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..... 3.00

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; S. P. Hansen, S. Rice, George Carson.
Kansas City, Mo.—Ricksecker Cigar Co., Ninth and Walnut; Yoma 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; Megeath Stationery Co.
Des Moines, Ia.—Mose Jacobs.
Sacramento, Cal.—Sacramento News Co., 430 K street; Amos News Co.
Salt Lake—Moon Hamilton & 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.
San Jose, Cal.— St. James Hotel News Stand.
Dallas, Tex.—Southwestern News Agent, 514 Main street; nine two street wagons.
Amarilla, Tex.—Timmons & Pope.
San Francisco—Forster & Orear; Ferry News Stand; Hotel St. Francis News Stand; L. Parent; N. Wheatley; Fairmount Hotel News Stand; Amos News Co.; United News Agency, 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, WEDNESDAY, FEB. 5, 1908.

THE PROVINCIALS.

This story is told in an English newspaper. There is pith in it, and point enough, to engage the reader's attention:

Mr. Woodrow Wilson, president of the Princeton University and a notable American historian, expressed interesting views in a lecture at Columbia University yesterday. He said: "If you live in a place where you can sit around a stove in a country store you are much more likely to have opinions than if you lived in New York."

He accordingly argued that Senators from the Western States were of more genuine value to the country than Eastern people.

In the East there was no time for original thought. People merely formed ideas from newspapers.

He thought that a National newspaper should be established, as the papers in great cities were provincial not a National medium.

This is not wholly true; very few statements, in which opinions are expressed, are truth absolute. And yet in this anecdote there is near approximation to truth.

But there are difficulties on both sides. You may hear a lot of good stuff in the talk around a stove in a country store. Original ideas crop out there. The talkers may survey mankind from China to Peru. But there may be lacking actual knowledge of the practicability and limitation of their ideas. There is too much tendency to overlook the lessons of human experience. Those lessons, indeed, are not before the minds of the speakers; who are too apt to think the ideal and the possible all one. And yet large ideas and impulses come out of such a situation, and the world of thought and action is continually refreshed by the effort.

On the other hand, the great city is centered in itself and upon itself. It becomes provincial; and the bigger it grows the more provincial it becomes. Take the great capitals—London, New York, Paris. To the great body of the people of each of these capitals, their city is the whole world.

But you do not find North Yamhill, or Prineville, with all their rusticity, imagining so vain a thing. Around the stove in the country store you will hear discourse on affairs of the wide world, such as you never will hear in the big cities that deem themselves all in all. The provincialism of the great cities is one of the chief hindrances of all civilizations. Yet it is no new thing. It always has been so. It was quite as much so in Rome two thousand years ago as it is now in New York, London or Paris.

The suggestion that a national newspaper should be established to cure our big cities of their provincialism is not practicable. It wouldn't cure them. Their people wouldn't read it, nor understand it if they should read it. Everything about them tends to concentration of their thoughts upon themselves. On the other hand, the philosophy you hear in the discourses about the stove in the country store deals with all things in the world of man and mind and matter, of potential energy and simple existence and whys and wherefores, and some other things. It isn't ultimate wisdom, we may admit; but it is a surer road to ultimate wisdom than the average thinking of New York and London—seats of the provincial and parochial press of the English-speaking world.

The attempt of the New York Board of Aldermen to stop women from smoking in public by municipal law has been turned down by Mayor McClellan's veto. While there can be no diversity of opinion among reputable men and women, who honor clean, dignified, lovable, old-fashioned womanhood, in regard to women smoking either in private life or in public places, the discrimination attempted against a habit in women that is indulged everywhere unrebuked by men savors too much of class legislation to pass muster in an American city or commonwealth. The young woman with a cigarette is erroneously held to be a menace to the moral sense and the physical stamina of posterity. Apprehension in this line is diminished by the reflection that girls of this type are not in training for motherhood. They may and do marry, it is true, but the one redeeming feature of these lives is that their sins of omission or commission are not visited upon posterity. They do not have children.

STATEMENT ONE NOT OBLIGATORY.

