as he will come to the young of succeeding generations—the kindly, earnest, wide-eyed teacher, awakening their aspirations, opening to them larger views of life, and stirring up their responsibilities, and stirring those deeper emotions and higher thoughts which are so potent in the formation of character. As we go over the list of his contemporaries who wrote and shaped the young literature of America, we find no one who yielded to each the full acknowledgment of helpfulness, we see that Emerson stands among them all distinctively the teacher and helper. Eminent as Webster was as a statesman, Emerson was the greatest statesman because he taught those fundamental truths of character on which states must be founded if they are to endure.

The fields of Hawthorne, and of Whittier, and of Thoreau, wide as they were, were more the flower gardens of our literature when compared with Emerson's, in which was grown that solid mental food which goes to the making of character. Lowell, with his thought-laden words, led to Emerson all that bright galaxy of prose that has since shone so strikingly, as he always did, those chords in the souls of men which respond to appeals to the best that is in them.

Emerson helped his generation, as he will help all succeeding generations of young men and women whose good fortune it is to be attracted or directed to him, in many ways. He came to the young, distrustful of their own powers, fearing to express the thought that came to them, and to them in ridicule, telling them to be self-reliant, to believe their own thought, and trust it, and speak it, and be true to it, and the conviction out of which it came. In his "Self-Reliance" he made his young readers feel that there was no other possibility, if they relied upon themselves and thus developed the best which was in them. His constant injunction was to be true to themselves, and most of all when the whole cry of voices is on the other side.

In "Compensation" he taught the inflexibility and inexorableness of law. "Justice is not postponed. A perfect equity adjusts its balance in all parts of life. The dice of God are always loaded." Cause and effect, means and end, seed and fruit, cannot be severed, for the effect already blooms in the cause, the end pre-exists in the means, the fruit in the seed." He thus helped us to know that there is no trifling with the eternal verities; that sin indulged is not forgiven, but leaves its enduring scars on character. And so through that list of memorable essays he tells those deep and vital truths which, if learned and applied to human conduct, help the learners to a higher realization of life, to a better sense of their relations to it and to their fellow creatures, broadening their mental horizon and elevating their spiritual view. Among all the men who have sent messages to their fellow men in this or any other time, Emerson stands out pre-eminently the Helper.

NO MARRIAGES ON MARS.

The lone planet is abroad again, and this time its professor Holden, of Lick observatory, who connects the Mars has no atmosphere that would sustain life, and consequently that planet has no inhabitants. So there fall to the earth all those projects of establishing communications with the people of that planet by some code of great electric lights, and the pleasant truth that sunny lights, seen on Mars' surface were indications of a wish to communicate with us.

A STRANGE CUSTOM.

Peculiar economic conditions exist in some sections of Russia. To the average American citizen it appears almost like a religious proposition, but under the existing system of land leasing, as practiced on a large scale, the possession of individual homes is unknown, and in the greatest measure impossible. In certain sections the communities make their peregrinations in common with the lessee of an estate. As soon as the lessee has closed his arrangements with the owner of the land the community arrives and proceeds to construct a village or town. And there the people live and raise among themselves, just as if they were owners of the property. There they will remain for periods sometimes ranging several years in duration.

As soon as the period for which the land was leased has expired, and if the renewal is granted, the lessee proceeds to make arrangements for emigration. The farmers of his system, without much ado, commence to tear down the houses unless they have been previously purchased by the owner of the ground, which is a rare occasion. If the landlord desires to have a new tenant, he simply raises the price of the lease, which in all cases among the Russians is deemed a case of getting rid of the incumbent. As soon as the buildings have been taken down the material is packed upon wagons, and between two bars the entire community moves away, bus and baggage. Thus it often happens that entire communities are wiped out of existence in a single night, and the traveler who comes perchance that way fails to discover any sign of what was at one time a prosperous village.

Often the owner of the land does not make an effort to re-lease or cultivate it for some time, and nothing remains but a memory that a village of hard-working people had once occupied the spot.

THINGS THAT GO TOGETHER.

A lazy horse and an inconsiderate driver.

An altruistic husband and an egotistic wife.

A palm leaf and a fin de siecle novel.

A populist stump speech and red fire.

A politician and a bad cigar.

A mother-in-law and chronic dyspepsia.

