The Scranton Tribune

Published Daily, Except Sunday, by The Tribune Publishing Company, at Fifty Cents a Month.

LIVY S. RICHARD, Editor,
O. F. BYXBEE, Business Manager.

New York Office: 150 Nassau St.
S. S. VREELAND,
Sole Agent for Foreign Advertising.

Entered at the Postoffice at Scranton, Pa., as Second-Class Mail Matter.

When space will permit, The Tribune is always glad to print short letters from its friends bearing on current topics, but its rule is that these must be signed, for publication, by the writer's real name; and the condition precedent to acceptance is that all contributions shall be subject to editorial revision.

SCRANTON, APRIL 27, 1900.

TEN PAGES.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,

CHARLES EMORY SMITH,

OF PENNSYLVANIA.

REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS.

State.

Congressmen-at-Large—GALUSHA A. GROW,
ROBERT H. FOERDERER.
Auditor General—E. B. HARDENBERGH.

Legislative.

First District—THOMAS J. REYNOLDS.
Second District—JOHN SCHEUER, JR.
Third District—EDWARD JAMES, JR.
Fourth District—P. A. PHELBIN.

Counting those who were paired, Colonel Quay had the support of 33 Republicans and 6 Democrats; and the opposition of 17 Republicans, 20 Democrats and 4 Populists. In character and ability as well as in numbers his Republican supporters compare favorably with his opponents; and on party lines he is still the majority's choice.

Special Pay for Special Work.

SECRETARY ROOT'S reply to the resolution of inquiry respecting extra allowances to army officers serving as administrative officers in the new dependencies is straightforward and conclusive. Inasmuch as the Democratic campaign workers appear to want to build a party issue upon this grant of special pay for special work, it may be well to give the secretary's version in his own words.

"Pursuant," he says, "to the orders of the secretary of war dated, respectively, March 1, 1899; April 19, 1899, and May 9, 1899 allowances have been paid four officers of the army who have been required to live in the city of Havana and to perform important civil functions in connection with the administration of the government of Cuba, as follows: To the military governor of Cuba, at the rate of $7,500 per year; to the military governor of Havana, at the rate of $5,000 per year; to the collector of customs for the island of Cuba, at the rate of $1,800 per year; to the treasurer of the island of Cuba, at the rate of $1,800 per year. These payments were in addition to the salary and allowances which the said officers were entitled as such to receive out of the treasury of the United States. I am not aware of any other payments of the character described in the resolution to any officers in Cuba. I annex hereto a report received some months since from the headquarters division of Cuba showing that none other have been made. The payments have been made monthly from the dates stated in said orders until the present time. The precise dates of payment will appear in an itemized statement of receipts and expenditures now in the course of preparation. Payments to the military governor of Havana will cease with the termination of that office on the 1st day of May, 1900. The names and ranks of the officers receiving the payments were: As military governor of Cuba, Major General John R. Brooke, until the 13th day of December, 1899, and Major General Leonard Wood, U. S. V., since that time; as military governor of Havana, Brigadier General William Ludlow; as collector of customs for Cuba, Major Tasker M. Bliss; as treasurer of the Island of Cuba, Major E. F. Ladd, U. S. V. No allowances have been made to any officer in Porto Rico other than the statutory salary and allowances out of the treasury of the United States.

"The payments specified were made out of the revenues of the island of Cuba on account of government thereof, and they were made on that account for the reason that it was impossible for the said officers to properly perform the necessary duties pertaining to their positions without the expenditure of the full amount of such allowances in addition to their statutory salaries and allowance out of the treasury of the United States. The aggregate of the payments thus made prior to the first day of the present month was $17,441.66. The total receipts of the island of Cuba collected by these officers during the period covered by the aforesaid expenditure therefrom amounted to $21,026,572.76, and the total disbursements under their direction amounted to $19,280,512.21. Similar allowances to officers of the army performing civil functions in Mexico and California were approved by congress by the act of March 3, 1849, and the act of Feb. 3, 1853. The said payments were authorized by the president of the United States upon the oral advice of the attorney general that the same were in all respects lawful."

