

The Oregonian

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. (By Mail.) Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00. Daily, Sunday included, three months, \$1.50. Daily, Sunday included, one month, \$0.50. Daily, without Sunday, one year, \$4.00. Daily, without Sunday, three months, \$1.25. Daily, without Sunday, one month, \$0.40. Sunday, one year, \$1.50. Sunday, one year, \$1.50. Sunday and Weekly, one year, \$3.00.

BY CARRIER. Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$5.00. Daily, Sunday included, three months, \$1.50. Daily, Sunday included, one month, \$0.50. Daily, without Sunday, one year, \$4.00. Daily, without Sunday, three months, \$1.25. Daily, without Sunday, one month, \$0.40. Sunday, one year, \$1.50. Sunday, one year, \$1.50. Sunday and Weekly, one year, \$3.00.

POSTAGE RATES. Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice No. 24, Second-class Matter. 10 to 25 Pages, 2 cents. 26 to 40 Pages, 3 cents. 41 to 60 Pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage double rates.

EASTERN BUSINESS OFFICE. The S. C. McClure Co., 110 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, rooms 310-312 Tribune building.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

REPT ON SALE. Chicago—Auditorium Annex, Postoffice No. 174 Dearborn street. St. Paul, Minn.—St. Maris, Commercial Station.

them all. Every civilized nation, except Russia, refers all questions of fundamental importance to the voters for ultimate decision. Nor is it otherwise with the initiative. In our National affairs the initiative works patiently and with cumbersome impediments, but it is there none the less. For certain, we may cite the slow but certain triumph of the popular election of Senators. The initiative, however, has been but unmistakable, and there are few to deny that it would be better for the country could the process go more directly to its end. What Mr. Bryan wishes is the same unimpeded initiative and referendum in National affairs which Oregon, Dakota, Oklahoma and other states enjoy in local matters. Whether he is right or wrong is a question to be decided by experience, investigation and serious argument. The idea will not be accepted merely because Mr. Bryan desires it; it will not be rejected because the organs of the interests see fit to ridicule it.

The initiative and referendum are still in the status of experiments. They are steps in the groping progress of the people toward genuine self-government and toward the desirable end in which we are all interested. Time will tell. But thus far where the experiment has been tried it has worked well upon the whole, though not entirely without discouraging features. Moreover, the idea is far from decrepit. On the contrary, it is one of the most vital in present-day politics. The trend of the present political aspiration throughout the Nation is toward measures identical in principle with the initiative and referendum. In other words, the tendency is toward government by the people without intermediaries. How to accomplish this desirable end is a question of method merely. The end itself will never be abandoned, and if one path fails to reach it, some other and better one will be chosen.

A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT.

What will the lawyers say to Judge Hebbard's latest exploit? When in a previous debate he exposed himself and the initiative and referendum in a venture upon the disgraceful exhibition and we were assured by a legal correspondent that the San Francisco bar had begun proceedings looking to his expulsion. The proceedings must have looked very far indeed, for he has not been expelled, and so far as one can discern, he holds his own with the best of his professional brethren. Drunk or sober, he sits serene on the bench and disposes what passes for justice to his fellow-citizens.

The latest report is that he invaded the District of Columbia, and that he was drunk and was kicked out. Is not this contempt of court? Can such an assault upon the majesty of the law be passed over without penalty? Must not this kick be construed as comment upon a pending case, namely, the case of Judge Hebbard? Must not the having made such comment, certainly Mr. Langdon is liable to a fine. The courts must be respected, even when they are drunk.

Why do not the lawyers of San Francisco proceed to abate the nuisance of Judge Hebbard's conduct? He is a nuisance. It is reported that he had a bad man with a gun, especially when in his cups; and surely among the lawyers of San Francisco there must be somebody who has courage enough, not to speak of self-respect, to try to bring the justice of the law into the world. Perhaps it is not true that Judge Hebbard might still continue to adorn the bench even if the bar association should expel him? Taken for all in all, he is an interesting and instructive figure, and a quaint commentary upon our system of justice.

NO LONGER A POLITICAL PICK-UP.

