

ROBBERS HACHED 'S' PLOT IN SALOON

Only Rougher Element Took Part in Driving Japanese Out of Town.

MAYOR FIRM FOR ORDER

Little Brown Men Made no Resistance and Promptly Left—Railroad Will Not Return Japanese Section Crew.

WOODBURN, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—You Japs come in here and take place of white man. White man here two, three years. White man here, you Japs cut pay, you get out right now, if you no get out we come two, three, four, five hundred strong, blow Jap house all to pieces, blow you too.

In these terms, according to what C. L. Ogle has been able to learn regarding it, Mr. Baker, ex-chairman of the Enterprise saloon here, and Eugene Wright, whose name was connected with a recent Portland robbery, informed seven Japanese section men of this division that their presence in town was no longer needed.

The mob, it is said, was hatched in the Enterprise saloon, and from this point the mob, largely composed of rowdies, and increasing in size as it went, made its way to the home of A. Schwabauer, section boss.

They informed him of their designs, and told him to remain inside the house if he did not want to be hurt. They then went out to a lot adjoining the bunkhouse, located southeast of the depot, and it is said fired several shots, at which the spokesmen went up to confer with the Japanese, while the rest of the crowd remained in a field away from the house.

At first the Japanese were reluctant to go, but when told that they might be shot, or even killed, they were willing to comply with the demands, and went to Portland on the overland trail about noon Sunday.

The mob wanted the Japanese to pack their things and leave immediately, said Station Agent S. T. Johnson, "but the Japanese argued the case and were finally told that it would be all right if they came before Sunday night. The Mayor came to us and said that if they would stay, he would see that they were protected, if he was compelled to jeopardize every good man in the town."

"I told the Japanese what the Mayor said, and that they would stay I would that they would not interfere with them. They were afraid, however, and left. I had telegraphed Superintendent Fields about the matter and he replied that the railroad company would furnish a patrol of police."

"The mob was largely composed of hoodlums. I do not think any section hands were among them, although there possibly was one. The sentiment of the responsible people of the town is to petition the railroad company to take the Japanese out, and they are seriously considering it."

"I do not believe the sentiment against the Japanese is any stronger here than elsewhere in the Coast, as it is strong throughout the West."

A Schwabauer, section boss at Woodburn, handed his resignation to the company Saturday, and went to Portland today to learn whether or not it would be accepted.

When asked if any arrests would be made, he replied, "No."

Frank Useiman, the one white man who has been working with Japs, said since the whites were discharged, said tonight.

"Japs came to work February 4, yesterday they quit. I don't know where they are now; boss and Japs being in Portland."

"It was two weeks ago Sunday that the boss showed me letters from headquarters saying that the whites were to be discharged, and Japs sent down from Portland. He told me tonight that he had heard the Japs had been run out of Gervasa, a small town near here; there were seven of them there, too, one white man working with them."

"I don't think I will work with Japs, for it is very difficult to make them understand what is required. They work for \$1.50 a day, while the whites get \$1.50. I don't see how it is possible for Japs to have had the premium section for two years. My boss has a gold medal for his good work."

POZZE TO SCORNS

Banking Law Causes Law-makers Much Tribulation.

CONFLICT IN ARGUMENTS

State Regulation Is Opposed by Ultra-Conservatives as Well as by Irresponsible Bankers—Legislators Are Seeking Light.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—Whether the state banking law shall be a near approach to the National Banking act or a much more lenient statute, the issue now being discussed by those members of the Legislature and of the banking fraternity who are taking an interest in Haines' Senate bill 908. The bill was drawn by a committee of bankers who believed in the enactment of a law lenient in its provisions, and then amending the law from time to time as experience disclosed a need for it. Though not very strict in its requirements, the bill met the opposition of some who asserted that it was too exacting in its terms, and who, in reality, opposed a state banking law. On the other hand it met many criticisms from those who thought it too loose in its provisions, and who would make it conform more nearly to the Federal law.

NORMAL ISSUE IS RODGED

COMMITTEE SENDS APPROPRIATION BILLS TO HOUSE.

Provides for Drain, Weston and Ashland—Recommends \$100,000 for the Seattle Exposition.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—Among the appropriation bills favorably reported to the House this morning by the committee on ways and means were those appropriating \$100,000 for an Oregon exhibit at the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition at Seattle; for the maintenance and support of normal schools as follows: \$27,000; Weston, \$5,000; and Ashland \$6,000; and \$150,000 for additional buildings at the State Agricultural College at Corvallis. Members of the committee in the absence of any specific instructions from the two houses as to what appropriations should be made for the support of the normal schools of the state, considered it advisable to report all of the bills carrying appropriations for these institutions back to the Legislature and let the subject be disposed of in the two houses on the merits of the claims of these schools and in accordance with such legislation bearing on the subject as may be enacted.