The fact that $40,000,000 of Cuban revenues have been collected and disbursed at a total cost to Cuba of only $17,500, or not quite one-twentieth of one per cent., does not indicate that there is much material in this matter for the construction of Democratic campaign arguments: but if our friends, the enemy, want to use what there is, they are cordially welcome.

David Martin is now due for a few loud war whoops in favor of ballot reform.

The writers of stories regarding the kidnapping of children by gypsies have at last been vindicated. A young girl of Binghamton has been induced to accompany a band of nomads and her parents are not on the trail. The girl, who is about fourteen years old, appears to have accompanied the gypsies of her own accord, but when the father overtakes the horse traders it is probable that material for a first-class melodrama will be furnished on the spot.

Those who have read Senator Penrose's speech, which we conclude in today's issue, will have to recognize that it was an argument worthy of a better fate. No abler exposition of a constitutional problem has been made in recent years.

The Plan for The Occasion.

THE STATE convention let pass a splendid opportunity when it failed to indorse for vice president of the United States Pennsylvania's most accomplished orator and statesman, Hon. Charles Emory Smith. This failure was a natural result of factional controversies and small politics, of which the better membership of the Republican party is thoroughly weary and ashamed.

But the consequences of this neglect fall upon those only who are responsible for it. In no degree is the fitness of Mr. Smith for recognition and promotion lessened or the esteem in which he is held by intelligent people diminished. He remains one of the master minds in the Republican party, a vivid illustration of the difference between a politician and a statesman, and still the choice of influential Republicans in many sections for the honor in which the faction-ridden convention in his home state failed to exhibit an appreciative or even a politic interest.

The country is rich in vice presidential material and many names have been suggested which would satisfy and delight the discriminative masses of the party. But we believe that we are well within the truth in saying that not another suggestion has been made which in combination of essential qualities equals the suggestion of Charles Emory Smith. There are men of influence in every state who prefer his nomination to any other which could be made, and it is yet our hope that Pennsylvania may this year gain representation on the national ticket in spite of herself.

One by one the Democratic issues fall. First it was state rights and the right to enslave; then free trade; and last sixteen to one. What will be the next Bourbon shibboleth to go by the board?

Hanna's Photograph of Hanna.

IT IS NEVER profitable to waste time in crying over spilt milk. For present purposes the Quay case is settled. Some are glad and some are sorry but irrespective of either the fact remains that the commonwealth of Pennsylvania is deprived of the equal representation in the senate of the United States which is its due, and that chiefly through the curious action of one man, Mark Hanna.

We can understand now better than previously why Hanna in his own state has never dared to run for an elective office and why every time the decent people of his party have had a chance to express fairly their opinion of him it has been a verdict of censure. We can understand why, in the factional differences between Hanna and Foraker, the latter has had almost invariably the willing support of both politicians and people while the former has commanded only those who could be bulldozed or bought. The fact that Foraker keeps his word in politics while Hanna is capable of apparent deceptions and false promises like those which he is credited with having employed in his knifing of Colonel Quay is sufficient to account for much in the politics of Ohio which to outsiders has hitherto been inexplicable.

Hanna, to be sure, owed nothing to Quay and could appropriately have opposed him or been neutral from the start. But to agree to do one thing and then at the last minute to do another, when premeditated and prearranged, is a conception of political smartness which has never been popular among the plain people of this country and it never will be. It may or may not be what Quay deserved. We recognize that there is an honest difference of opinion on that point. But regardless of Quay's merits, the photograph of Hanna made by Hanna himself in Quay's case, if the facts are as they seem to be, is unfortunate and it seems clear that it must lead to his early disconnection from active participation in the management of the ensuing national campaign.

The season for arbutus parties is at hand and the few remaining roots of this beautiful flower of springtime will soon be removed from the soil in this section. If arbutus gatherers could be satisfied to pick the flowers instead of pulling them up by the roots this rapidly disappearing plant might be preserved, but at the present rate it will soon be extinct.

Congress has decided to cut off the New York postal tube appropriation. Come to think of it, $37,000 a mile rental for mail shooting tubes makes rapid-fire postal facilities rather expensive.

In the past generation we have paid to foreign ship-owners for ocean freights as much as we have collected at our custom houses. It is time to remedy this condition.