The merit system has at length been installed in the consular service of the United States. This service, after a long struggle to maintain it as a political dependency, subject entirely to Congressional and official interest, was by a law enacted in April of last year established as a merit system, and thereby subjected to the principles embodied in the civil service act of 1883. Following the purpose of this law, vacancies in the office of Consul above the lowest class are hereafter to be filled by promotion from the lower grades of the consular service, and not by appointment from outside the service. The lowest grade is to be filled by promotion of Vice and Deputy Consuls who won their places in the service by passing required examinations, or by the appointment of candidates who have satisfactorily passed the examination prescribed by the State Department.

The first examination under the law of 1906 was recently held in Washington. The examining board consists of an officer of the State Department designated by the President, the Chief of the Consular Bureau and the Chief Examiner of the Civil Service Commission. There is an oral examination to determine the character, disposition, address, manners, health, personal appearance, readiness of judgment, discretion, accuracy of information, resourcefulness and business capacity of candidates. The written examination includes one modern language other than English; the natural, industrial and commercial resources of the United States; political economy; the elements of international, commercial and maritime law; American history, government and institutions; the modern history of Europe, Latin-America and the Far East; geography and arithmetic. This list of qualifications seems far from exacting, but the requirements are not more than an intelligent and efficient discharge of the duties of the consular service demand.

There is clearly in this reform encouragement for intelligent, ambitious young men to qualify themselves for a service under the Government that is at once permanent, honorable and profitable.

THE BLACKMAILER.

A special to the Chicago Record-Herald says that the death of the late G. A. Groves, of Pennsylvania, was hastened by workaholic schemes worked by women in his town. If it is true and can be shown that such was the case, the guilty person should be given the maximum punishment provided by law. A man of spotless public life, against whose private character no charge of reproach had ever been uttered, Groves died of the most confidence and admiration of the people of his state. Blackmail levied by attacking a man's character is a heinous crime in any circumstances, but when aimed at a man of upright character it becomes doubly atrocious. The man who has fixed a decent life has a greater dread of charges of immorality than has a man who is guilty of questionable conduct. He is for that reason more susceptible to the crafty schemes of the blackmailers. An decent man owe it to the public to see that every blackmailing is brought to justice and punished without mercy. The robber who holds up a citizen, clubs him on the head and takes his money, inflicts a physical injury from which he may quite likely recover. The blackmailing, however, inflicts an injury which forever destroys his peace of mind and perhaps makes him an outcast from social circles of which he has been an honored member.

WHEN MAY COURTS BE CRITICIZED?

While criticizing the Oregonian for asserting the right of a newspaper to comment upon a case pending in the courts, Mr. S. B. Huston has done so in another column of this issue himself upon the Moyer-Haywood case still pending in Idaho, and criticizes the courts for their decision in one phase of that case. He has exercised the right he denies to the newspapers. Quite likely he will say that the controversy upon which he commented has terminated; but that is not true. He says Moyer and Haywood were kidnaped and taken to Idaho, and since the jurisdiction of a court is a question that can always be raised, that question may still be open for discussion before the case is ended. In any event, the case is still pending and Mr. Huston asserts the belief that the courts of Idaho have no right to try the defendants. If that is not commenting upon a pending case, we would like to know what it is. It is a comment upon one feature of a case, why may he not comment upon every feature of it, and criticize the court at every step in the proceedings? In Mr. Huston's expressed opinion, the Idaho courts have no right whatever to the custody of Moyer and Haywood, and every subsequent step in the proceedings must be unlawful and wrong, and his criticism stands against anything and everything that may hereafter be done toward their trial and conviction or acquittal.

In addition to this flagrantly violating the rule he has himself laid down, Mr. Huston otherwise shows the weakness of his position and gives support to the arguments the Oregonian has advanced in behalf of liberty of speech and freedom of the press. The paper looks exceptions to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in which it is held that a stricture upon the court is none the less contempt because it is true, and that the court has an inherent right to punish as contempt any gratuitous attack upon the court concerning a pending case. This paper asserted the right of the people and the press to discuss at any time any question pending before the executive, legislative or judicial departments of our Government. Mr. Huston differs, and declares that the people must maintain silence until the court has spoken. Yet he adds that the Supreme Court's "recent decision in the case of Moyer and Haywood to the effect that kidnaping is lawful if done by the officials of the state, and that I have been unable to find any excuse.