Nowhere in the direct primary law is it ordained that candidates for the Legislature shall "take" Statement No. 1. The effort of Democrats and of the U'Ren class of Demo-Republicans to make the public believe that the primary law requires the taking of Statement No. 1 by all candidates for the Legislature ignores the presence in the law of Statement No. 2, which is as important a part of the law as Statement No. 1. Nor, as a matter of fact, does the primary law declare that candidates for the Legislature must subscribe to either statement; the law allows them discretion, either to pledge themselves to vote for the so-called "people's choice" or their party's choice, or to consider the "people's choice" as nothing more than a recommendation, or to subscribe to no pledge at all. Statement No. 2, contained in the same part of the primary law as Statement No. 1, is as follows:

> During my term of office I shall consider the vote of the people for United States Senator in Congress as nothing more than a recommendation, which I shall be at liberty to wholly disregard if the reason for doing so seems to me to be sufficient.

Suppose a Republican candidate for United States Senator should be nominated by a minority of his party against the will of the majority, and rejected by the majority in the general election (a likely outcome)—in that case, should the Democratic candidate, winning the general election, be designated the "people's choice," that is, the choice of 30,000 or 40,000 Republican majority in this state? Should a Republican aspirant for the Legislature bind himself to vote for the Democratic candidate for Senator, merely because the minority Republican candidate was rejected, and make this state to be represented in Washington—in the most intensely political office that Oregon possesses—by a Democrat?

If Republicans of Oregon could nominate for Senator a man the majority of them want elected, then in the general election, in running against the Democrat, he would be the "people's choice" in the true sense of the name and the Legislature ought to elect him. But in the June election the 65,000 Republicans of Oregon may have to pick between two nominees, neither of which they really want elected—the Democratic nominee and the one named by a minority of the Republicans. In that case will it be fair to call the winner "the people's choice?" Manifestly, the winner would not be the people's choice.

These matters are mentioned simply for the purpose of pointing out the humbug of the "people's choice" doctrine. The people should elect their United States Senators. Their delegates in the Legislature should have nothing to do with this function. The change can be effected, however, only by amending the National Constitution—and many of the states have called for it.

The Oregon method does not enable the people to name their choice for Senator. And aspirants for seats in the Legislature are not obliged by the law to bind themselves to that method. The law allows them a variety of pledges, besides adherence to Statement No. 1.

Not another state in the Union has Oregon's Statement No. 1, or anything like it. Not another state of the Union proposes to set aside, in the method of electing Senators, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The method of the Constitution must prevail till the Constitution shall be changed. To take the popular vote on Senator is very proper as a guide. But it cannot control the Legislature, nor will it, to the extent of causing a Democratic Legislature to elect a Republican Senator, or a Republican Legislature to elect a Democratic Senator. It is really childish to think of it.

SHERMAN ACT INADEQUATE.

The unanimity of opinion regarding the outcome of the suit against the Harriman merger is so pronounced that it seems strange that any attempt should have been made to attack it on the lines which Attorney-General Bonaparte is forced to follow. "In logic and as a measure of public policy," says the New York Times, "the suit is senseless and without warrant. But the law has apparently been violated, and that justifies the Attorney-General. He has no choice; he must sue, though his suit can have but a sterile and empty triumph." No denial which the Harriman people can make will convince any one that competition between the Southern Pacific and Union Pacific has not been eliminated. We have the prima facie evidence ever before us. We do not even expect that Mr. R. B. Miller, in charge of traffic for the O. R. & N. Union Pacific, will engage in any violent competition for business with Mr. R. B. Miller, in charge of traffic for the Southern Pacific.

The only semblance of an excuse why competition should be indulged in under such circumstances might lie in the fact that not all of the stockholders in the Union Pacific are stockholders in the Southern Pacific, and vice versa. But, even in this case, Mr. Harriman is like the man who was uncertain as to his destination in the next world, for he "has friends in both places," and to avoid offense it is but natural that he should divide the territory just as Mr. Hill divided the territory of the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific before and after the celebrated merger suit which resulted in divorcing the properties but failed to restore competition.

