The Oregonian

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.
INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.
(By Mail.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Sunday, one year	2.50
Weekly, one year (issued Thursday)	1.50
Sunday and weekly, one year	3.50

BY CARRIER.

Daily, Sunday included, one year	9.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75

HOW TO REMIT—Send postoffice money order, express order or personal check on your local bank. Stamps, coin or currency are at the sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

POSTAGE RATES.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.
10 to 14 Pages....1 cent
16 to 28 Pages....2 cents
30 to 44 Pages....3 cents
46 to 60 Pages....4 cents
Foreign postage, double rates.

IMPORTANT—The postal laws are strict. Newspapers on which postage is not fully prepaid are not forwarded to destination.

EASTERN BUSINESS OFFICE.

The S. C. Beckwith Special Agency—New York, rooms 48-50 Tribune building. Chicago, rooms 510-512 Tribune building.

KEPT ON SALE.

Chicago—Auditorium Annex; Postoffice News Co., 178 Dearborn street.
St. Paul, Minn.—N. St. Marie, Commercial Station.
Colorado Springs, Colo.—Bell, H. H.
Denver—Hamilton and Kendrick, 906-912 Seventeenth street; Pratt Book Store, 1214 Fifteenth street; H. P. Hansen, S. Rice, Geo. Carson.
Kansas City, Mo.—Ricksecker Cigar Co., Ninth and Walnut; Ysima News Co.
Minneapolis—M. J. Cavanaugh, 50 South Third.
Cleveland, O.—James Pushaw, 307 Superior street.
Washington, D. C.—Ebbitt House, Pennsylvania avenue.
Philadelphia, Pa.—Ryan's Theater Ticket Office; Penn News Co.
New York City—L. Jones & Co., Astor House; Broadway Theater News Stand; Arthur Hotaling Wagons; Empire News Stand.
Ogden—D. L. Boyle; Lowe Bros., 114 Twenty-fifth street.
Omaha—Barkalow Bros., Union Station; Mageath Stationery Co.
Des Moines, Ia.—Mose Jacobs.
Sacramento, Cal.—Sacramento News Co., 430 K street; Amos News Co.
Salt Lake—Moon Book & Stationery Co.; Rosenfeld & Hansen; G. W. Jewett, P. O. corner.
Los Angeles—B. E. Amos, manager ten street wagons.
Pasadena, Cal.—Amos News Co.
San Diego—B. E. Amos.
Long Beach, Cal.—B. E. Amos.
San Jose, Cal.—St. James Hotel News Stand.
Dallas, Tex.—Southwestern News Agent.
Amarillo, Tex.—Timmons & Pope.
San Francisco—Foster & Orear; Ferry News Stand; Hotel St. Francis News Stand; L. Parent; N. Wheatley; Fairmount Hotel News Stand; Amos News Co.; United News Agents, 14½ Eddy street; B. E. Amos, manager three wagons.
Oakland, Cal.—W. H. Johnson, Fourteenth and Franklin streets; N. Wheatley; Oakland News Stand; B. E. Amos, manager five wagons.
Goldfield, Nev.—Louie Follin; C. E. Hunter.
Eureka, Cal.—Call-Chronicle Agency; Eureka News Co.

PORTLAND, FRIDAY, DEC. 13, 1907.

ROOSEVELT'S RENUNCIATION.

The Oregonian has always respected the declaration made by President Roosevelt on the night of his election in 1904, that he would not be a candidate for re-election. It has often said, therefore, that it did not feel at liberty to urge that he be a candidate again. Not that it thinks much of the "anti-monarchical" stuff uttered against more terms than two. That, in its judgment, is mere clap-trap. Washington could have been President a third term, had he been willing to serve. And President by successive elections to the end of his life. He declined for a third term, because he desired retirement and repose, and because he believed that the service he had rendered his country had discharged the full measure of his obligations to it. In his declination of a third term he gave his countrymen none of this rotten demagogical stuff about the dangers of drifting into a monarchy, with which we have since been made so familiar.

But President Roosevelt, on the night of the election of 1904, in a statement addressed to the country, said that he would consider his seven and a half years of service two terms, and inasmuch as he thought it was wise usage or custom which had limited the President to two terms, he would under no circumstances be a candidate for another term, or accept another nomination. He has reaffirmed this statement. It must stand. By all those who know the President well it never has been doubted that he intended to stand by the statement he made in November, 1904.