The bill providing for the development in the House this morning to the bill by Representative Edwards, which proposes to transfer all moneys received from the United States from foreign investments in the school funds of the different counties, and providing that the per capita tax for school purposes be raised from \$5 to \$8. After several attempts had been made to get the bill passed, it was referred back to the committee on judiciary for amendment. Edwards made a strong plea for the passage of the bill in the House and the subject was referred to the districts in the state that are now unable to hold more than three months' terms of school annually. Barrett of Washington county, who has introduced a bill to increase by \$12,000 annually the taxes in his county. Dobbin actively attacked the measure for the reason that it would divert from the treasury about \$240,000 per annum that is now received from the Government for grazing privileges within the forest reserve. Campbell raised the question of the constitutionality of the bill, since the title embraced more than two subjects that were not germane. The committee on revision of laws was unsuccessful, as was also the motion of indefinite postponement made by McCullough. After the passage of the bill, a motion to refer the measure to the judiciary committee for such changes as may be considered necessary to make the constitutionality unquestioned, prevailed.

The joint committee appointed to investigate the Patton Baby Home at Portland today submitted a report complimentary to that institution and the work it is doing. The report includes a recommendation for an adequate appropriation by the state, and also recommends that the Home be placed under the control of the State Board of Charities, and that its funds be increased. Representative Newell's bill to prohibit public officers from convicting and in any way allowing violation of the criminal statutes of the state or criminal ordinances of a municipality was favorably reported by the committee on revision of laws in the House today. The purpose of the bill is declared to be to prevent obstruction of justice, and heavy penalties are prescribed for all violation.

Representative Barrett of Umatilla displayed his surprising opinion in the House this morning when he secured the reference again of two of his bills that had been adversely reported from the committee, which they had been referred. One of the measures provided more stringent measures for the extradition of Russian and Canadian thistles and the other related to stock running at large in Eastern Oregon counties.

The House committee on claims this morning reported Speaker Davey's bill, appropriating \$100,000 for the reimbursement of Indian War Veterans for the use of their horses during the Indian wars of 1855-66, recommending that by means of the appropriation authorized therein be reduced to \$50,000. The report of the committee was adopted.

Committee on medicine and pharmacy in the House today favorably reported Senator Smith's bill, for establishing and enforcing quarantine regulations in this state.

Favorable report has been made by the House committee on penal, reformatory and charitable institutions on the bill of Senator Kay providing for a revised system of credits to be used in reducing the terms of convicts in the State Penitentiary as a reward for good conduct.

House bill 924, Connell, proposing important revision of the state land laws, was today made a special order for 2 o'clock next Thursday afternoon.

Routine of the House.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—House was convened at 9:30 a. m., with 43 members present. In absence of the regular reading clerk, J. Withycombe, Jr., by a delayed train, N. McAfee, reading clerk, was drafted into service for a part of the morning session.

The House today was extended to J. M. Lawrence of the House; Land Office.

Speaker Davey announced appointment of the following special committee, to which Governor Chamberlain's protest to Congress against the repeal of the Timber and Stone act was referred: Umpierre, Slusher and St. John.

The House spent the remainder of the afternoon considering Eaton's bill increasing the appropriations for the University and Clatsop-Klamath Commission bills.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—House was convened at 9:30 a. m., with 43 members present. In absence of the regular reading clerk, J. Withycombe, Jr., by a delayed train, N. McAfee, reading clerk, was drafted into service for a part of the morning session.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The House today was extended to J. M. Lawrence of the House; Land Office.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—House was convened at 9:30 a. m., with 43 members present. In absence of the regular reading clerk, J. Withycombe, Jr., by a delayed train, N. McAfee, reading clerk, was drafted into service for a part of the morning session.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The House today was extended to J. M. Lawrence of the House; Land Office.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The House today was extended to J. M. Lawrence of the House; Land Office.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The House today was extended to J. M. Lawrence of the House; Land Office.

FRUIT MUST BEAR NAME OF GROWER

Perkins Bill Requires That Name and Address Go on All Packages.

Measure Is Intended to Promote Better Methods in Marketing Fruit.

Heavy Penalty Provided for Violations of the Law.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The passage of Representative Perkins' bill, requiring the marking of boxes of green fruits, so as to show the name and address of the grower and the name and address of the packer, will probably do more to promote good methods in fruit marketing than anything else that has occurred in Oregon up to the present time. This law, which will go into effect three months from the close of this session of the Legislature, will compel every grower and packer to show whatever criticism may be due him for the shipment of inferior fruit, and will insure to every grower and packer due credit for the shipment of fruit of superior quality.