A proud mother and a spoiled child.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

A blue book, recently published by the British government, on the subject of marriage and divorce, presents some facts which are not generally known to the people interested in this very important study. The book covers various countries, including the United States. Careful investigation discloses that the nearly all civilized nations have a limit to the age at which young people may marry. But Russia presents the only instance where a limit is placed at the mature years. In that country no person over eighty years of age can marry, and no person is allowed to enter the married state more than three times. In Hungary the law forbids widows who have children to marry after they have passed the age of thirty. But should they be childless, they may marry as often as they please, that is, legally, until they reach the age of forty, but they are not allowed to have more than four matrimonial ventures. Men, too, find restrictions in the country. They cannot marry women thirty years younger nor twenty years older than themselves. Marriageable ages differ in the countries according to their latitudes. India is not the only country (which investigation discloses) that Southern nations, as a rule, owing to the fact that their women age rapidly, permit marriage at a much earlier period.

Most civilized countries tend towards making marriage wholly a civil contract. In Hungary for many years the spectacle was presented of a struggle for the supremacy of civil or religious marriage. The Catholic and Greek churches headed the movement directed against the change from the old established religious contracts, which were up to recent period compulsory. The victory of the reform party, during the past year, in making the civil contract binding, was celebrated with much rejoicing in every section of the kingdom. In France the civil contract, which became the rule at the time of the revolution, is still in force; but there are peculiar formalities connected with it which make an irksome bar. Scotland is perhaps the most liberal in the matter of marriage contracts. There all a man need do is to formally announce to a number of bystanders that a lady "is his wife," and if she assents the statement takes the form of a legal marriage contract. In England the law, however, requires a ceremony at a place of worship licensed for the purpose, or a ceremony at the office of some registrar. In Switzerland notice of an intended marriage must first be published in the newspapers.

Causes for divorce differ in the various countries of Europe as much as they do in the different states of this country. France demands that incompatibility must be proven, while Germany makes a limit at "insuperable aversion." This latter cause appears rather trivial to the well-informed, leaving a great latitude for action. In Roumania the courts demand that proof shall be furnished beyond a question that "existence in common is impossible." This latter cause is similar to the cause of divorce in Great Britain and Prussia. In the United States the law is more liberal in the matter of divorce. In some states it is necessary for the husband to apply to parliament for relief. There is general dissatisfaction existing over this last-mentioned method, and efforts are now being made to establish a uniform system for divorce actions, applicable to all of the British possessions.

Every body knows the modus operandi in the United States. But the fact that the state of South Carolina has no law authorizing divorce is perhaps not generally known.

MR. OLIVER ERICKSON.

[Democratic Candidate for Congress, Minneapolis.]

Should United States senators be elected by the people? No! They should neither be elected nor selected, but should be appointed. The so-called popular vote is simply the fraud of monarchy that was foisted upon our institutions by the Hamiltonians and the force of circumstances which at that time made it necessary to yield to the wishes of the aristocracy. Whether senators be elected by popular vote or otherwise, so long as they are apportioned as at present, the result will be a travesty upon popular government.

To see how far our country comes from true Democracy, it is but necessary to take a glance at the relative power of New York and Nevada in framing the laws of our country. The first, an empire in territory and population, the second, with scarcely enough voters to make a respectable legislative district, yet each one has two senators. New York with her millions of people might want free wool, but some Mormon in Nevada like a religious proposition, but under the existing system of land leasing, as practiced on a large scale, the possession of individual homes is unknown, and in the greatest measure impossible.

There is nothing a state can lose by the abolition of the senate except two officeholders, unless it be the privilege of thwarting the will of the majority—a luxury no state should enjoy. Aside from the injustice of the apportionment of senators, there are two serious objections to the present system. The first is that the services should be dispensed with. A double-barreled rifle has advantages over a single-barreled one sometimes, but a double-barreled legislative body is bound to be a failure, for it takes two barrels to do less than one barrel's work.

However, if we must have a senate, by all means let us have its members elected by popular vote. To have a legislative body composed of one class of people is no more than a mere name, and it matters what class it may be. The United States senate is composed of one class, namely, the rich. That this is so is no particular fault of the senators; it is simply a case of cause and effect. Rich men or their instruments, come into the senate as naturally as cat-tails come up in a swamp. The further the selection of an officer is removed from the voters the more certain they are of wealth.

MR. H. F. STEVENS.

[Member of the State Senate from St. Paul.]