While, therefore, The Oregonian would rather support Roosevelt in 1908 than any other man, and while it has regretted and still regrets that he cut himself off from the candidacy by his statement that he would regard his service beginning in September, 1901, and ending March 4, 1909, as two terms, and would adhere to the two-term usage, deeming it a wise custom, it has not felt at liberty to join with those who have been pushing him for the nomination again. Renewal of his declaration is but attestation of his absolute sincerity, if any new proof had been needed. But in fact it was not. Yet we shall not be surprised if the convention, failing to agree on any candidate, should call on him, by a unanimous vote, to accept again. That he would yield to any pressure, we do not deem probable. Nor is it probable he would be elected again in the face of all his protests. A good many people, holding that no one man was indispensable, would be likely to take him at his word. Yet we believe it absolutely sure that had he not pledged himself not to be a candidate again, his nomination and election next year would come about through general acclaim.

From this time the thoughts of increasing numbers will turn towards Governor Hughes. Taft is a representative of controversies in the Republican party; Hughes is not. What is even more to the purpose is the fact that Hughes is recognized everywhere as a man who holds a fair balance between the contending forces of the country—between the corporations and the people, between capital and labor. His administration in New York has been admirable. It has won golden opinions from all sorts of people. But it is nothing against Taft to say that Hughes seems to be the more available man. Bryan will be the Democratic candidate. His opponent will need, to beat him, a vote greater than can be summoned on mere party grounds. Roosevelt, but for his declination, could command that vote. Hughes probably could command it—though the composition of it, cast for Hughes would be different in many ways from the vote that would be cast for Roosevelt.

The Republican party has hitherto seemed, and still seems, to have the better prospect for 1908; but no one can tell. The American people have adhered these fifty years with remarkable constancy to the Republican party, because they have believed its policy the better. And yet there has been a break or two. Is it time for another? There always is a lot of people who like change so well that very sober and convincing argument is necessary at times to show them why they should not vote for change. Political talk from this time till next November will follow fast and follow faster.

PENALTY AS A PLAYTHING.

A strained effort at justice is witnessed in the case of one A. J. Hembree, now enjoying his liberty in Yamhill County. This statement will recall a crime and the shooting circumstances connected therewith, in Tillamook County some months ago. Briefly stated, this man's wife and daughter were murdered in their little cabin, or shack, at night, and the building, with their bodies, was set on fire by the murderer and burned. Circumstances pointed so strongly and conclusively to the husband and father as the murderer and incendiary, that he was arrested, tried and convicted of "manslaughter"—the persistence of one juror, it is said, preventing the verdict from being that of murder in the first degree. He was given the indeterminate sentence by Judge Burnett, and having served the minimum term fixed by law, he is thus early at liberty "pending good behavior."

Now, it is plain that Hembree was either guilty or not guilty of the abhorrent crime with which he was charged. If guilty, he deserved to be hanged twice, if that were possible; if innocent, he should have been fully acquitted instead of being allowed to make a plaything of penalty and appear, after a few months among his fellows, something after the manner of a grinning schoolboy whose punishment is tempered by the sympathies of his teacher rather than ordered according to his just deserts.

Respect for law and a wholesome dread of the penalty of its violation are weakened by a public exhibition like that which was made in the Hembree case. With murder running riot in the land, our courts cannot afford thus to belittle the crime by playing at penalty.

WHY TEMPERANCE IS GROWING.

"The liquor traffic is prohibited by law in one-half the territory of the United States," according to statements submitted by Charles F. Carter in the current number of Harper's Weekly. In detail, Mr. Carter explains how the temperance movement has been spreading through the South and West so rapidly that even old Kentucky with $100,000,000, invested in distilleries, has 97 "dry" counties out of 119.

Mr. Carter after discussing the various factors which have contributed to the present situation, decides that "The most moving of all temperance sermons though, do not come through the mails nor the schoolroom, nor yet from the pulpit, nor the lecture platform. They are delivered in brutally blunt terms by the conditions which confront every man who has a living to earn. It is becoming increasingly difficult for a drinking man to find employment." There is another very important feature of the movement and its causes which the liquor men themselves, if they expect to save anything out of the wreck of their business would do well to observe. That is the vital necessity for the better element in that calling, to place the business on a plane where it will be less offensive than at present. This cannot be accomplished by the men "higher up" in the liquor business rushing to the defense of the worst elements whenever its members are guilty of law-breaking.

If they would stay this rising tide of public sentiment against the business, they must not only refuse to stand by the lawbreakers, but they must actually stand with the law and deliver them up for punishment. There are undoubtedly all over the land men who have been more or less in sympathy with prohibition, but who under ordinary circumstances, would object to being deprived of the right to drink any beverage that suited their taste. But these men have become exasperated by the continual abuses permitted by saloon men. We have plenty of examples here at home nearly every day. In yesterday's Oregonian appeared an account of the murder of a young man in a saloon in this city, the story being accompanied by the usual statement that "both men were considerably under the influence of liquor." Wednesday's paper told of the suicide at Hoquiam of a man who had been on a "prolonged spree." Tuesday we read of the murder at Waterford, Cal., of a saloonkeeper and an innocent bystander by a ranch hand "crazed by drink," and so on day after day.