But while it is expecting too much to look for any tangible results that will benefit the people, the prosecution of Mr. Harriman for violation of the Sherman act will bring to light the shortcomings of that act, and thus show the vital importance of a substitute under which prosecutions can be carried on with some assurance of success. Enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission might accomplish something on these lines, and, if that should not prove practicable, effects similar to those conferred on shippers by active competition might be secured through local maximum rate bills in the states traversed by these roads.

The people of the Pacific Northwest have suffered most by this Union Pacific merger, and they are becoming extremely dissatisfied with the division of territory which gives California the corn and Oregon the husks. The outcome of the pending suit promises to be somewhat farcical, but there will be nothing farcical about the measures that may be invoked to replace the inoperative Sherman law.

VOTERS AS LAWMAKERS.

Now we may see how extensively the people of Oregon have embarked on the business of making their own laws. Nineteen measures are to be submitted under the terms of the initiative and referendum. The time expired Friday when such bills might be filed with the Secretary of State at Salem; so we know that there will be just nineteen, no more, no less. It is enough, far more than enough. The voter has ample time, perhaps, between now and the June election to acquaint himself with the provisions of these bills. But will he? He will not. Very few will take the time or trouble to know what these things are about, or what vital and far-reaching effect they will have on the legislation and life in Oregon. For these measures are important, every one of them, and some of them are revolutionary. Take, for example, the extraordinary constitutional amendment proposing in effect the single tax as the sole method for all future property tax in Oregon. It proposes to exempt from taxation all manufacturing establishments and all dwellings and to impose the chief tax burden hereafter on land. If this measure shall pass there will be readjustment and reform of all values in Oregon that will shake and undermine the whole property structure at its very foundation. Here is an innovation that no sane community would adopt, if at all, without careful consideration and long preparation; yet here in Oregon a few agitators and reformers propose that it shall be done by the mere scratch of the careless or uninformed voter's pen.

The facilities for law-tinkering and lawmaking in Oregon are too easy, and we are beginning to see that they are dangerous, or at least that they may be employed in dangerous and ruinous ways.

MR. WALTON'S LUCK.

Charles Walton is an enterprising young man who mounted a streetcar four years ago and proceeded to rob the passengers. Policeman Nelson venturing to interfere with the business which he had initiated, Walton shot him. We have learned of, late from Dr. Day and other great moralists that business must not be interfered with, no matter though it be robbery; but at that time the world was not so advanced in its standards and Walton was arrested. He was taken before the Judge and ordered to say whether he was guilty or not of the two charges against him. One that he had attempted to rob the passengers in the car, the other that he had tried to murder the policeman. Walton seems not to have been quite certain whether he was guilty or not, and accordingly asked for time to make up his mind. The court graciously allowed him several weeks which he spent in meditation, and, possibly, in prayer. Then he was again haled before the bar of justice.

At this momentous point in the proceedings a lapse occurred. It seems that the judge forgot to ask him again whether he was guilty or not. It is difficult to understand how the omission injured Mr. Walton. At the worst it only deprived him of an opportunity to say that he was guilty, which opportunity he did not desire; for clearly he had made up his mind to defend himself, and this he was permitted to do. By his conduct Walton pleaded not guilty; his plea was accepted and the trial proceeded on that basis. He was deprived of nothing but the privilege of confessing his guilt, a privilege which he had no intention of using. There is no intimation that the trial was not perfectly fair. The evidence was such as the law demands for conviction, and the judge's charge to the jury seems to have been impregnably proper. The prisoner's guilt was established beyond all possible doubt; the jury brought in a verdict of guilty on both charges, and Walton was sentenced to thirty years in the penitentiary. Of this sentence he has served four years. The Supreme Court now intervenes and declares that the omission to ask Walton a second time whether he was guilty or not was fatal to the validity of the trial. The sentence is annulled and the whole must be begun again from the beginning.

One exquisitely humorous phase of the subject is that the evidence taken in the former trial has lost all its virtue and cannot be used again. Evidence is like wine. After the bottle is once opened it goes stale. The only way to convict Walton now is to make the witnesses say all over again what they said before. The verbatim report of their former testimony has lost all its veracity. This beautiful provision for the protection of crime is important to Walton, since two of the principal witnesses against him have gone to parts unknown. Very likely his lawyer waited for this interesting contingency to occur before he moved upon the fortress of the Supreme Court. The grant of a new trial before the hostile witnesses had vanished might not have been so much of a favor as it is now.

