

"Nominal" Support.

Our very independent Union cotemporary on the bill finds fault with us because we did not hoist the name of Mr. McLane at the head of our columns in the daily as well as weekly TRIBUNE, and infers from this that the TRIBUNE is not quite so decidedly Union as it should be, and that we intend to render the Union candidate for Councilman only a "nominal" support. This frivolous inference, from a paper professing Unionism and independence at the same time, comes with a bad grace, and will receive its due weight from sensible people, which may be fully expressed by the sign 0. When the present proprietor purchased the TRIBUNE establishment, he was under no obligations to any party to publish a political newspaper, or any paper at all; but it accorded with his wishes and principles to continue the TRIBUNE as a Union journal, and it was so announced. But had he even omitted to say what was to be the future political complexion of the paper, no one would have had any right to assume that its political character was different from what it had always been in the absence of any announcement of a change.

But to question a man's fealty to party because he does not raise the name of his party candidate at the head of everything

he prints, is certainly far-fetched and feeble argument. The weekly issue of the TRIBUNE is a compilation of all its daily issues, and therefore the political principles of each must necessarily be identical. Moreover, it is not usual to hoist the names of candidates in daily papers. This may be news to those whose knowledge in the publishing business is derived chiefly from Webfoot and Washington Territory, and we furnish the information to the concern on the bill free of charge.

But let us see which of the two papers—TRIBUNE or *Transcript*—has most cordially endorsed the Union candidate for the Council. The Daily TRIBUNE of the 21st inst., speaking of the special election, says

"Mr. McLane is a man of the right stripe, politically and morally, and merits the cordial support of every Union man in the district. Let him have it, and his election is sure." On the other hand, week before last, the *Transcript* "nominally" endorsed McLane so far as to raise his name at the head of its columns, and in the same paper stultifies the act by the absurd and unfounded declaration in reference to the controversy between the Council contestants, that McLane had the law on his side, but Longmire had justice! Then, the illegal proceeding at Skookum Chuck—which the law says was no election—was really an election after all, in the opinion of the super-excellent Union paper on the hill! Surely this admission involves as "liberal interpretation of the election law" as even Longmire's swamp rebel could ask or desire.

"The Mountain speaks to the Sea,"
And claims for Mack the law—
The Sea says Longmire has the right,
And hill-top answers—Yaw!

If such an endorsement were likely to have any influence in the election, Mr. McLane would have good reason to exclaim—"save me from my friends."

Again we say to the people of Thurston and Lewis counties, vote for McLane—the man who has once been fairly elected to the Council, and fraudulently ousted from his seat to subserve the purposes of a sectional clique hostile to the local and general interests of this Council district, and the whole Puget Sound country!