Perhaps, respectable society might not be expected to care much for these numberless killings. But there is the "muss" to be cleaned up. There are innocent widows and orphans, fathers and mothers dependent on these men who were murdered because the cupidity of some saloonkeeper caused him to deal out liquor to men who were already "drunk" far past the safety point. These people generally become a charge on society which also has to foot the bills for murder trials, policing, etc., and their pitiable plight naturally excites sympathy and that uncomfortable feeling of sorrow and regret which we always feel over trouble or tragedy that might so easily have been averted. People are so selfish and so much opposed to these needless murders and other crimes directly due to unrestricted drinking, that they are willing for their own peace of mind to go to almost any extreme to stop them. If the liquor men will demand of their people a decent observance of the law, the cause of prohibition will receive a setback, otherwise it will march triumphantly on.

It is reported from Washington that negotiations are under way for the divorce of the Southern Pacific from the Union Pacific control. This change is said to be a concession made by Mr. Harriman in return for a promise from the Attorney-General that he will not be prosecuted for violation of the anti-trust law and the competitive clause in the interstate commerce law. This arrangement may be very good for Mr. Harriman, who naturally welcomes an opportunity to take an immunity bath, but it is not at all clear where the dear public which pays the freight is to profit by the change. It will hardly have much effect on rates or service whether the Union Pacific owns the Southern Pacific, or the Southern Pacific owns the Union Pacific, or whether they are separate and distinct properties so long as Mr. Harriman controls the stock, bonds and operating of the roads. Perhaps the land-fraud farce is not the only farce case now on the boards at the National department of justice.

THEN AND NOW.

What do we live for? To work. What do we work for? To get the means of living. This is the philosophy of life which many people practice even if they do not preach it, and through its influence existence is reduced to a dull grind from which death seems like a desirable escape. When college professors are asked to tell us why we ought to study the dead languages they reply that many of our ideals in art and religion have come down from the Greeks and that we cannot understand modern life without studying the language of the nation which did so much to make modern life what it is.

Truly we have taken much from the Greeks. Whether the study of their language makes us more or less grateful for our obligations may be questioned, but the obligations themselves are indubitable. One ideal which the Greeks had, however, we have missed. To them the great end and aim of human life was beauty and happiness. To us beauty is a thing of little consequence and happiness is trivial if it is not sinful.

The old Greek thought of his city as a place where human beings might lead healthy and happy lives. Whatever interfered with this end he removed. Whatever contributed to it he builded up, no matter at what expense of time, money and labor. Noble men were the highest aim of the city and the state. We, on the other hand, think of the city as a place for making money and whatever interferes with that aim we remove. We think it worth while to sacrifice human comfort and happiness to the ideal of profit. The Greeks thought no money profit worth comparing with strong bodies and blithe hearts.

It is interesting to see how the different ideals have been worked out in practice. The old cities were clean, beautiful, spacious; ours are sordid and ugly. The ancients had to depend upon slaves for their menial tasks, while we have machines; but, upon the whole, there was more leisure for all men in Greece than there is in America. Our machines have not made things easier for the common man, though they have increased the relative wealth of the millionaire. Could we not wisely take lessons from Greece in other things besides grammar?

THE REAL MENACE.

Tradition and custom teach us to believe that American institutions are menaced by two serious dangers. One arises from the passions of the unthinking mob; the other from the influx of ignorant foreigners. No other dangers which threaten us can be compared with these two in magnitude. No others are so imminent. Thus we are taught to believe; but when we compare the teaching with the facts of the case, it does not seem to agree, at least, not altogether. The formula, venerable as it is, breaks down in the face of things as they are. To cite one case only, let us recall that President Roosevelt for the last two or three years has been trying to enforce the laws of the country against certain great predatory corporations. That these corporations were breaking the laws nobody thinks of denying. They do not deny it themselves. Now, concerning these most conspicuous of all our criminals, we note first that they form no part of the unthinking mob, nor are they ignorant foreigners. But perhaps defiance of the law is not a menace to our institutions. It may be that this Nation can flourish and prosper while its laws are flouted and its courts controlled by a predatory class.

