

THE ELECTION IN ALABAMA.

POLITICIANS have been, for some time, looking forward to the election which came off yesterday in Alabama. All the State officers from Governor to Constable were elected. The situation there was somewhat complicated. The straight Democratic ticket on the one hand, was antagonized on the other by a fusion of recalcitrant Democrats—People's party men and Republicans. The dispatches state that in yesterday's election color lines cut no figure. Numbers of Africans voted for Jones, the regular Democratic nominee. It is conceded that Jones is elected by at least 20,000 majority. Gen. Weaver might as well omit Alabama from his list of People's party certainties.

In contrasting yesterday's election with former ones, it is observed that it is not all a victory for Governor Jones and his party. In 1890 he received an aggregate of 139,910 votes for Governor of Alabama. His opponent Long, on the Republican ticket received only 42,440, while the Prohibition candidate, Coulton, received 1380. From the figures we see that Jones in 1890 received a plurality of 97,470 votes over the Republican candidate. This year he received only 20,000 over the fusion candidate, Kolb. In addition to this, color lines are partly abolished. This proves that conditions are changing in Alabama. In 1888 Cleveland's plurality over Harrison was 61,123. November will tell something different.

North Carolina is another State that is occasioning much alarm to Northern Democrats. Cleveland carried the State in 1888 by a majority of 13,000 out of a total vote of 285,512. Fowler, the Democratic candidate for Governor, carried the State by 12,000 over his Republican antagonist, Dockery. It is conceded by all that this is the stronghold of the People's party in the South. But it is admitted that it has no chance of carrying the State, though it is working aggressively. Just at present a fusion seems imminent between the Republicans and Populists. If this should be effected, Democrats concede North Carolina to the fusionists. In the event of this fusion not taking place, the Democrats assert that the Populists will gain nothing but that they will probably throw the State to the Republicans.

A SCHEME TO SETTLE THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

As a settlement of the liquor problem, perhaps the most moral proposition comes from the city of Sioux Falls, South Dakota. In that burgh the city council recommends, without a dissenting voice, that the municipality own, operate, and regulate the saloons within its limits. The proposition as outlined by the councilmen is, that the saloon business be made a department of the city government, to be presided over by a superintendent, who will be held responsible for the proper working of this bureau. Under the guidance of this official, a saloon will be opened in each ward, and placed in charge of bartenders hired

by him, who will become city employes the same as policemen, or waterworks officials. Beer will be sold at five cents a glass, but whisky will be retailed at twenty-five cents a drink, and it is possible that the drink will be measured by the bartender. The idea in thus discriminating is to discourage the drinking of ardent liquors and divert the taste to what is deemed a less harmful liquid.

It appears that this scheme is being received by the general public without opposition. Even the saloonkeepers do not antagonize it. South Dakota has a strong prohibition element in its population. Perhaps the people are willing to see the project carried into practice by way of experiment. However we view it as improper and something outside of the functions of government national or municipal.

IT SMACKS OF HUMBBUG.

PLAIN, blunt people who think actions speak louder than words and do not look upon all that glitters as gold, make some caustic remarks about the verbal endorsement of the Mayor's courses by certain preachers who helped the party of liquor and lust to gain control of this city. It does look funny to see ministers of religion paw the air, and shout that they will never support men who support Sunday liquor selling and other evils, and remember all the time that they joined in supporting those very men at the polls, knowing just as well as they do now, that they were pledged to do all they could in favor of it. The whole manner of the alleged protest against local lawlessness and encouragement of the Mayor conveys the idea of insincerity and humbug. Talking one way on the platform and voting the other way at the polls may be satisfactory to some sectarian consciences, but it does not pull the wool over the eyes of the discerning public. Humbug is the word that lingers on many lips in comment on the ministerial protest.

"SALARIED HORSES."

MR. HARVEY, city watermaster and Mr. Hines, supervisor of streets, have each applied for a dollar a day—which means \$30 a month—for a horse and buggy. The Council did not seem, last night, to be in favor of providing salaries for any more horses belonging to municipal officers. The people pay more than enough money now for that purpose. Doubtless Mr. Hines and Mr. Harvey have as much claim in this line as others who are now sporting around in buggies at the popular expense, but this does not make the matter right in any case. According to statements made by members of the Council, the salaried horse expense account ought to be cut down and should by no means be augmented. We will see what the committee to which the applications of the supervisor and watermaster were referred will say when it shall report upon the subject.

THERE are said to be 25,000 idle workmen in Chicago.

CANON LLOYD ON BETTING.

A FEW weeks ago an article appeared in this journal which commented deprecatingly upon the fact of the leading business houses of this city closing on a special day to enable employees and others to attend a horse-race. We took the position that such a public demonstration in favor of horse-racing would have the effect of giving an impetus to that sport and its commitants that would be injurious, because they were spreading all over the Territory—even the smaller settlements being affected—without any special incentive, such as the holiday incident, being necessary. What we mean by the commitants of horse-racing is betting, or gambling, evil associations and other conditions liable to influence young people especially in the direction of wrong.

The position taken in the article in question was, to our knowledge, heartily endorsed by numbers of good people who are not in unison with the popular trend in the direction of pleasure-seeking and the evils associated with some phases of that pursuit. One of that class has kindly handed us an English newspaper containing a synopsis of an address recently delivered in the city of London by Canon Lloyd, Vicar of Newcastle, on the subject "Why should men not bet." The gentleman handed in the paper because he observed that the Canon's views were in line with those expressed in this journal. We quote from the report of the address:

"Why did men bet, he asked? Was it not to get money from their neighbor, and to get money out of their neighbor's ignorance, an ignorance that was no shame to him, and a little bit of knowledge which was no credit to them. But they might say it was all fair play. His neighbor wanted to get his money, and he wanted to get his neighbor's. Well, was that an honorable position for Christians? Where was there any noble feeling in the transaction of a bet? Where was the consciousness, after the miserable transaction was over, of having done one little lot of good to a brother? The man who bets was nothing better than a covetous animal, and a man who was utterly regardless of his brother's interests. The old apple woman on the race-course was a better person than the gambler there, because she gave money's worth for the money given to her, but the bookmaker did not give value. They might say they did not bet merely for the sake of the money they laid down. Now he considered that that was all twaddle. Why, if that was the case, did they not bet with tables, or even stones? Then there were those who said that horse racing and betting improved the breed of horses. This again was utter nonsense. What did the great majority of those who bet know about the breed of horses? He was not going to say that horse racing in itself was wrong, but he did mean to say that since betting and gambling had entered into horse racing it had degraded what might have been an innocent and a beautiful sport, and turned the racecourse into a very pandemonium on earth. He had this fault to find with betting and gambling, quite apart from horse racing, and whatever it entered into it spoiled; it absolutely spoiled and was spoiling, their old English games. One of the games that Englishmen used to be most proud of was the old-fashioned game of wrestling, but that game had gone out simply because of