Students of jurisprudence as it is practiced should note two or three significant facts about the Walton reversal. In the first place nobody, either in court or elsewhere, entertains any doubt whatever that he is guilty as charged. Secondly, his guilt was adequately proved, as the law requires. Thirdly, Walton was deprived of no right in the course of his trial which was of the slightest advantage to him. The omission to ask him whether he was guilty or not was the omission of an empty ceremony. If he had been asked the question and had not answered, the law would have presumed him innocent. It made the same presumption when the incantation was left out altogether. Fourthly, although the jury in the former trial held the testimony true, it cannot be used in the new trial. Finally, a conviction now becomes almost impossible because the witnesses have disappeared. Is not the farce delirious? Were such a train of incidents presented on the stage, critics would say that it was wildly improbable.

What makes this blow at practical justice more significant is the fact that it is one of many almost precisely alike. The Washington Post thinks The Oregonian must have had a bad digestion because it animadverts upon the love of some of our courts for scholastic subtleties. But the belief that they prefer ingenious technicalities to the substance of justice is no nightmare arising from a disordered stomach. Would it were; but the evidence to the contrary is too abundant and too big with dangerous import to society.

Although by his own statement Coroner Finley knew that the girl Golda Rowland died at the Radium quackery, and although he had Dr. Locke's report that she died from a criminal operation, still he can say that he held no inquest because "there could be no evidence secured on which to base a reasonable belief of convicting anybody." What did Coroner Finley do to get the evidence or lay it before the proper officers? Mr. Finley's account of that extraordinary death certificate falls to explain it; nor is it clear to the ordinary intellect how he can separate himself into two distinct individuals as he does, one being Coroner and the other a mere undertaker with no public duties whatever, even when a patent crime lies under his very eyes. The single item in these transactions which is above reproach is the conduct of Dr. Locke. He appears to have done his whole duty where duty was unpleasant and perhaps dangerous. If others had acted with his promptitude and courage, justice might have reached the criminals who have now escaped, perhaps forever.

A Newburg, N. Y., dispatch announces that in spite of the Winter weather work on the new palace which E. H. Harriman is building near Arden, N. Y., is still in progress, with a payroll of $10,000 per month. The house is built in the form of an old English castle, and will cost about $4,000,000. It will be pleasing to the people of Oregon to learn that the vigorous swing of the big stick has not deprived the railroad king of the right to spend the money wrung from the producers of Oregon and other states in $4,000,000 palaces. There is, of course, no money for opening up the isolated regions of Oregon, but the times will never get so hard that the Harrimans and all of their kind will not have enough to gratify their own selfish inclinations for pleasure. If the recent upheaval has disturbed the financial condition of the men it was aimed to reach, it is not in evidence that success has been achieved.

Old Mars ought to feel fairly comfortable over the outlook for the future. A London dispatch from Tangier announces that the French and the Moors have been getting so close togeiher that 10,000 of Othello's countrymen were killed in a little sortie with the French a few days ago. Russia has just dispatched 5000 troops to the Turko-Persian frontier in anticipation of trouble which may make necessary a Russian bluff at Turkey. The situation in India is increasing in gravity, and the anarchists are stirring up matters throughout Europe. These diversions, while the mighty white squadron is plowing its way through the Straits of Magellan in anticipation of police duty in the Pacific, are sufficient in their way to cause some anxiety in the mind of the dove of peace, as well as elsewhere in the camps where men would rather have peace without being obliged to fight for it.

The Japanese Diet, after a heated debate, has decided to increase the taxes on sugar, sake, alcohol, beer and kerosene. As the people are already groaning under the weight of an enormous war debt, it is not surprising to learn that this added burden was not agreed to without a struggle. The acting Minister of Finance, in explaining the measure, stated that the increase in taxation was absolutely necessary, and that he believed the people would be willing to pay it. This action confirms previous reports that the Nippon Empire, through its extravagant subsidies and other wild schemes of industrial expansion, had reached the limit of its credit abroad. It now remains to be seen to what lengths the patriotism and patience of the people will permit the leaders to go.