I am in favor of the election of United States senators by popular vote. The present plan had its justification, if not its origin—at least in so far as what had been the Northern colonies was concerned—in the system, then prevailing of electing the legislature by the people, or, in other words, by the voters, of each district. Railroads and the telegraph did not exist; newspapers had practically no general circulation, and mail facilities were inadequate to secure a free communication between different communities. Primaries and conventions were unknown, and it was therefore expedient to commit to a legislature thus chosen the duty of selecting United States senators. With the change in the conditions which a century of national existence has produced, to say nothing of the corrupting influences which accompany advancing civilization, the reasons for the method have ceased to exist, and other reasons why it should not continue have arisen. It was the theory of the founders of the constitution that the legislature should select the United States senators. Instead of that, to a large extent, the United States senators are selected by the legislature, a large proportion of whose members are chosen rather with reference to their supposed preferences in that respect than on the ground of personal fitness for their position. It has become the custom, then, to consume several weeks in a political game, in which merit and ability do not always win. The fact that we have as many able and honorable men in the senate as we do occurs in every section of the country, not because of it. Every proper incentive and restraint which our laws afford members of the legislature in electing a senator would influence members of state congresses in nominating candidates for their position, and in addition, the people would be called upon to ratify the choice of one party or the other. This is the referendum in its best form. The people can be trusted to do what is right when they have opportunity for information and time for reflection. The man who now receives and deserves election at the hands of the legislature would secure it by popular vote; those who do not deserve it would be rejected. The character of the legislature would be improved, and better laws would result.

MR. R. T. WILDER.

[Prominent Citizen of Red Wing, Minn.]

The framers of the federal constitution were patriots and statesmen—not prophets. They foresaw that in less than four generations there would enter the senate solely and alone through the influence of combined wealth—money—members sufficient in number to constitute a balance of power, and enable them to resist any and every legislative adverse to the interests of the republic and the general demands of the people. The outlook in this direction is pregnant with grave conditions. Should the constitution be so amended as to confer direct election upon the people of the state the election of its senators? Yes; emphatically yes. For this change there are many reasons, of which only one need now be named. While it is too much to expect that the corrupt use of money in this field can be wholly prevented, it will be a thousand-fold more difficult to purchase the people or a state convention than to purchase a half-dozen or a dozen venal representatives.

MR. F. C. BROOKS.

[Prominent Democrat of Minneapolis.]

Our federal constitution should be so amended as to provide for the election of United States senators in the same manner as presidential electors are now chosen. This would leave it optional with each state to elect by direct vote or according to the present mode. And it would inevitably lead, in most states at least, to the election of senators directly by the people. When so elected, they would more readily respond to the popular will. Unconsciously the senator under the existing order of things comes to consider himself the representative of the few whose actual votes and influence have contributed to his election. He would be more in touch with the people if they voted directly for him, and not by proxy. Senators thus elected would also be less subservient to the influence of wealth. The senate as now constituted, unlike the house, is composed in the main of rich men, and who are not wealthy themselves are, almost without exception, the representatives of wealth. And it is a natural consequence that the senate is the chief obstacle to the passage of any bill which would relieve the masses of the burden of tariff taxation. In the discussion of this question, however, it should not be forgotten that the senate was intended to be, and usually is, the conservative branch of our national legislature, and that sometimes conservative action of a Republican senate. But upon the whole, the advantages to accrue from the proposed constitutional amendment seemed greatly to exceed any disadvantages likely to result from its adoption. It is in this regard that the beneficial effect it would unquestionably have upon our state legislatures to remove from them the corrupting and demoralizing influences which many times attend the election of senators as now chosen.

HOW TO ELECT UNITED STATES SENATORS.

HON. H. F. STEVENS.

[Member of the State Senate from St. Paul.]