It is to be noted in the second place that the President has been outrageously abused for trying to make these powerful interests obey the law. One judge, who ventured to impose rather a severe penalty upon a hardened offender, has been vilified persistently by the criminal corporation which he sought to punish. No judge in recent times has suffered so much abuse as Judge Landis has for imposing the famous fine upon the Standard Oil Company. It is said that a certain express office in New York is kept busy day and night sending out printed libels to poison the public mind against him and the President who upholds him. To some persons it looks as if it were a danger to our institutions to malign the President for enforcing the laws and to slander a judge for applying them, though this may be a mistake. But in either case it is not the unthinking mob which has heaped calumny upon Mr. Roosevelt, nor is it the ignorant foreigners who have vilified Judge Landis. It is to be remarked also that certain persons and newspapers are accusing Mr. Roosevelt of having caused the late money panic, when they must know that their accusations are false. If ever a calumny was patently devised for political effect, this one has been; but it was devised neither by the mob nor by the foreigners. Those who have set it going and sedulously propagated it belong to the very best circles in the country. All of them are wealthy and most of them are pious.

We are moved to make these observations by reading a speech which Mr. Langdon made before the Civic Forum in New York on December 11. Mr. Langdon, it is needless to say, is the Prosecuting Attorney of San Francisco, who, in conjunction with Mr. Heney, has wrought such havoc among the aristocratic grafters of that city. He told his hearers something about Rudolph Spreckels' aid in the work of cleaning up San Francisco, and then went on to relate how he had been rewarded. "They heaped abuse upon him. They questioned his motives. They snubbed him at the clubs. They tried to ostracize him from his own social set. They caused the withdrawal of deposits from the bank of which he was president. But he never flinched." Good for Mr. Spreckels. It is grand to hear that he did not flinch. But who were these people who tried to make him flinch? Who were the men who sought so ardently and meanly to break up the graft prosecutions in San Francisco? Of course, they belonged to the unthinking mob; they were ignorant foreigners?

Far from it. The persons who have done their worst by fair means and foul to protect the San Francisco grafters and bring to naught the work of Heney, Spreckels and Langdon, belong to the first families in the city. They include the beauty, the wealth, the culture, the piety, of that gay metropolis. It is the high-toned aristocrats who have cut Spreckels at his club for standing by Heney. It is wealthy merchants who have drawn out their money from his bank to punish him for attacking the grafters. These people hate Spreckels with all the virulence of class hatred. If they could crush and slay him as the old Roman aristocrats slew the democratic Gracchi they would do it and dance for joy upon his grave. The loyalty of these people is to their class, not to their country or city, and there is no hatred like that of the best families to a man who has "turned traitor" to their interests. At bottom, this is the secret of the unrelenting malice of the elite New York grafters for Hearst. He is a class rebel, though he is one of a very different sort from Rudolph Spreckels.

But how have the unthinking mob and the ignorant foreigners of San Francisco treated Heney and Langdon? The best families, led by the fragrant Mr. Herrin, put up a "Labor" candidate for Mayor and a phantom Republican to beat Taylor, who is the hope and stay of honest men. Whom did the mob support? Unwashed as they are, unthinking, actuated only by vile passions and degraded motives, they voted for Taylor; while the wealth and culture of the city voted against him; and as for Langdon, the courageous knight champion of decency, the mob gave him their vote almost to a man. In San Francisco is it the people or the select classes that menace the city by their selfish passions? Which has it been in the country at large for the last two or three years? Which is it likely to be in the years to come? Is it the mob that whines and vituperates when the laws are enforced? Is it the mob that seeks to purchase permission to break the law? Is it the mob that prostitutes courts and corrupts legislatures? It is time that we ceased to repeat the timeworn cant concerning these matters and began to face the truth.

We have from the Secretary of State a letter giving his version of the collection of fees for his own use in excess of the compensation allowed by the flat salary law. He has turned into the Treasury the amount in excess of the sum paid to writers for transcribing the laws for the use if the state printer. He had supposed that it was within his province to retain these fees, but on consideration he has decided to deposit the amount less the sum paid to writers for the transcriptions. It seems that the Legislature had not made it part of his duty to furnish the "copy" to the State Printer, nor had made appropriation to cover the work. Clearly it was an oversight on the part of the Legislature, which certainly intended that the Secretary should have no compensation beyond that allowed by the so-called flat-salary act. Yet if the Secretary has not clerical force enough for this additional work, the Legislature should have provided it.

Impartial judgment must decide that Mr. Simon is not the proper attorney for the receiver of the Title Guarantee & Trust Company. The affairs of the defunct company ought to be administered in the interest of the creditors, not in the interest of the officials who plunged it into ruin. Mr. Simon appeared in court a few days ago with an argument designed to protect the officials of the defunct confidence game from prosecution. Yet they ought to be prosecuted, and they will be prosecuted. Neither receiver nor his attorney ought to have any sympathy with them, or to try to protect them. Such property as is left out of the wreck, saved from this colossal swindle, ought to go to the creditors wholly, with no favors to the officials who lured and gulled depositors. Mr. Simon is able enough, but his argument in favor of the officials was offensive; and inasmuch as the receiver was changed the attorney should be changed, too.