A rummage sale of his jewelry and bric-a-brac would doubtless enable the sultan to pay the American indemnity.

Our exports are leading our imports $50,000,000 a month. Republican ascendancy pays.

The constitution is all right but the interpretation of the document is often faulty.

Funeral sermons over Quay have been preached before.

Penrose in Behalf of Colonel Quay

[Continued from Yesterday's Tribune.]

A similar case arose during the administration of President Jackson, in relation to the appointment of a register for the land office for the Mount Salus district, in the state of Mississippi. Attorney-General Taney sustained the right of the president to appoint to fill a vacancy which had "happened" during a session of the senate, but "existed" after it had adjourned. In that case it was held to be the intention of the constitution that offices created by law, and which are necessary to the operations of a government, should always be full, and that when vacancies "happen" they shall not be protracted beyond the time necessary for the president to fill them.

In the administration of President Tyler in 1841 the question was again raised, and Attorney-General Legare took the same view of the constitution in this connection as his predecessors. It is interesting, however, to note that he even advanced a step further, and advised that the president has the right to make an appointment to fill a vacancy which existed after a session of congress intervened, to which a nomination could have been made.

Attorney-General Mason advised President Polk, in 1846, to the same effect, in the following words:

"Even though the vacancy occurred before the session of the senate, if that body, during its session, neglected to confirm a nomination to fill it, the president may fill it by a temporary appointment; and public considerations seem to require him to do so." (Opinions of Attorneys-General, volume 4, page 522.)

Thus not only is the president declared to have the power, but it is declared to be his duty, from public considerations, to see that the public offices are kept filled.

The same question was raised by President Lincoln, with his attorney-general, in 1862, on the question of his power to fill a vacancy on the bench of the Supreme court during a recess of the senate, which vacancy existed during and before the last session of the senate, and the right of the president to fill such vacancy on the bench of the Supreme court was sustained by Attorney-General Bate. (Opinions of Attorneys-General, volume 10, page 357.)

Again, in the case of Peter McGough, appointed by President Lincoln as collector of internal revenue for the Twentieth district of Pennsylvania, it was declared by the attorney-general that where the president made a temporary appointment of a collector of internal revenue during a recess of the senate, and no nomination was made during the next regular session, or during an extra session called thereafter, that the president, after the adjournment of the extra session, might fill the vacancy by a second temporary appointment. (Opinions of Attorneys-General, volume 2, page 179.)

Thus the power of the executive was advanced another step, and it was the opinion of the attorney-general that he could make a second appointment even after the lapse of two sessions of the senate, to neither of which the nomination had ever been sent. On the same principle the power of a governor of a state to appoint a senator is inexhaustible. It has been argued that

One important distinction is to be borne in mind, however. As set forth by Attorney-General Stanberry, in 1866, a distinction is made between a temporary appointment by the president, without the consent of the senate, and an appointment for a full term, made with the consent of the senate. A similar distinction obtains between the appointment by an executive to fill a vacancy in the United States senate, in which the governor does not give full title to the office, but makes only a temporary appointment until the legislature can make an election. The following is the language of the attorney-general in this connection:

"I say by the temporary appointment of the president; for, in strict language, the president cannot invest any officer with a full title to the office without the concurrence of the senate. Whether the president appoints in the session or in the recess, he cannot and does not fill the office without the concurrence of the senate. He may fill the vacancy in the recess, but only by an appointment which lasts until the end of the next session." (Opinions of Attorneys-General, volume 12, page 41.)

Similar constructions have been adopted by succeeding attorneys-general; by Attorney-General Williams, in 1775; by Attorney-General Devens, in 1877, and by the same attorney-general in 1880, when he advised the secretary of the treasury on the question, raised by th appointment of John F. Hartranft as collector of the port at Philadelphia; by Attorney-General Brewster, in 1883, and by Attorney-General Miller, in 1893, who advised President Harrison that the rule is the same as to the power of the president to fill a vacancy in the case of an office created but not filled during the session of the senate which had adjourned.

MEANING OF "HAPPEN."