I am in favor of the election of United States senators by popular vote. The present plan had its justification, if not its origin—at least in so far as what had been the Northern colonies was concerned—in the system, then prevailing of electing the legislature by the people, or, in other words, by the voters, of each district. Railroads and the telegraph did not exist; newspapers had practically no general circulation, and mail facilities were inadequate to secure a free communication between different communities. Primaries and conventions were unknown, and it was therefore expedient to commit to a legislature thus chosen the duty of selecting United States senators. With the change in the conditions which a century of national existence has produced, to say nothing of the corrupting influences which accompany advancing civilization, the reasons for the method have ceased to exist, and other reasons why it should not continue have arisen. It was the theory of the founders of the constitution that the legislature should select the United States senators. Instead of that, to a large extent, the United States senators are selected by the legislature, a large proportion of whose members are chosen rather with reference to their supposed preferences in that respect than on the ground of personal fitness for their position. It has become the custom, then, to consume several weeks in a political game, in which merit and ability do not always win. The fact that we have as many able and honorable men in the senate as we do occurs in every section of the country, not because of it. Every proper incentive and restraint which our laws afford members of the legislature in electing a senator would influence members of state congresses in nominating candidates for their position, and in addition, the people would be called upon to ratify the choice of one party or the other. This is the referendum in its best form. The people can be trusted to do what is right when they have opportunity for information and time for reflection. The man who now receives and deserves election at the hands of the legislature would secure it by popular vote; those who do not deserve it would be rejected. The character of the legislature would be improved, and better laws would result.

MR. R. T. WILDER.

[Prominent Citizen of Red Wing, Minn.]

The framers of the federal constitution were patriots and statesmen—not prophets. They foresaw that in less than four generations there would enter the senate solely and alone through the influence of combined wealth—money—members sufficient in number to constitute a balance of power, and enable them to resist any and every legislative adverse to the interests of the republic and the general demands of the people. The outlook in this direction is pregnant with grave conditions. Should the constitution be so amended as to confer direct election upon the people of the state the election of its senators? Yes; emphatically yes. For this change there are many reasons, of which only one need now be named. While it is too much to expect that the corrupt use of money in this field can be wholly prevented, it will be a thousand-fold more difficult to purchase the people or a state convention than to purchase a half-dozen or a dozen venal representatives.

MR. F. C. BROOKS.

[Prominent Democrat of Minneapolis.]

Our federal constitution should be so amended as to provide for the election of United States senators in the same manner as presidential electors are now chosen. This would leave it optional with each state to elect by direct vote or according to the present mode. And it would inevitably lead, in most states at least, to the election of senators directly by the people. When so elected, they would more readily respond to the popular will. Unconsciously the senator under the existing order of things comes to consider himself the representative of the few whose actual votes and influence have contributed to his election. He would be more in touch with the people if they voted directly for him, and not by proxy. Senators thus elected would also be less subservient to the influence of wealth. The senate as now constituted, unlike the house, is composed in the main of rich men, and who are not wealthy themselves are, almost without exception, the representatives of wealth. And it is a natural consequence that the senate is the chief obstacle to the passage of any bill which would relieve the masses of the burden of tariff taxation. In the discussion of this question, however, it should not be forgotten that the senate was intended to be, and usually is, the conservative branch of our national legislature, and that sometimes conservative action of a Republican senate. But upon the whole, the advantages to accrue from the proposed constitutional amendment seemed greatly to exceed any disadvantages likely to result from its adoption. It is in this regard that the beneficial effect it would unquestionably have upon our state legislatures to remove from them the corrupting and demoralizing influences which many times attend the election of senators as now chosen.

MR. H. A. UELAND.

[Ex-Judge of the Hennepin County Probate Court.]

It was proposed in the constitutional convention to have the senators elected by the people. Madison said in the report of the committee on the subject that it was in what mode the best choice would be made. If an election by the people, or through any other channel than the state legislatures, promised as incorrupt and impartial a preference of the people, solely because their duty for an appointment by those legislatures. Sherman opposed elections by the people "as not likely to produce such fit men as elections by the state legislatures." In short, the opinion prevailed that the legislatures would elect better men.

MR. LESLIE MATHEWS.

[Editor of the Swift County Monitor.]

"Should United States senators be elected by the people?" The writer doesn't lay claim to possessing any original ideas on this subject, but it is his personal opinion that they should be, most decidedly. The experience of the last two years strongly support the views of those who advocate a change from the present system. Who would say that the best interests of the people of a state are being served when a legislature wastes an entire session in a fruitless attempt to elect a senator, as was the case in several states last year? Three states are now getting along with only half a representation in the senate, solely because their legislatures failed to perform the duties assigned to them. This circumstance is not so bad in itself, but when we consider the expense to the taxpayers and the utter uselessness of the legislature in all other work, it seems a little short of criminal. If there were no other reasons for desiring a change, those stated are surely sufficient. But there are many other reasons which might be advanced, or have been advanced. There is the well-known tendency and ability to corrupt legislatures. We have seen enough of this in Minnesota. There is also the setting aside of all local issues (and local interests are always of paramount importance), choosing men for the legislature solely that they may vote for this or that candidate for the United States senate. A machine might just as well be used, and it would be incorruptible. Then there is the fact that those who are chosen to represent the people are not chosen for their ability, but for their political manipulation or by the liberal use of money.