The United States Bureau of Fisheries has at last decided to abandon the practice of turning salmon fry out of the hatcheries before they are old enough to look after themselves. In a very able article Mr. H. S. McGowan recently offered indisputable evidence that the fry that have been turned out of the Government and state hatcheries for a number of years, had in remarkably large proportion been used as feed for trout and other foes of the diminutive fish. It is now proposed to follow the suggestion of Mr. McGowan and keep the young fish captive until they attain the length of three or four inches. By that time, they will be sufficiently strong to take care of themselves, and the results from hatchery work will be much more satisfactory than under the old method of turning the immature fry out to fall an easy prey to the voracious trout.

Says the Wall street news report: "Today's political news received favorable interpretation in Wall street, with the Harriman stocks displaying the most activity and strength." For the first time in his career, Roosevelt has done something that Wall street approves.

The newspaper was wrong that said The Oregonian had declared it would have no politics. The Oregonian will have politics enough, as a spectator and auditor; as an actor, too, when it shall see cause. It will have politics, but mighty little of the old kind.

Would you rather, exclaims the Baker Democrat, in a burst of moral enthusiasm, be Cardinal Newman or E. H. Harriman? We fear the average man, if this is addressed to him, will never be either.

We notice with pain that a lot of our professional reformers and sturdy supporters of civic righteousness are among those who haven't paid to the city their occupation tax and are to be sued for it.

The attempt to enroll Fritzi Scheff in the Ollie Mack school of theatrical freaks was a flat failure, and reflects no credit on those who attempted the infamy.

Among others to whom the legal holidays gave relief is Mrs. Waymire.

FUN OF OTHER PEOPLE'S KEEPERS

New Brotherhood That Everybody Is Guardian of Everybody Else.

New York Tribune

Since the day when a rude barbarian denied, in a rhetorical question, that he was his brother's keeper many things have happened to make his theory of society even less sound than it was in nomadic, patriarchal times. Indeed, so many new relations binding men to one another have grown up that observers are already assuring us that every man is the keeper of his divorced wife's stepfather's butler. A few philosophers make this social tie look like a Gordian knot by declaring everybody both ward and guardian of everybody else.

To judge by the number of citizens who want to compel others to eat, sleep, drink and think as they do, and who also urge the Government to pay everybody a salary, this doctrine of universal responsibility for everything seems to be growing. And we doubt not that some incidents of the recent panic will be gleefully garnered by the teachers of universal brotherhood (sisterhood, cousinhood, compatriothood, hands-across-the-seahood, etc.) as proofs of the interdependence of all men.

According to recent dispatches, the panic of 1907 is to blame for the following calamities: Some sportsmen in Sweden had to postpone an international yacht race. An Armenian banking firm in Stamboul had to suspend, thereby causing many Zoroastrians, Parsees and children of Islam much grief. In Rome the wise men of state were forced to sit up nights wondering how they were going to find jobs for the thousands of laborers returning from American towns to their native villages. Similar disturbances probably occurred in Zululand, Tasmania and Kamchatka on a smaller scale. When the universal brotherhood (etc.) people get hold of all the details about Hottentot ladies pawning their opera cloaks, bushmen closing their boomerang factories and Esquimaus reducing their daily rations to two handfuls of blubber, American bankers, speculators and depositors will probably hear some scorching remarks on the immorality of conducting business with so little regard for other people's feelings. The world is so sensitive nowadays to every injury! How can a man be so heartless as to withdraw his funds from the bank without having computed the weight of woe which the transaction will load upon stevedores in Shanghai and widows in Winnipeg?

It is a harrowing scene that the panic philosophers disclose. If "American business and banking methods are upsetting the industrial equilibrium of the whole world and bringing disaster to countless innocent foreign laborers and investors" the moral obligation of the accused persons is several times heavier than the classical white man's burden.

Think of the brainwork and patience demanded in doing anything so that nobody on earth will be even slightly perturbed by the act! No wonder the accused turn in despair upon their moralizing tormentors and declare that the world's hypersensitiveness is chiefly to blame for panics! No wonder they say that if everybody is ward and guardian of everybody else everybody is to blame for industrial crises and money stringencies!

MIXUP ON BROWNSVILLE REPORT

But All Save Three Republican Senators Will Vote to Sustain President.

WASHINGTON.—There is a mixup in the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in its attempt to reach an agreement on the character and scope of the report which it will make to the Senate of its investigation of the affair at Brownsville, Tex., in August, 1906, which resulted in the dismissal of three companies of negro troops from the army by President Roosevelt. After a long discussion today the committee adjourned until Thursday. It is certain that its report will not be submitted to the Senate until next week.