If it is admitted that the kidnaping question had terminated, what is to be gained, Mr. Huston, by your expressing such an opinion now? It is frivolous to criticize a court decision after the fact. The doctrine of the paper is that a man after he has been hanged, if that decision is, as you say, without excuse, much more is it without reason. If it is without reason it is wrong, and if it is wrong it is a monstrous wrong. It is no trivial matter, for it involves a principle of law passed upon which this country was founded. You remained silent when your voice or your pen might have done some good; and now you express the opinion that the view of the Supreme Court is "without excuse." The doctrine of the paper is that a man after he has been hanged, if that decision is, as you say, without excuse, much more is it without reason. If it is without reason it is wrong, and if it is wrong it is a monstrous wrong. It is no trivial matter, for it involves a principle of law passed upon which this country was founded. You remained silent when your voice or your pen might have done some good; and now you express the opinion that the view of the Supreme Court is "without excuse."

The Texas anti-pass law provides, among other things, that "no public officer shall hold passes unless he be an employe of a railroad." There was a time when such an exception might be applicable to members of the Portland City Council.

Ambassador Bryce has at least demonstrated his proneness to form opinions upon scanty information. He says Chicago is destined to be the most beautiful city in America. But he has never seen Portland.

The labor leaders who assert that confidence in Roosevelt is misplaced might do well to pick out the names of a few public men who have given them more faithful public service.

"Give us green bug, boll weevil and locusts, and we can survive, but from over-much legislation you shall deliver us," exclaims a Texas paper. Perhaps you need the referendum.

If butter prices do go down a little, it will be no more than fair. These plutocratic farmers have been getting Klondike prices out of the poor city man for quite a while.

Fourth of July is two months and a week distant. It is to be supposed Mr. Daniel McAllen, who has just recovered from a severe spell of sickness, has a calendar.

The price of lemons has gone up. That is no reason to believe that a smaller number of lemons will be handed to candidates at the primaries.

The man who wants to sue Henry for libel would better be sure he is in a state where the truth is not admitted as a defense.

Grover Cleveland might institute an investigation of the charges of illegal voting in the insurance company elections.

THE COURTS AND THE PRESS

Lawyer Huston Makes a Few Suggestions as to Criticisms. PORTLAND, April 25.—(To the Editor.)—Referring to The Oregonian's editorial criticism upon the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Patterson contempt case, to which you again referred in your issue of April 22, it seems to me that it should not go unanswered. I had hoped to find someone more able to answer it properly who would undertake the task, but so far no one has seen fit to do so. Hence this letter.

To understand the matter thoroughly, perhaps it would be better to re-cite the facts. A case was pending before the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado. Senator Patterson, through his newspaper, attacked the Supreme Court and predicted that it would decide the case in a certain way because of the influence of certain corporations to have it so decided, and because, as he alleged, the court was dominated by corporate influences. For this he was fined \$1000 for contempt of court and this decision was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. The court held that, after the case was decided, a newspaper or an individual was perfectly free to criticize the decision, and that the court was not exempt from such criticism any more than any one else, but that such articles as were published by Senator Patterson, and which attempted to influence the decision of the case and tended to interfere with the calm and orderly consideration of the matter and therefore constituted contempt of court.

With this conclusion The Oregonian finds fault. It says in substance that it is wrong that the newspapers ought to be permitted to discuss the case and say how it should be decided, and why it should be so decided, during the pendency of the trial; that it is wrong that the right to discuss the case should be given to the press and not to the parties to the litigation. Let us examine this carefully. If a writer might advise the courts or jury how a case should be decided in the absence of the parties to the litigation, if he may state certain facts or things which may be facts to the jury, or if he may make arguments as to why the case should be decided so and so, in the absence of the parties, then may not any other citizen interview the judge or jury and give to them his opinion as to how the case should be decided? If the editor of The Oregonian may do this, why may not the editor of the Williams or Hon. Joseph N. Taylor, or any other citizen of Portland for that matter, go and say to the judge or the jury in the absence of the parties: "I know some facts about this case. I know how this case should be decided and if you do not decide it that way, you are going to be held up to public ridicule and the man may do this, why not another? And then the result of the case would depend in all probability upon the question as to who would get the most people to go and tell the judge or the jury how the case ought to go. In such a trial the man without money would have a small chance, would he not? The rich man would keep the court busy listening to the opinions from outsiders as to the merits of the case.