It will be observed that the word "happen" in all of the opinions and cases above cited was construed to be used in the sense of "happens to exist," and it was held to apply to all kinds of vacancies, whether the vacancy happened or occurred by death, resignation, removal, the beginning of the term of a new office, where no incumbent had either been elected or appointed, or the vacancy occasioned by the expiration of the term. No distinction was made in the kind of a vacancy to be filled, and it was uniformly held that the power to appoint was complete when the vacancy happened to exist, without reference to the manner in which or time when the vacancy occurred. It will be observed that no distinction is made as to whether these vacancies occurred prior to a session of congress or during a session of congress. In every case, including that of an office newly created, it was held to be the power and the duty of the president to keep the public offices filled.

Can senators adopt two interpretations of the word "vacancy" in the same day, or even in the same hour? Can they apply one interpretation to the word "vacancy" when it occurs in the constitution in connection with senatorial vacancies? Can they in open legislative session expound their arbitrary definitions and qualifications and restrictions concerning these vacancies, and, a few moments, perhaps, afterward, in the secrecy of an executive session, give an entirely different construction to the word "vacancies" in connection with vacancies in offices filled by the president? In fact, we then give the broadest and most liberal interpretation to the word "vacancies" in this latter connection in order that the paramount purpose of good and efficient government and the obvious meaning of the constitution may be carried out that the public offices may be filled. This principle has been acquiesced in by the house, which has always recognized the authority of officials so appointed to such vacancies, and, in the act of making appropriations for the salaries and expenditures of such officials, distinctly and emphatically acknowledges the validity of their title.

There is a third and last place in which the word "vacancy" occurs in the constitution, and the construction which has been placed upon it throws considerable light upon the interpretation of the word "vacancy" in connection with senatorial appointments. Clause 4 of section 2 of article 1 of the constitution of the United States provides:

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any state, the executive thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies."

A case in point occurred in the state of Rhode Island. William A. Pirce was declared by the general assembly of that state to have been on November 4, 1884, elected a representative in the Forty-ninth congress. The national house of representatives on January 25, 1887, resolved that he was not elected; that the seat was vacant; and that neither he nor any other person received a majority of the legal votes cast at the election on November 4, 1884. This, then, was a case of the people of that district having failed to elect a congressman. The question was then raised before the Supreme court, whether, under the provisions of article 1 of section 2 of the constitution of the United States, already referred to, the governor should issue awrit for a special election to fill the vacancy. It was contended in that case that it was not such a vacancy as was contemplated by the provisions of the constitution. The Supreme court held that it was a vacancy within the meaning of article 1, section 2, and the governor had power to issue a writ of election to fill the same. (In re Representation Vacancy, 15 R. I., 621).

OFFICES SHOULD NOT BE VACANT.

It will be, of course, argued, as it has been in the past, that these cases of vacancies in reference to executive appointments and vacancies happening in the house of representatives are not similar to those vacancies occurring in the office of senator. It is said that there are no words of limitation as are found in the provisions regarding senatorial vacancies in the words "by resignation or otherwise." But, if the argument is good that these are not words of limitation, this objection falls to the ground. It is difficult to see how, except by the most strained construction, senatorial vacancies are not upon a precisely similar basis as vacancies occurring in an appointive office or the house of representatives. The office is vacant; the constitution of the United States intended that all the offices of the government should be filled. Some senator has said in past years that the constitution abhors a vacancy as nature abhors a vacuum.

It is essential to the very purpose of government that vacancies should be filled. Reference is made to a provision in the constitution of Pennsylvania relative to the filling of vacancies. Article 2, section 4, of the state constitution, provides as follows:

"In case of a vacancy in the office of United States senator from this commonwealth, in a recess between sessions, the governor shall convene the two houses, by proclamation, on notice not exceeding sixty days, to fill the same."

In considering this provision of the constitution of Pennsylvania, it is observed that the federal constitution is the supreme law of the land and of paramount authority in all matters, including the duties of federal, state, and other public officers. The chief executive of any state can follow any rule of official action prescribed by the federal constitution to the exclusion of a different rule prescribed by the constitution and laws of his state. It therefore follows that when a vacancy happens to exist during the recess of the legislature of any state in the office of United States senator, the executive thereof may make a temporary appointment under the clause of the constitution which has been so fully considered, until the next meeting of the legislature, even if the constitution of the state provides a different method for the filling of vacancies. Section 2, article 6, of the constitution of the United States, provides as follows:

"This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges of every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contray notwithstanding."