The membership of the committee is very much divided. Senators Fulton, of Oregon, and Hemenway, of Indiana, about whose attitude there has been some uncertainty, made it plain at today's meeting that they would join with the majority to sustain the contention of President Roosevelt that the negro soldiers were responsible for "shooting up" Brownsville. But some of the Republicans who will sign the majority report want to qualify their approval of the President's action in dismissing the negro troops by recommending that all the discharged soldiers who can show that they were not concerned in the raid and did not try to conceal the identity of the guilty persons shall be restored to the army.

The four Democrats who agree with the majority object to any such qualification. They hold that none of the discharged soldiers should be reinstated and want to make a recommendation that all negroes shall be excluded from enlistment. The five Republicans who will act with the Democrats in fixing on the negro troops the responsibility for the raid will not go that far. Senators Foraker, Scott and Bulkley, the Republicans who will submit a minority report, will hold that the evidence does not warrant fastening the guilt upon the discharged soldiers and may recommend that all the men discharged be restored to the army immediately. It seems to be pretty well established that three reports will be submitted by the committee.

In Spokane.

The following letter has been received by the Spokesman-Review. It seems only proper that the question should be put up to the financiers of the city, so it has passed along:

"Columbia Falls, Mont., Nov. 13.—Mr. Editor Spokesman-Review: i se bi youse papper of Monday dat de bankers After feeding their faces at louis davenports Feels konfident dat de monie cituasion is Airite an i wod ask wi in hel dey shodent be konfident wen dey got all our monie and wont give it up. Yours troly,

"MICHAEL CUSICK.

"valleyford wash wen im home."

In the Tropical Belt.

Drain Nonpareil.

Talk about being "handed a lemon." On Wednesday Mrs. J. M. Stark, of Elkton, sent us a lemon that IS a lemon. It was grown in her garden at Elkton. It is about 13 inches in circumference and looks more like a pumpkin than a lemon. The tree is four years old and has been bearing for three seasons. About all of the tropical fruits can be grown here to perfection, with the possible exception of bananas and "tarantulas."

Admires an Oregonian Editorial.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 12.—(To the Editor.)—I wish to congratulate The Oregonian on its recent splendid editorial "A Little More Folding of the Hands to Sleep." It is brimful of good horse sense and rings out one more stroke for the people. Let the good work go on. The voters will show at the polls their appreciation. E. A. BARNS.

Horticultural Advice.

Weston Leader.

The freezing of apples from this section while in transit to the markets of the East during the Winter months could be avoided if growers could be induced to graft red pepper pods on the trees at the proper time. This would warm up the fruit and dispel the frost.

Uncle Bill's Matrimonial Agency.

Dallas Itemizer.

Uncle Bill Brown is still receiving letters from persons who want to get some of the widows he fed on his birthday. Uncle Bill helped in the good cause by offering a nice rocking chair to the widows present who got spliced within six months.

INSURANCE OF BANK DEPOSITS

Examiner Wilson Suggests a Plan to Insure Complete Safety.

PORTLAND, Or., Dec. 10.—(To the Editor.)—About three years ago I prepared an article upon the creation of a safety fund for bank deposits, intending to have it read before the National Bankers' Association then about to meet in New York, but as the convention date drew near, knowing how wise the Eastern financiers were and fearing that there might be some weak spot in my argument which would justify the current Eastern idea that no good could come out of the West, I withheld the article until I could have it passed upon by some one of greater experience than myself. Happening to be in Washington a few days later, I submitted the paper to Hon. William B. Ridgely, Controller of the Currency, and asked him to read it carefully and point out the weak places in my argument. He read it with considerable interest and said I had covered every point; that I had touched upon the character of opposition with which it would meet, namely that the officers of the larger banks would see in such a plan an attempt to make the strong banks secure the deposits of the weaker ones, as well as the possible leveling of individual prestige. A few days later I sent the article to the Financier, published in New York City, and it appeared in a subsequent number of the magazine together with another article upon the same subject written by one of the associate editors. They attracted considerable attention at the time and the agitation in favor of some method by which bank deposits may be made as secure as bank notes, has become general.

C. F. Allis, vice-president of the Second National Bank, of Erie, Pa., has prepared a bill to be introduced in the present Congress, providing that a fund for this purpose shall be created by an assessment of the National banks varying from $100 to $500 each per year, according to their capitalization, said fund to be placed in the custody of the Treasurer of the United States and the proceeds used to meet the deficit in amounts due depositors in failed National banks after the assets have been exhausted.

This expense is slight when compared with the benefits to be derived, and it goes without saying that if a law of this character had been in effect when the present panic began, there would have been no necessity of clearing-house certificates or legal holidays. The millions of currency now being hoarded by the banks through fear of a possible run by frightened depositors, would have been in circulation and the residents of this Coast would not have known there was a panic. There would have been no frightened depositors in this broad land if it was known that their savings were protected by a fund under control of the Treasurer of the United States.