If this is to be done, why not simply matters by empowering a jury and then submitting the question as to how the case should go to a popular vote, or by petition and remonstrance. Of course if editors of newspapers are infallible that would make a difference and they would, of course, have rights not granted to the ordinary citizen.

Now I do not wish to be understood as holding the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other court for that matter, to be above criticism. I have criticized that august tribunal myself at various times. I thought its decision in the income tax case very unfortunate and its recent decision in the case of Moyer, Haywood et al. to the effect that kidnaping is lawful, if done by the officials of the state, one for which I have been unable to find any excuse. S. B. HUSTON.

Hint: Cheating Gown Rejoice.

Advising young women that sort of a man not to marry, Miss Belle Kearney, well-known student of sociological problems, lectured at Temple College, said that "drinking and smoking men should be tabooed."

Miss Kearney was addressing the women's educational association on "The Moral Evils of Today." She continued: "If girls would insist on sobriety and prudence, they would have most their requirements. The American girl sets the pace for the whole world, and if she raises her standards and demands one more good for boys and women she will benefit humanity at large."

Miss Kearney asked the young women present to think a long time before they married, and to debate seriously upon the qualifications of the man they choose.

The Whole Family Had It.

A queer case of collective temporary mental aberration, of which an entire family were the victims, is reported from a village situated at Belleville, Ill., on the border of the Sarthe and the Orne Departments. A family of six persons had made their midday luncheon on Sunday, and shortly after all abandoned themselves to extraordinary frolics. One woman spent the whole afternoon washing her hands, under the delusion that they were dirty; another made her bed on a lumber heap, and two men kept loading a wagon with soil and then emptying it. Another went to drive imaginarily a cow, and another was seen with balloons, while the youngest roamed about with one boot on and the other off. Toward evening all resumed their usual sane composure.

The Suburbanite.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch. On Monday night he took a walk. Upon his shoulder boldly. And marched upon the train with it. Though he seemed so bold. He hung it high up in the coach. And when he got to his room. And fell upon a lady's head. He listened to her sally. On Tuesday night he took a box of books. He put them in the rack. And often did his poor eyes meet. He put them firmly in the rack. And when they came down flying. He spooled a fair typewriter. And heard without replying. On Friday night he took a bag of walnuts. To plant his country garden with. He placed it high above the seats. And when it came untied. And he heard a neighbor's back. He never once replied. On Saturday he stayed at home. And worked his soil with a hoe. And when the train went by the rest. Looked out and smiled him. "Good boy," he shouted from the train. "Your garden's looking well. I took the end of the train spoke. 'You're people go to it.'"

CITY COUNCIL AND FREE WATER

Why Was Not the Wagner Amendment Submitted. PORTLAND, April 26.—(To the Editor.)—The City Council should be severely and universally condemned for its attitude expressed in the rejection of the Wagner water amendment.

The serious question before us is not one of whether the amendment is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, or whether it contained some feature which the members of the Council, so admittedly lax in office, so negligent of their duties to the people, failed to discover. The question of serious moment to us is one of attitude. It is high time that public servants who assume to arrogate to themselves the powers of the people, who conspire to reign and neglect to serve, should be rigorously rebuked. The Council members stated, as their reason for the act of rejection, that the amendment contained a method of obtaining funds for the building of bridges which the Council was not aware of. Certain members of the Council have also stated that they passed upon the measure, without any knowledge of its contents. This is an admission of incapacity and invalidates any claim to act for the public good and if the people are not of those to whom Lincoln referred as capable of being "fooled all of the time," these same senators will meet their political doom at the next opportunity. But let us suppose the amendment to contain the method referred to and grant that the Wagner amendment is, in the opinion of the derelict City Council, undesirable.

Do remissness and private opinion preclude the City Council with all its deprive the people of the constitutional right on initiative petition, to declare whether they do or do not approve of the measure as a law. If they do not attempt of the people through the initiative and referendum, may be similarly interfered. What motive had the City Council in forestalling the referendum by which the people have overwhelmingly declared their pleasure and their "right"? Has the City Council grown so cramped that it regards itself as God of our affairs? Are we pigmies, imbeciles, infants and idiots? We are certainly regarded as such by this immaculate, admittedly incompetent, City Council. And in the pressure of special privilege, it took the people's will out of the people's hands and arrogantly decided in the interest of some of its members, that it would be the will of the people. Who was it? LOUIS BOWERMAN.