This provision of the constitution has been from time to time liberally construed by the Supreme court of the United States. The governor of a state has authority under section 2 of article 2 of the federal constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, to fill vacancies that exist, and that authority is supreme and paramount to any state regulation. In other words, the provision of the Pennsylvania state constitution in reference to calling an extra session of the legislature to fill a vacancy in the office of United States senator cannot abrogate or annul the provision of the federal constitution under which the executive makes temporary appointments to fill vacancies. It is true that clause 1 of section 4 of article 1 of the constitution of the United States provides that:

"The times, places and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof."

A DISTINCTION AND A DIFFERENCE.

It is to be noted, however, that this provision applies to "elections" and not to "temporary appointments" to fill vacancies. Section 2 of article 1, as we have seen, expressly gives the power of temporary appointment to the governor and not to the legislature. The state legislature does not have, under the federal constitution, the power to make "temporary appointments." This power is solely lodged in the governor. As the federal constitution in the supreme law of the land, and each governor swears supreme allegiance to it, the federal and not the state constitution must govern on this question. If, for example, the constitution of Pennsylvania expressly provided that the governor of the state should not make temporary appointments to fill such vacancies, it is evident that this provision, being directly in conflict with the provisions of the federal constitution, would be void, and it would become the duty of the governor, when the emergency arose, to appoint. It is possible to put a strained and technical interpretation on the words in the constitution of Pennsylvania "in a recess between sessions," to the effect that the meaning of this provision was intended especially, and perhaps only, to cover the case of a vacancy that originated after an adjournment. The word "recess" is not used in its unrestricted sense, as in the federal constitution, but is limited and restricted by the words "between sessions."

If we are to indulge in the strict and technical construction contended for by the opponents of the validity of the executive appointment now under discussion, there is ample reason for doubt whether under this provision of the constitution of Pennsylvania, the governor of that state had any authority to convene a session of the legislature in this particular case of Mr. Quay. The section referred to provides that the governor shall convene the two houses in case of a vacancy in the office of United States senator in a recess between sessions, but the present vacancy originated some time before the legislature of Pennsylvania had adjourned. It is, therefore, more than a vacancy in a recess between sessions; it is a vacancy during a considerable period of the legislative session and extending into a recess between sessions. It might be well argued by our strict constructionist friends that the constitution applies only to vacancies originating in a recess between sessions, and that the constitution of Pennsylvania never intended to impose upon the governor of Pennsylvania the necessity of convening a legislature soon after its final adjournment, which had failed after continued and protracted efforts to elect a senator, and which by the admission of all parties and factions to the controversy could not possibly come together on such a basis of agreement as would bring about the majority required to elect a senator. In other words, the constitution of Pennsylvania declared that the governor should call an extra session where a vacancy originated while the legislature was not in session, but the constitution never intended to apply this provision to vacancies occurring during the session of the legislature, which the legislature had been unable to fill.

It may be assumed for the sake of argument, however, that the clause does fairly include a case of vacancy originating during a session and continuing after an adjournment. The meaning of the clause, however, cannot certainly be to deny to the governor the power committed to him by the federal constitution to make temporary appointments. It evidently refers to elections and not to temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature. If it does not cover the case of temporary appointments, and takes from the governor the power to make such temporary appointments, and lodges it in the legislature, then it is in palpable and direct conflict with the federal constitution and is therefore void, as the latter is the supreme law of the land.

AS TO PRECEDENTS.