The opposition to this safeguard against a panic comes from the so-called strong banks whose officers imagine that their depositors need no protection, but the panic of 1907 began with these strong banks and they were the first to refuse to pay their obligations in cash. The smaller and so-called weak banks were compelled to follow suit because they could not control their own reserves in the custody of their Eastern correspondents. And yet so simple a remedy for distrust is frowned upon by no less a personage than ex-Secretary of the Treasury Leslie M. Shaw who calls it paternalism, and by a local financial publication which refers to it as "The River Platte Remedy."

If it is paternalism for the banks to ask the Treasurer to become custodian of a fund raised by themselves, why is it not paternalism for the banks to make a deposit of bonds with that same officer for the protection of their circulating notes? If it is paternalism to compel the banks to insure their deposits, why is it not paternalism for the Treasury Department, through its agents, to supervise the management of the banks and make semi-annual examinations of their condition? It should not condemn the plan for Mr. Bryan to see merit in it, for even Mr. Bryan may occasionally be right.

The American Review of Reviews for December sees nothing to laugh at in the proposition, and after discussing it fairly and intelligently says:

"It is not well to jump to the conclusion that this step ought to be taken. It is evident, however, that in a time of panic, when all banks are in some danger of having frightened depositors crowding their doors, a Government guaranty of the safety of deposits would make a vast difference. * * * If the Government could offer protection to the depositors as it does to the noteholders, the National banks, at least, would be practically immune from the outbreak of depositors' panics. As for the state banks, it would seem possible for the states, if they so chose, to offer protection to depositors, the same thing being true of savings banks."

In Montana the last Bankers' Convention appointed a committee to draft a bill for presentation by the next Legislature, providing for the protection of depositors practically along the lines proposed by Mr. Allis. The Review of Reviews further says:

"There is great question as to the propriety of pushing the functions of government very far in the direction of the ownership of public service enterprises. A very different extension of government agency, however, is that which lies in the line of the securing of monetary and financial conditions. It is a great public misfortune when the honest and industrious poor are so afraid of the savings banks that they rush to draw their money out in times like those of last month."

It is not within the possibilities of a newspaper communication to go fully into the advantages of a safety fund for bank deposits, but the proposition is entitled to respectful consideration. The time is approaching when something of the kind will become a law, and the idea cannot be laughed away. If the banks are wise they will not oppose it, but will rather help to frame a law that will be mutually satisfactory, for serious opposition from that quarter will prompt the people who are most interested, to action, and they will take it over the heads of the wise men and make it a prerequisite to an election to either branch of Congress.

EUGENE T. WILSON,
National Bank Examiner.

A FEW SQUIBS.

"Well, Bobbie, do you like your new Sunday school?" "I can tell better when I find out what they give you for being good."—Life.

Little Clarence—Poppy, what is a millenium? Mr. Slewfoot—It's dess about de same as a centennial, muh son, on'y it's got mo' legs.—Puck.

"So you are hungry, eh?" said the woman to the tramp. "How would a few chops suit you?" "Lamb or wood?" asked the tramp, cautiously.—Philadelphia Record.

Mr. Stingely—I think it's a mistake to make children believe there's a Santa Claus. Mrs. Stingely—I can't see any harm in it. Mr. Stingely—Why, it makes them expect too much.—Judge.

Markley—Scribbles is coming along famously, isn't he? Crittick—How do you mean? Markley—He tells me that he has been spoken of as the coming novelist. Crittick—Yes, he has spoken of it a good deal.—Philadelphia Post.

Father (angrily)—I wish you would let that painter chap alone. I never see him that he isn't coming out of a saloon. What is his artistic specialty, anyhow? Son (cautiously)—He is a marine painter, and I rather think he devotes himself particularly to schooners crossing the bar.—Baltimore American.

Another Idaho jury has failed to convict Steve Adams of the murders he confessed to. But, as the bodies of the victims were found and buried, there is reason to believe they are still dead.—Kansas City Star.

POTPOURI

BY NANCY LEE.

Matrimony is Cupid's clearing-house certificate.

Alimony is the divorce court's asset currency.

* * *

Jack Day, president of the Depositors' Association of the Oregon Trust & Savings Bank, recently celebrated his 35th birthday and was felicitated on the event by a French employe of the defunct institution:

"Ah, monsieur, congratulazions," said the Frenchman. "I am 33 years old, so I will, of course, respect you some, but not very much."

* * *

Overheard in a Cafe.

He—Drink to me only with thine eyes.

She—Well, here's looking at you.

* * *

A. L. Mills, president of the First National Bank, is said to have jocularly remarked, "Roosevelt is undoubtedly responsible for the present financial situation, he has removed from the coin of the realm 'In God we trust,' and naturally people have lost their confidence."

