

He is informed that he "has closed his political career."

The *Tribune* says this morning:

"The President will carry his own State; and as against Hill or Cleveland he will carry New York. As we reckon it, that will elect him, for we do not believe that he will lose any vital Northern State; he may even carry North Carolina or Louisiana."

On Wednesday it talked in this way:

"There is a constant yell for Blaine among his supporters, and that sort of thing is contagious; it spreads as a whirlwind. But on the other hand it is difficult to get up enthusiasm for a man like Harrison. Nobody shouts for him; nobody is on fire with enthusiasm when his name is spoken or his acts referred to. It takes an argument to convince men of President Harrison's merits and achievements, and when all is done there is a total lack of zeal and sympathetic fire. We conclude that every day harms Harrison's chances and helps Blaine's. It is only a question how long the Harrison delegates can resist. They make no accessions. All this tells, and tells both hard and fast. It points to but one result, and that is the enthusiastic nomination of Blaine. And behind it all is the feeling that Blaine is the only Republican sure to be elected; the fight with him as standard bearer would be lightsome and easy; with any other it would be hard; with Harrison it would be both hard and lifeless."

On Wednesday Blaine was "the only Republican sure to be elected." Today Harrison is to carry New York and "that will elect him," for he will not "lose any vital northern State." On Wednesday everything pointed to "but one result, the enthusiastic nomination of Blaine." Today: "Blaine gave this re-nomination to the President by his February letter."

As a political prophet the hand at the *Tribune* bellows it not a success. He raises much wind but blows "every which way" without any definite guiding principle or regard for consistency.

It was the same in reference to the "Liberal" attempt to keep out the straight Republicans at Minneapolis. On Wednesday it was proclaimed in a striking headline: "Liberal Triumph Inevitable," and the wind up was "it will battle to its ultimate and inevitable triumph." But how is it today? Less wind and more wisdom is what the "Liberal" organ needs in its present emergency.

ONE OF THE REWARDED.

The official head of the person who occupies the position of Inspector of State street appears to be in some danger. A demand was made last night for his dismissal. Some of the "Liberal" councilmen seemed to assume that the charges preferred against this inspectorial barnacle are altogether too trifling for serious consideration. One of them is that he is utterly incompetent for the position; another that he neglects his duties. As a matter of fact the first charge covers the second, because if he has not the needed capacity to perform his duties he must necessarily leave them undone, from sheer inability to perform them. One councilman—Mr. Lawson—intimated that the Inspector did not allow a sufficient time to

elapse between drinks to admit of his doing effective work even if he were otherwise capable.

The evidence in the hands of the advocates of dismissal seem to be strong and abundant. The city engineer had written two letters to the Board of Public Works, setting forth alleged Inspector Wood's incompetency and neglect, but that autocratic body had treated these communications with contempt. Among other derelictions on the part of the objectionable officer is that of having allowed the contractor to put into the paving of State street two lots of material which had been condemned by the engineer as unfit or use. Perhaps the Council members will learn some fine day—when they wake up to the fact—that, so far as running certain lines of the public business of this city with a high hand and an outstretched arm is concerned, the Board of Public Works is a good deal bigger than the Council.

It seems plain enough that the inspectorship of Mr. Wood is a failure, so far as it relates to enhancing the public good. Consequently if that gentleman must be rewarded for "Liberal" partisan work, or because some friend of his has a "pull" on the powers that be, he may just as well, so far as relates to the good of the people, be turned out and continue to draw his salary as remain and take it. According to the presentation of the case he is of no use where he is.

OUR "LIBERAL" COUNCIL.

If our readers desire to entertain an idea to the effect that there is even the semblance of dignity in the alleged deliberations of the present "Liberal" City Council, we beg of them not to read the reports of the meetings of that body which appear in the local papers. Such a thing as calm consideration of a theme connected with the common weal, except in the case of a few individual members of the Council, is exceedingly rare. School-boy banter and word-bandyng are conspicuous at almost every meeting.

The spectacle presented by this body of men, speaking as a whole, is humiliating to the people. The sensible men are in the minority. In relation to the latter we have no strictures to offer, as they are honestly seeking the public welfare.

Our advice to all connected with a body so important as the Council is, that each of them, so far as practicable, give thoughtful scrutiny to public questions, so that when propositions are introduced something in the form of reasons, for or against, may be offered. This method would be much more dignified than the flinging back and forth by the members, at each other, of disconnected, wordy, ill-natured scraps. What is wanted is for the majority of the "Liberal" members to cease projecting jobs and for all hands to have recourse to dispassionate analysis of questions and presentations of facts and cease the everlasting petty squabbles which are bringing the Council into popular contempt. When anything like an abuse in the shape of a job makes its appearance, the man who loses his temper and assails his oppo-

nent in a loose and desultory way may be as honest as the day in his purpose, but he simply attacks the enemy with a tack-bammer. Cool determination and persistency that never back down from a rightful position, combined with facts and reason, constitute the sledge with which to smash a public wrong. There is abundance of work of that kind for the few honest men in the Council. If they will go at it coolly, determinedly, without fear or favor, they will have the support of every right-thinking citizen. The man who is determined to fight a wrong should never lose sight of his point, nor let up on the object of attack until the matter is rectified. In supporting a measure that is right, the same persistency should be brought to bear upon the subject at issue. More reason and less boyish banter is what is wanted in the meetings of the Council.

CEREAL PRODUCTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE series of census bulletins pertaining to cereals furnish instructive reading to the political economist. In 1889, the six New England States had 580,287 acres in cereals as compared with 746,128 acres in 1879. These figures show a decrease of nearly 166,000 acres, or over 22 per cent. The total area in corn decreased over 84,000 acres, in wheat 64,000, in rye 31,000, and in buckwheat nearly 14,000. Oats and barley show slight increases.

In Maine cereals decreased for the decade 8 per cent., in New Hampshire 30.56 per cent., in Vermont 11.93 per cent., in Massachusetts 39.43 per cent., in Rhode Island 35.32 per cent., and in Connecticut 37.12 per cent.

Connecticut shows the greatest absolute decrease, 50,590 acres, or 37.12 per cent., while Massachusetts shows the greatest relative decrease 41,255 acres, or 39.43 per cent. In Maine wheat seems to have given way almost entirely to oats.

Accompanying the New England bulletin is one on Georgia, Albany, Florida and Delaware. In Georgia in 1879 the total area under cereals was 3,654,546 acres, in 1879 3,317,645 acres. These figures show a net decrease of nearly 337,000 acres. The areas in wheat, oats, rye and barley show large decreases, while those in corn and buckwheat show increases. But the area devoted to cotton increased from 1879 to 1889 over 728,000 acres.

In Alabama there were in 1879 2,651,845 acres under cereals, and in 1889 2,514,768. These figures also show a decrease, but as in the case of Georgia the cotton area increased over 431,000 acres.

Florida shows a slight increase; in 1879 there were 408,959 acres in cereals, in 1889 421,822.

Delaware fell from 308,000 acres in 1879 to 289,000 acres in 1889. The corn area decreased, but wheat and oats increased.

The bulletin devoted to Iowa, Kansas and Arkansas shows figures somewhat different. In Iowa in 1879 the total area in grain was about 11½ millions of acres, in 1889, 12½ millions. In Kansas in 1879 the total in grain was 5½ million acres, in 1889, 10,574,000 acres. In Arkansas an increase is also shown. In 1879 the figures were 1,672,446 acres, in 1889, 2,080,203.