Unquestionably in the early history of the government there were precedents in favor of a contracted and illiberal construction of the clause which gives the governor the right to appoint senators. I have not seen a better or more lucid classification of the character of these narrow constructions, indicating as it does the nature of the much-talked-of senate precedents, than that made by the senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, in his speech in the Mantle case. He defines the historical development or four limitations attempted to be set up upon the language of the constitution pertaining to the gubernatorial power to make temporary appointments. The first limitation was that the governor could not appoint to fill a vacancy happening at the beginning of a senatorial term. The word "happen" was construed to mean a vacancy happening in a term after that very term had once been filled. That was an old and prevalent contention. Secondly, the limitation was contended for that there could be no appointment by a governor in anticipation of a vacancy. In other words, the governor of a state undertaking to exercise the power of appointment must wait until the vacancy actually happened, and no matter how sure the governor might be that a vacancy would exist on a particular day, with no possibility of filling it by means of the legislature, nevertheless he could not make the appointment, but must wait until the vacancy actually happened and then make the appointment at the seat of government of his state, and let the place remain vacant until the appointee could reach Washington. Thirdly, the limitation was set up, and it is now under discussion, upon the power of the executive, to the effect that it could not be exerted where the legislature of the state had had an opportunity to fill the vacancy and had failed from any cause to do it. Finally, the fourth limitation has been contended for, necessarily resulting from the third, that after a governor had once made an appointment his appointee could only hold his office until the next meeting of the legislature, and, if the legislature failed to elect, the governor could not make a second appointment. The senator goes on to say:

"These are, I believe, all the limitations which have been put upon the power of gubernatorial appointments at any time during the one hundred years of our governmental history. But they have never prevailed as admitted and undisputed restrictions. They have always been contested, debated, and re-debated, and have never become established constitutional or parliamentary law. On the contrary, by advancing toward a broad and liberal construction of the constitution, we have gone on step by step to enlarge the scope of gubernatorial appointments and to allow such appointments to be made where the advocates of the old doctrine would not agree to tolerate them. In the first place, we have allowed many appointments by governors at the beginning of senatorial terms. Senators are familiar with the cases. Beginning with the case of Cocke, of Tennessee, in 1797, and coming down to the case of Pasco, in March, 1883, there have been thirteen cases where the governor has appointed a senator to take his seat at the beginning of a senatorial term, and in each case the senator has been admitted to his seat. By these precedents we have utterly destroyed the old notion that a vacancy cannot possibly happen in a term unless that very term has once been filled. Second, the senate has come to allow an appointment to be made by a governor in anticipation of a vacancy. The influences which prevented a governor from making an appointment until a vacancy actually happened, however sure he might be that it would take place, was not finally removed until the Fifty-second congress, in 1891, when in the case of Senator Chilton, of Texas, it was deliberately determined by a unanimous report from the committee on privileges and elections, adopted by the senate, that the old notion should be exploded, and that a governor, if he knew that a vacancy was to take place, and that no legislature could fill it, might make his appointment before the vacancy took place, and that the senator might come here and hold his seat under such appointment. Thirdly, the senate has made this further advance, in the three New Hampshire cases, and in the case of Senator Pasco, of Florida, sitting under a gubernatorial appointment, that it has consented to seat in this body a senator appointed by a governor where there is a doubt as to whether a legislature meeting next previous to the vacancy should have chosen or should not have chosen the senator. The fact that although a legislature may have met which was entitled to fill a senatorial vacancy, and failed to fill it, yet there was a doubt about the right of that legislature to fill it, has been accepted as a justification of a gubernatorial appointment. So we have made three new gains from the old prohibitory notions, and we are now confronted with the question of whether, fourthly, a governor may not appoint, although a legislature which had the undoubted right to fill a vacancy has met and failed to fill it; and, fifthly, whether or not as the result of an affirmative decision upon this point a governor may not continue to appoint as often as a legislature shall make the attempt but shall not succeed in choosing a senator and placing him within the senate chamber."

In other words, the progress made in the precedents of the senate has been one of steady advance. It has been a contest against a spirit of narrowness and technicality. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, the interpretation of every word in the provisions of the constitution concerning senators has exhibited a progressive tendency toward liberality, in order that the evident purpose of the constitution might be carried out, that the senate should be kept filled. The present contention that a governor cannot appoint where a legislature has had an opportunity to elect, or after having once appointed, that his power is exhausted, are two of the last places left for those who by a curious persistency would desire to hamper the full representation of states in this senate. I have no doubt, whether it shall be realized in this case, or some other, that the ultimate decision of this body will be to complete this progressive constitutional interpretation, and will recognize the intention of the constitution to create a senate and as a consequence to have that senate filled; and to have that senate filled by elections by legislatures for full terms, or remainders of terms, and by temporary appointments by governors where there are vacancies existing in the recess of the legislature.