The ancient measure providing for the payment of claims of the American sealers who had their property seized in Behring Sea before the American Government discovered that such seizures were illegal is again before the Senate. Unlike some of the claims which bob up at each session, the chances of this sealing claim seem to improve as the years go by. In view of the treatment given British sealing claims for damages which were inflicted by American revenue cutters at the same time the American seizures were made, it is a disgrace to this country that American sealers should have been deprived of their just remuneration for more than twenty years, and it now seems probable that the Government may right the wrong done.

One hundred hopgrowers have announced their willingness to co-operate with the Pacific Coast Hopgrowers' Union and cut down the acreage of their yards 30 per cent. This will, of course, restrict the output, and, other conditions remaining unchanged, prices should improve. But suppose that the oncoming wave of prohibition sweeps over more than 30 per cent of the beer drinkers? Will it then be necessary still further to reduce the acreage of hops, or will some wise man discover a method of converting them into a new kind of breakfast food? The possibilities for trouble in the hop market and the hop fields are unlimited, so long as it is impossible to determine where the prohibition wave will establish its high-water mark.

It is one of the beauties of illustrated journalism that the portrait of a coming theatrical celebrity may also be employed when the subject receives two weeks' notice.

One cannot help but admire Bourke Cockran's ingenuity in using praise of Roosevelt to boost the Bryan boom.

They who hold oratory not as a lost art may take comfort in the Congressional proceedings of Monday.

We see only one way out of it: Invoke the initiative on the crematory site.

ONE VIEW OF BRYAN'S CHANCES

He Must Make Gains in the East, or Revolutionize Middle West.

New York Sun.

While Mr. Bryan is adamant in insisting upon a single term of the Presidency for any incumbent, there is no reason why he should not be a candidate as often as the Democratic party can be persuaded to nominate him. For his desire to make a third campaign he can cite the Cleveland precedent. It is true that Mr. Cleveland was elected the first time, missed election the second time by losing New York State and swept the country the third time. Mr. Bryan has sustained two sweeping defeats, but the buoyancy of his nature is such that he could stand a third defeat, as he has frankly announced, out of consideration for the Democratic party, which loves a winner but seldom is lucky enough to get one.

To students of Presidential elections since 1880 it seems clear enough that a Democratic candidate can scarcely hope to reach the White House unless he carries both Eastern and Western States. Even with his remarkable gains in the West in 1892, when he received electoral votes from Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio and California, as well as from Indiana, which he had carried in 1884, Mr. Cleveland's total of 276 electoral votes would have been reduced by the loss of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland and West Virginia to 207, and the electoral votes of these states transferred to General Harrison would have elected him. In neither of his campaigns did Mr. Bryan carry a single one of these six Eastern States; in fact, he lost all of them by large majorities that could be interpreted only as determined repudiation of Mr. Bryan and the principles he stood for. It is most significant of the want of faith of Mr. Bryan's friends in him as the Presidential candidate that they are never heard to say that he would have a fighting chance to carry one or more of these Eastern States if he should obtain the nomination again. With the exception of Maryland, which Mr. Bryan lost in both of his campaigns, they have continued to elect Republican Governors and Legislatures since 1896.

To justify their opinion that his candidacy would not be entirely futile, Mr. Bryan's friends must claim for him a large number of Western States which have been as regularly Republican since 1896 as the Eastern States which have always declared against him. Allowing Mr. Bryan the solid South, including Kentucky, he would have 135 electoral votes; add Missouri, Oklahoma, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming, the number would be 180; give him Indiana, Nebraska and South Dakota, it would rise to 207; throw in Kansas and California, which would increase his tally to 227 votes, and he would still be short 15 of the number required to elect, which will be 242; transfer Michigan's 14 votes to his column and he would still be in the minority in the electoral college. Thus it may be seen how utterly vain would Mr. Bryan's candidacy be unless he could convert the East, which no intelligent observer believes for a moment he could do. If the East rejected Mr. Bryan, there would be no hope for him unless he brought about a political revolution in the great Middle West, of which there is no sign at all.