QUERY: WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT?

Several Newspaper Wisecracks Vainly Endeavor to Solve the Riddle. Milwaukee Sentinel. "What is a Democrat?" How long is a piece of string? Buffalo News. The New York World was making something like progress in its inquiry as to what constitutes a Democrat, but the editors, who have thrown all its fat into the fire again.

What is a Democrat? Has received no satisfactory answer. Most people would rather guess on the number of beans in a jar. Portland (Me.) Express. A lot of people are trying to answer the question, "What is a Democrat?" but none of them has really given an answer yet.

Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. We beg leave to suggest that it would be a good idea to ask President Roosevelt to settle this interesting and important question, "What is Democracy?" No Democrat appears to be able to answer it. The satisfaction of a Democrat is in the fact that he is a Democrat, and does not believe in permitting any one to crush out these cardinal ones.

What is a Democrat? The happy medium between a Socialist and an Imperialist. Charleston News and Courier. A Democrat is a creature that once haunted Wolfert's Roost.

Wilmington Evening. Democrat is a voter who believes in hard money, home rule and free trade, and does not believe in permitting any one to crush out these cardinal ones.

Cleveland Leader. Can it be that David B. Hill, of Wolfert's Roost, has been forgotten so soon?

Ought to Be Brought to an Issue. Chicago Chronicle. Charges that certain Western United States Senators have been stealing Government land ought to be brought to an issue speedily. Left unanswered, such charges strengthen the hands of those who maintain that the entire membership of the Senate is corrupt and dishonest. The best way to disprove the insinuations of the Senate's enemies is to go after those Senators who are charged with dishonesty. If they are innocent that fact will speedily be demonstrated. If they are guilty, the place for them is not in the Senate, but in the penitentiary.

Reducing Speed of Trains. Pittsburg Post. Some of the Western railroads are said to have decided upon reducing the speed of passenger trains because of recent legislation. Such action, while it may be intended as retaliation upon the traveling public, ought to result in promoting their safety. The fastest trains might well be slowed down some without harm. If it is proposed, however, to run the trains in such a way as to embarrass the people generally, the railroads will soon discover that they have made a costly mistake, which they will in due time be glad to remedy. This is no time for the exhibition of mere spite upon the part of the railroads, for such an exhibition is certain to only add to the popular sentiment against their abuses.

Women Fuss and Cry Over Walls. Austin Dispatch in New York Sun. The annual convention of the Daughters of the Texas Republic has broken up in a row, the question at the bottom of the disruption being whether the old walls of the Alamo at San Antonio should be torn down and the site converted into a park. After a parliamentary storm, in which some of the women cried and others shook their fingers at their opponents, the meeting was declared adjourned sine die. No action was taken on the Alamo proposition.

IN THE SUNDAY OREGONIAN TOMORROW

TWO STRIKES AND THREE BALLS. Full-page illustration in colors of boys at the great game.

MAY DAY PLEASURES. Beautifully pictured presentation of the joys of childhood.

THE IDEAL ROADSTER. Uncle Sam's work in developing the perfect carriage horse.

DEADLY "STEEL FISH". All about 18 new submarine boats to be added to our navy.

WILD ANIMALS AS MODELS. How painters and sculptors use them in artistic work.

SALLY ANN'S EXPERIENCE. A little masterpiece of home-spun philosophy and humor.

DUCHESS IN THE SLUMS. Duke of Marlborough's wife (Consuelo Vanderbilt) joins London's Salvation Army.

WITH THE GOOGAN GIRLS. An hour in the studio, discussing offers of marriage.

BUSTER BROWN AND TIGER. These mischief-makers have an adventure in a Chinese laundry.

LIFE IN OASIS REPUBLIC. Frank G. Carpenter writes from the wilds of Western Sahara.

BEULAH'S APPLE PIE. A good picnic story for girls by Louise Lexington.

The Sunday Oregonian for sale by all newsdealers.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

ANY PORT IN A STORM. A story of a man who was blown down by a storm.