APPROVED BY THE PEOPLE.

By the failure of the legislature to elect a senator the state is not only deprived of its equal representation, but the will of the majority of the people is frequently completely frustrated. In Pennsylvania it is interesting to observe that the people of the state have sustained by increasing majorities the regular organization of the Republican party, which was represented in the last legislature by the Republican caucus which unanimously nominated Mr. Quay for the senate. In 1897 the Republican candidate for state treasurer, after a campaign in which the administration of the state treasury had been directly and vigorously attacked, received 372,448 votes, and the Democratic candidate 242,741, making the Republican candidate's majority 129,717. The vote for the Democratic candidate and all other candidates for state treasurer opposed to the Republican candidate was 412,517, making a popular majority over the Republican candidate of 40,029. It will be observed that in this election of 1897, while the Republican candidate polled an enormous plurality, he failed to poll a majority of all the votes cast.

In the following election in November, 1898, the Republican candidate for governor received 476,206 votes; the Democratic candidate, 358,300 votes, giving the Republican candidate a plurality of 117,906 votes. The vote for the Democratic candidate and all other candidates opposed to the Republican candidate for governor was 405,500 votes, making the popular majority against the Republican candidate, notwithstanding his enormous plurality, 19,305 votes. While the leading candidate failed to poll a majority of the whole vote, the majority against him of all candidates was actually 30,000 votes less than that for state treasurer in the preceding campaign. In the election of 1899 a state treasurer was elected. The Republican candidate ran upon a platform which contained an emphatic indorsement of Mr. Quay and declared that "our state is entitled to full representation in the United States senate, and we indorse the action of the governor in making his appointment to fill a vacancy caused by the failure of the last legislature to elect."

Upon the question of the adoption of the platform in the state convention, containing this emphatic indorsement, the vote had been 192 to 49, indicating a practical unanimity in the convention. The campaign involved the attacks upon the management of affairs by the Republican party, which had been vigorously made in the two preceding campaigns, and, in addition, the issue was squarely fought out upon this plank in the platform as to the indorsement of Mr. Quay. The vote for the Republican candidate for state treasurer, elected in November, 1899, was 438,000 votes. The vote for the Democratic candidate was 327,512 votes, making the Republican candidate's plurality 110,488 votes. The vote for the Democratic candidate and all other candidates opposed to the Republican candidate was 352,488; thus giving the Republican candidate an actual majority of all the votes cast of 85,512 votes.

I called attention above to the fact that in the two preceding campaigns, with the enormous pluralities, the candidates of the Republican party failed to poll an actual majority. I called attention to the fact that while the state treasurer in 1897 had a popular majority against him of over 40,000 votes, that this majority was cut down 30,000 at the ensuing election for governor. Now, with the issue fairly made upon a candidate for state treasurer, with the added issue made the leading feature of the campaign upon Mr. Quay and the plank in the platform of the Republican party indorsing his appointment, in an off year, with every opportunity for party dissatisfaction and reaction, after three years of agitation and unlimited opportunities for publicity, the final result has been the polling of an enormous actual majority for the Republican party and an indorsement of the Republican platform, with this plank indorsing the appointment by the governor. One of the most striking features of the results in the last election for state treasurer, following upon the adjournment of the legislature, is the fact that in the counties of Pennsylvania from which had come the bolting Republicans the candidate for state treasurer received enormous gains. I refer to these facts to illustrate the statement that the governor of Pennsylvania in making this appointment, having a due regard for his individual responsibility to the people of the state, has been sustained by them, and that in sending these credentials to the senate it can be fairly claimed that he acts in accord with the sentiment of the great majority of the people of Pennsylvania.

Particular interest centers around our $20 Three-Piece Bedroom Suites.

And it is not difficult to decide why. There is something about each piece which catches the eye and invites a better acquaintance. Then construction and finish are observed and comparisons made. The decision generally is—that these are better in every way than anything ever offered at the price.

