

ACT ON MONUMENT

Committee of Fifteen Given Charge of Memorial.

BODY WILL HAVE FULL POWER

Fund to Commemorate Deeds of Spanish-American War Veterans Stands at \$14,000—Those in Charge of Details.

Tangible shape was yesterday given the soldiers' monument project by the appointment of a committee of 15 citizens to take entire charge of the matter. The names follow:

H. W. Scott, D. Sells Cohen, Gen. Charles F. Beebe, H. S. Rowe, James Jackson, Captain W. R. Gilbert, H. W. Gantzen, Charles E. Ladd, Gen. O. Summers, Captain C. U. Gantzen, Ben Selling, Capt. J. C. McDonald, H. C. Campbell, A. L. Barber,

According to the notice published yesterday morning, a meeting was held at the office of the Chamber of Commerce, 111½ Washington street, at which Mr. Scott presided and explained the status of the movement for a monument to the volunteers of the Spanish-American War. He said a fund of about \$14,000 had been made up by private contributions, most of which was in his hands. Last winter it had been thought best to have the negotiations carried on through the募捐会, which made the total for the purpose \$26,000, but that bill had failed of passage, chiefly because of the efforts of some of the zealous members to engrave upon the monument a record of all the deeds of valor since white men came to this country, though this monument was to be for the special purpose of commemorating the volunteers in the war against Spain. Whether it should be best to proceed with the money in hand to erect the monument, or to wait for another Legislature to make an appropriation, he was not certain. Mr. Scott said he was not willing to go ahead alone, or even upon consultation with a few, to carry out the work, but that the others on the committee, therefore, had called this meeting. His own idea was that a monument should be erected on some design to be selected and that the names of the gallant young soldiers who fell in their country's service should be inscribed thereon. If the matter be left to sleep, the Legislature will almost surely, in the discussion, likely to move ahead so that we are neglecting it; therefore, Mr. Scott said, he was in favor of forming a committee to ask for and consider designs for the monument, estimates of cost, etc., in fact, a committee to take charge of the funds raised and the expenses of the erection.

Colonel Jackson asked whether consideration had been given the respective merits of stone and bronze for the monument. Mr. Scott replied that that matter had not been discussed, and it was one of the things to be determined by the committee having in charge the monument. General Gantzen, who had been invited in front of the City Hall in San Francisco a fine bronze monument to the soldiers of the Civil War, and he thought something like that would be appropriate here, and that it might be erected on a marble base for \$14,000 to \$15,000.

On motion of General Summers, Chairman Scott, Colonel Jackson and Major Gantzen were appointed a committee to select 12 others, to act with themselves as a committee of 15, to take charge of the fund and all arrangements for the monument.

Dr. Joseph raised the question as to the propriety of determining at once whether the monument should be a bronze or a granite appropriation or proceed to erect the monument with the money on hand. Colonel Jackson moved that the committee proceed with the money on hand, but on motion of General Gantzen this question was also referred to the general committee, with power to act.

The meeting adjourned and the committee at once met and selected to constitute the monument committee the names given above.

POULTRYMAN SPEAKS.

We Think Only Successful Experience Should Be Reported.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—To the Editor:—It is now to the policy of your paper to seek out and advertise the failures in any branch of industry? Do you know of any business in which there have been no failures? Do you think you will assist in establishing industries in Oregon by dilating on failures in any matter how well intentioned they may be?

These questions are occasioned by your exploitation of the failure of Mr. Gorham and his associates to succeed as well as they expected in the poultry business.

Suppose he has been disappointed; it is apparent that his failure is absolutely without fault, and that the industry is concerned, for he went into it without any knowledge of the business, he was not intimately connected with it at any stage—not with the practical work—and leaves it without having acquired any special knowledge except that returns have not been what he expected. All this time he has been endeavoring to establish himself, which he doubtless knows much. A year or so ago no man in Oregon was so enthusiastic for the poultry industry. No one of sound judgment expected his hopes would be realized fully. Mr. Gorham runs to extremes. He is extravagantly enthusiastic or extravagantly depressed. You can give him a temperate estimate of his worth, but he is, as you see, a man who makes a speculator, an adventurer in the poultry business.

If Mr. Gorham were an experienced poultryman, so something of warning or information could be deduced from his poultry experience, disastrous though it had been; there might be some point in exploiting his failure. But as it is, you must be very careful to let him do what he does.

I write this in the hope that it may in some way serve to palliate the injury done by exploiting a chance case where inexperience (not to say ignorance) reaped the harvest that should reasonably have been expected—the injury that comes from exploiting such a case as a typical one.

Our sympathies are with the management, not discouraging them, and the whole affair of the Gorham poultry article was to discourage attempts at commercial poultry raising, and on totally insufficient basis.

A. T. SMITH.

We think the Oregonian need offer no apology for printing a report of the experiment made by Mr. Gorham and others in the poultry business, even though the venture did not turn out successfully.

It is, we will inform our critic, the policy of The Oregonian, as it is of all newspapers intelligently and honestly conducted, to deal candidly with the public, and it never suppresses the report of any matter of interest, because it would have been better pleased with some other event. It is, we think, very important as related to the industrial development of Oregon, that the results of experiments like that of Mr. Gorham—failures as well as successes—should be given to the public. In any large or common-sense view it is as important to know what cannot be done as it is to know what can be done.

The difficulty with the writer of the letter printed above is that he has not read attentively, or at least has not understood what was said in the interview which so excites him. Mr. Gorham said nothing against the poultry business; on the other hand, his whole attitude toward the subject exhibited a lively and sympathetic interest in it. He has had some experience in it—such experience as entitles a man to definite opinions and to the privilege of declaring them. He does not believe that success in the poultry industry is for the commercial exploiters, but, on the other hand, that it is for

greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

FINE LECTURE ON CARLYLE

PROFESSOR SCHAFER APPEARS BEFORE THE ECONOMIC LEAGUE.

Sketches the Life Work of the Great Teacher and Author, and Draws Lessons Therefrom.

Professor Joseph Schafer, who has the chair of history at the University of Oregon, very kindly substituted, at short notice, last night, for Professor Young, who was to have lectured on "Public Finance" before the Economic League, but was prevented from doing so by illness. The lecture, given in the hall of the Unitarian Church, and was the eighth in the series of 18 planned by the league for the present season—a series that contains many of the soundest thinkers as well as the most brilliant problems of the country on the economic problems of the day. The lecture was delivered from the platform laid down for study by the league, the subject being "Carlyle as Historian." Professor Schafer has had the chair of

greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.

Turning to Frederick the Great, which is Carlyle's noblest work, real kingship was portrayed in distinction to sham kingship, which had obscured his thoughts in writing the History of the Revolution. When it was completed in 1844 it was at once recognized as his masterpiece.

Carlyle's essential characteristic as historian was that he made history didactic.

The lesson that he aimed to teach was that the world is so constituted that sham and mendacity cannot stand in conflict with truth.

to greatness, and he believed he recognized the only way was to let Cromwell tell his own story, which he did, collecting from her and her nest his letters and memorials. The work had an immediate and great success.