HON. A. LA DUE.

[Ex-Senator and Member World's Fair Commission.]

Could I have my way, there would be no United States senate. I think it as useless as a fifth wheel to a wagon; but, as long as the country is to be thus afflicted, its members should be chosen directly by the people. (But they would be less the representatives of capital, and more for the general good. If this is a government of the people and for the people, let it be by the people, and by the most direct route.

HON. M. MULLEN.

[Member of the State Democratic Committee from New Ulm.]

I certainly do favor the plan of electing United States senators by popular vote. The many good and valid reasons why the manner of electing them should be changed would fill a book.

MR. W. H. CUTTIG.

[Prominent Citizen of Buffalo, Minn.]

Should United States senators be elected by the people? Yes. Because: First—The present system has a tendency to encourage corruption in politics, starting with the primaries, in the interest of some candidate whose only qualification is his ability to command large sums of money for the election of the legislative ticket pledged to his support and the party ticket of that organization.

MR. W. H. CUTTIG.

[Prominent Citizen of Buffalo, Minn.]

Should United States senators be elected by the people? Yes. Because: First—The present system has a tendency to encourage corruption in politics, starting with the primaries, in the interest of some candidate whose only qualification is his ability to command large sums of money for the election of the legislative ticket pledged to his support and the party ticket of that organization.

Fur Bargains.

This is our last week in the old store. We open Monday, August 27th, in our new store on Sixth Street. We offer everything in our store this week at prices that will sell the goods. You will find us somewhat upset, but we will show the goods if you will come and look at them. It will pay. Try it!

Don't forget that after Sept. 1st we shall have the finest Cloth Cloak and Suit Department in the West. You can't afford to buy till you see our goods. All NEW and at Low Prices.

RANSOM & HORTON.

A LITTLE FUN.

"What is it?" exclaimed one of the bystanders, as a long-haired man, bare-headed and breathless, rushed wildly out of the rear door of the theater.

Wedding's are always popular. Invitations free. Don't have to pay nothing at all! That catches the crowd, by gee. An hour before the party commences. The seats are full. In the aisles the ushers are prancing up and down in evening dress and smiles.

Wedding's are always joyful; The organist on hand; And while the fokes is waltz! She gives em something grand. The ladies wear fine toggery And all is bright and gay. If you want to see real happiness Better get married some day.

Wedding's are always sorrowful, Sooties and tears unite; Parents' hearts are heavy, If the children's hearts are light. An idolized son a husband, A daughter become a wife; Duties and obligations In a new, uncertain life.

Wedding's are always expensive. A ring for your darling pet; Flowers, clothes, et cetera; That you ain't half-done yet. Wedding's are always popular, Admission strictly free. Youth and beauty and pretty girls, Vying with civility.

Many of us had wed and won, And seen some days of pain. But bless me, there ain't one of us That wouldn't wed again. —Michael Joseph Donnelly.

A dead end reposed in a New York street for nearly two days, and six policemen have been taken to task for not removing it. The cat that was let out of the bag by the Lexow committee witnesses created more noise in police circles—Philadelphia Ledger.

She fell upon his neck; In wild affright shrieked he, "That picnic youth, with the pale, sweet face; A cat's-paw!" —Detroit Tribune.

THE SMITH & FARWELL COMPANY

Offer This Week Fall Styles in Carpets.

New Wiltons, New Brussels, New Agras, New Extra Supers, New All-Wool Carpets

At 50 Cents a Yard.

NEW THINGS IN Chamber Suits.

Solid Oak Large Beveled Glass Suits... \$15.00. Solid Oak Cheval Suits... \$10.00. Two-Piece Oak Suits... \$8.50.

A Large Line of MISFIT CARPETS—BRING YOUR MEASURES.

Our Easy Payments, Foster Thrift; "Time on the balance! Catch the drift?"

Smith & Farwell Company St. Paul, Minn.