Hill & Connell

121 N. Washington Ave.,

EVERETT'S

Horses and carriages are superior to those of any other livery in the city.

If you should desire to go for a drive during this delightful period of weather, call telephone 794, and Everett will send you a first-class outfit.

EVERETT'S LIVERY,

236 Dix Court. (Near City Hall.)

ALWAYS BUSY.

SHOES FOR SPRING,
BASE BALL SHOES,
OUTING SHOES,
TENNIS SHOES,
FISHING BOOTS

Lewis & Reilly

114-116 Wyoming Avenue.

For Wedding Presents?

Yes, we have them, in Sterling Silver, Rich Cut Glass, Clocks, Etc.

An interesting variety of the richest goods in America. Prices the lowest, guarantee perfect at

MERCEREAU & CONNELL

130 Wyoming Ave.

Coal Exchange.

The Hunt & Connell Co.

Heating, Plumbing, Gas Fitting, Electric Light Wiring, Gas an Electric Fixtures, Builders Hardware.

434 Lackawanna Avenue

HENRY BELIN, JR.,

General Agent for the Wyoming District.

DUPONT'S POWDER.

Mining, Blasting, Sporting, Smokeless and the Repauno Chemical Company's

HIGH EXPLOSIVES.

Safety Fuse, Caps and Exploders
Room 401 Council Building,
Scranton.

AGENCIES

THOS. FORD, - - - Pittston.
JOHN B. SMITH & SON, - Plymouth.
W. E. MULLIGAN, - Wilkes-Barre.

FINLEY'S

Annual Sale of Spring Hosiery

Our showing of Fine Hosiery is the most attractive in years, and in addition to staple lines, includes many original and exclusive styles, not shown elsewhere.

In fine "Lace Stripes," "Drop Stitch," "Polka Dots" and "Embroidered," either in solid colors or fancies, our line is unsurpassed.

Note the following specials:

Good for this week.

FOR WOMEN.

At 25c Per Pair.

Polka Dots, Black, Blue and Red grounds, with white dot.

Fast Black, full regular made, with high spliced heel and double sole, also with white sole or white feet.

At 35c a Pair, or 3 Pairs for $1.00.

Extra fine Fast Black, white sole or white feet, and our regular 50c. line. Drop stitch Lisle in Black, new Reds and Purples, also in Lace Lisle.

At 50c a Pair.

Medium and light weight in Cotton and Lisle Thread. New colors in Lace effects.

At 50c, 75c, $1.00, $1.25 up to $2.50

A specially handsome line of fancies both in Lisle Thread and Silk.

FOR MEN.

100 dozen Fast Black with white sole, full regular made, our regular 25c. quality; during this sale, only 19c.

At 25c, 35c and 50c.

Special line of fancies, newest designs in Stripes, Dots and Lace effects.

510-512 LACKAWANNA AVENUE

The Neostyle Duplicator.....

It will print 2,000 copies from one original writing, drawing or music, and 1,500 copies from any original written on any typewriter. We are agents for the above and have one in use for the inspection of any one interested in duplicating machines.

The Planetary Pencil Sharpener, improved, The Star Paper Fastener, improved. We will put either in your office on trial for a few days.

Reynolds Bros

Stationers and Engravers,

Scranton, Pa.

We carry the largest line of office supplies in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Charles Austin Bates, the famous advertising writer, makes a specialty of medical advertisements. He has studied medicine and has a habit of analyzing the ingredients of every medicine about which he is asked to write, refusing to write advertisements for medicines which he can not indorse. He says of

Ripans Tabules:

"I had the formula and went through it from the ground up. I found that every one of the ingredients was put in for some special purpose, and was good for the purpose intended. I have as much confidence in Ripans Tabules as I have in anything I ever wrote about. I take them myself when I have eaten a little too much or feel nausea or symptoms of headache coming on, and I find them quicker to act than any medicine I ever took. You can feel their action in the stomach almost immediately; a very pleasant sensation. I know some people who think they can't possibly get along without them. My wife went to call one day on some friends she had known always. She found they swore by Ripans Tabules. They did not know that she knew anything about them or that I had written anything for them."