During the first season, wide growers and packers are becoming accustomed to the law and preparing to observe it, there will be some inconspicuous and expense, but the advantages will far more than repay the loss in this respect. Growers and packers will find it necessary to provide themselves with rubber stamps with which to print upon the boxes the names of growers and packers. While these names and addresses could be written on the boxes with a crayon, this method would be slow and would impair the appearance of the box.

How the Law Will Work.

In practice the law will probably work out something like this: Box factories will provide themselves with machines for printing the names of packers upon their printed boxes. Growers who pack will be marked with the names and addresses of packers before they are made up. Then the packers will secure rubber stamps bearing the names and addresses of their growers, and every box of fruit will be stamped with these stamps before it is packed. The grower will be marked with the name and address of the grower, and the packer will be marked with the name and address of the packer. This method will be of interest to every fruit grower and packer in Oregon, the text of the law is here given in full.

Text of the Law.

Section 1. Any person, firm, association or corporation engaged in growing, selling or packing green fruits of any kind, whether intended for sale within or without the State of Oregon, to stamp, mark, label, or otherwise designate every box or package of green fruit so packed with the name and postoffice address of the person, firm, association or corporation growing the same, and the name and postoffice address of the person, firm, association or corporation packing the same, and the name and postoffice address of the grower of such fruit. It shall be unlawful for any dealer, commission merchant, shipper, vendor, or by means of any false representations whatever, either verbal, printed or written, to represent or pretend that any fruit, or any portion thereof, has been raised or produced or packed by any person or corporation, or in any locality, other than that which is so designated on such fruit.

Section 2. It shall be unlawful for any grower or packer of green fruits to sell or pack any such fruit for market, whether intended for sale within or without the State of Oregon, to stamp, mark, label, or otherwise designate every box or package of green fruit so packed with the name and postoffice address of the person, firm, association or corporation growing the same, and the name and postoffice address of the person, firm, association or corporation packing the same, and the name and postoffice address of the grower of such fruit.

Section 3. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 4. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 5. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 6. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 7. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 8. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 9. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 10. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 11. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 12. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 13. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 14. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 15. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 16. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 17. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 18. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 19. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

Section 20. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not less than \$5 nor more than \$500 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than ten nor more than 100 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

BLow AT TIMBER BARONS

HOUSE PASSES BILL TO TAX THEIR HOLDINGS.

Requires Them to Make Truthful Return to Assessor—Heavy Penalties for Failure to Comply.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—An unsuccessful attempt was made in the House tonight to defeat Representative Beak's bill for the assessment of timber lands in proportion to the amount of timber and subdivisions contained thereon. The measure requires every person, managing agent or officer of any corporation or association owning timber lands in this state to file with the assessor, accompanied by a verified statement of a schedule showing the kind and character of the timber, the amount of land, and probable amount of such timber, as a basis for making an equitable assessment of the property.

Senator A. J. Johnston moved for the information called for, under the provisions of the bill, is made punishable by a fine of from \$25 to \$50. The bill finally passed with only one negative vote, those voting in favor being Brix, Farrell, McCue, Purdy, Washington and Weston.

Beak explained that the purpose of the bill was to enable assessors to make an equitable assessment of the property, and that in its operation no possible hardship can result to individual timber land owners. He stated that the measure would work a hardship on the small timber owner and invite perjury in statements of ownership of timber land. He held that it should be incumbent on assessors to determine the value of timber lands, as well as the value of real estate, and that the State of Oregon should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

From dinner this afternoon, the measure was referred to individuals in complying with the provisions of the measure, since such land should be made to contribute its share to the revenues of the county in which the timber lands are situated. Farrell agreed with McCue and moved an indefinite postponement, which was defeated by a decisive vote.

WANT A MILD MEASURE

Proprietors of private banks generally are willing that the law should be enacted, but they do not want it very stringent. Bankers who are doing business under the National act, or who have become accustomed to viewing the banking business from the standpoint of the National act, want the state law to include many precautionary provisions that the private bankers do not consider necessary.

SENATORS WANT MORE PAY

Adopt Knowles Resolution to Raise Per Diem of Legislators.

SALEM, Or., Feb. 11.—(Special).—The Senate today adopted Knowles' resolution submitting to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment raising the compensation of members of the Legislature from \$120 a session to \$400 a session. The bill was introduced by Representative Knowles and passed by a vote of 20 to 11. It was defeated by a vote of 11 to 20. The bill was introduced by Representative Knowles and passed by a vote of 20 to 11. It was defeated by a vote of 11 to 20.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.

Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected. Senator Johnson argued that the compensation of legislators should be raised to \$400 a session, but this was rejected.