* * *

They are telling the following story about a traveling man who makes frequent trips across the continent and who is on familiar terms with one of the Pullman car porters by the name of Sam Lee. On one of his recent journeys to New York, the traveling man greeted the whisk-broom wielder with a beaming countenance and announced: "Well, Sam, we've had a birth in our family, and twins at that."

"Why, dat am no birth, sah, dat's a section."

* * *

On one occasion Thomas Jefferson, while dining with some friends, was called upon to ask the blessing. For a moment he was nonplused, but with a noble effort gave thanks, but not being overly familiar with the proper finale, it seemed impossible to come to a period. Finally, in despair as to the proper termination, he raised his voice and declared, with victorious finality, "Yours truly, Thomas Jefferson."

* * *

The Final Test.

Smith—Is Jenkins the kind of a man who will stand up for his friends?

Brown—Yes, indeed, anywhere except in a streetcar.

* * *

Some 20 years ago, when J. Pierpont Morgan visited in Portland and when T. Jefferson Coolidge was first director of the O. R. & N., Colonel J. W. Nesmith remarked to a friend: "The only man I've got any use for who splits his name, is E Pluribus Unum."

* * *

Wife—Do call with me at Mrs. Barker's, John. She'll make you feel as if you were at home.

Husband—Then what's the use in going?

* * *

A New York divorcee, upon receiving her decree, resumed her maiden name. Invited one afternoon to a bridge party, she drove to the residence with one of the young debutantes.

Upon alighting, the young girl remarked: "Did you know that this is to be a series of bridge? The girls are asked this afternoon, and the matrons tomorrow afternoon."

"Oh, heavens," said the facetious divorcee, "evidently then I'm expected this evening."

* * *

On a recent visit to New York the champion, Jim Jeffries, dined at the Hotel St. Regis and ordered a broiled lobster, which was served minus a claw. Noting the defect, the conqueror of Fitzsimmons demanded that it be taken back to the cuisine. The colored waiter, recognizing the prize-fighter, laughingly remarked: "I spec Mistah Jeffries, that lobster done been in a fight."

"Well, if that's the case," said Jeffries, "take it back and bring me the winner."

* * *

A Quaker, living in Pennsylvania, received a letter from his son, who is now living in Oregon. In speaking of the sequoia gigantica tree, the son declared that the bark of the tree was 24 inches thick. In reply, the aged Quaker wrote: "My son, I regret that thee hath fallen into the habit of lying like other Westerners, for that statement is truly impossible." To convince his faher, the eon procured the bark of the tree, which was 24 inches thick, and expressed it East, C. O. D. To get the package delivered the "old man" was forced to pay $14. Upon receipt of the bark he tearfully acknowledged the note in this manner: "My son John: Thee need not prove thy statements any more. It is too expensive. We will take thee at thy word."

* * *

The Goldfield editor who killed a mining promoter that objected to an exposure of his unsavory record, was probably demonstrating the truth of that paraphrase, "Death loves a mining shark."

THE EVENING LIGHT.

By Alfred Austin, Poet Laureate of England.
From the Independent.

Angels their silvery trumpets blow
At dawn, to greet the morning glow,
And mortals lift adoring eyes
To see the glorious sun arise.
Then winged with faith and urged by hope,
Youth scans the hill and scales the slope;
Its pulses bound, its thoughts exult,
It finds no danger difficult,
Doubles the pace, disdaining ease,
Victor before it comes and sees,
Deeming the universe its own,
The sovereign of a self-made throne.

Each hope achieved, fulfilled each prayer,
We glory in the noonday glare,
Welcome the blinding heats of strife,
Deeming the resistance part of life.
We deal the blow, return the stroke,
Fighting our way through dust and smoke,
Until, our battle banner furled,
We tower above a conquered world.
Whether we lead mankind along
By gift of speech or grace of song,
Seize with a strenuous hand the helm,
Or add an empire to the realm,
We front the sun with forehead bare,
Still glorying in the noonday glare.

But, as the lengthening shadows glide
Silent along the eventide,
Till dews baptize lawn, leaf and flower
In that dim sanctuary hour,
A sacred something haunts the air,
Tender as love, devout as prayer,
And in the darkening dome afar
Glimmers one bright, outriding star,
Announcing to the sentry sight
Coming battalions of the night.
The noonday glare and morning low
Pale into shadowy longago.
We feel earth's vain ambitions fade
Into the vanished dust they made.
All that the glow of dawn foretold,
And all the noonday sun unrolled,
Seem nothing to the quiet joy,
No clamor mars, no care annoy,
'Twixt restless day and restful night
That sanctifies the evening light.

Swinford Old Manor, Kent, England.