It is to be noted that Mr. Bryan made a very much worse showing in 1900 than in 1896 in Western states which are allowed him, for the sake of exposition, in the above calculation. In Indiana the Republican plurality increased from 18,181 to 26,476; Kansas changed from a Bryan plurality of 12,269 to a McKinley plurality of 23,354, and Nebraska from a Bryan plurality of 13,576 to one for McKinley of 7822, while South Dakota gave McKinley in 1900 a plurality of 14,986 in place of a Bryan advantage of 183 in 1896; in California the Republican plurality increased from 2797 to 29,770; and in Missouri the Democratic plurality fell from 58,737 to 37,830; Michigan gave McKinley 56,868 in 1896 and 75,384 in 1900; Wyoming, which had recorded a Bryan plurality of 583 in 1896, gave McKinley 4318 in 1900; and Utah, which went for Mr. Bryan by 51,033 plurality in 1896, turned Republican by 2133 in 1900. In short, Mr. Bryan was a much weaker candidate in the West in 1900 than he was in 1896, and in both campaigns he polled almost the entire Populist vote.

The Middle West today, outside of Minnesota, where John A. Johnson is Governor, is incorrigibly Republican. In vain will the election statistics be scanned for a vestige of evidence favorable to the fortunes of Mr. Bryan as a Democratic candidate. With the East remaining the enemy's country and the West unchanged, no candidacy more futile than Mr. Bryan's could be conceived by the student of contemporary politics.

Dog and Alligator Close Friends.

Memphis Dispatch to the New York Herald.

Jim, an alligator, and Towser, a dog, the property of C. C Merz, of 178 South Front street, have formed a friendship which is one of the most remarkable in animal life. They even sleep together under the platform where their master has his work bench.

The alligator, which is now six feet long, has been the property of Mr. Merz ever since it was a baby, 17 years ago. It is a pet and travels all over the house.

He stops eating about the 1st of December and fasts until June. During this period he remains in a sluggish condition. His usual diet during his "eating period" consists of raw beef, varied with an occasional rat.

In the Summer he is active and has established a reputation as a pigeon catcher. When an unwary pigeon lights near Jim in the back yard, there is a quick snap and the pigeon is gone.

Judge Tells Wife to Don Breeches.

Atlanta Dispatch in New York World.

"Mrs. Jackson," said Judge Broyles recently, "you should certainly don the breeches in your home. Let your husband wear the dresses. You are the one who should rule." The case was brought to court through the action of the husband in ordering from his wife's boarding house Miss Ida Thompson, a pretty young woman, who went to church on Sunday with a young man who did not meet the approval of Mr. Jackson. Mrs. John Jackson objected to the course of her husband, and he slapped her face. Then she picked up a chair.

"I tried to kill him," said the wife. "I am quiet and peaceable so long as I am treated right, but when my anger is aroused the very old Nick is in me." Mrs. Jackson is the mother of 10 children. The Judge fined the husband.

Wealthy Man as Car Conductor.

Kalamazoo, Mich., Dispatch in New York World.

Superintendent Garrett, of the Kalamazoo Street Railway has received an application for a position as car conductor from A. S. Armstrong, of Mexico, Mo. The men are old friends, and Garrett says Armstrong owned an entire downtown block in the Missouri town and enough other real estate to make his fortune $200,000. Armstrong gives no reason for seeking a $2-a-day job except that he has sold his real estate to his brother.

ARE PARTIES A NECESSITY?

Primary Law Says They Are, but Statement No. 1 Says Not.

Eugene Register.

The primary election law says political parties are a necessity, then Statement No. 1 is injected declaring they are not. But the primary law is right in its declaration that political parties are a necessity, and being a necessity they should be maintained, and in order to be maintained, Republican Legislators should vote for a Republican candidate for Senator and Democrats for a Democratic Senator. But to sign Statement No. 1 is to deprive the Democrat or Republican of the privilege of standing by his party, which the primary law declares is necessary to do. Some candidates and many voters have an idea that a legislative candidate must sign Statement No. 1 in order to conform to the law. This is a mistake. Any candidate can make his own statement and the statement every Republican candidate for the Legislature should make, to be consistent with himself and his party, should be to the effect that he will support for United States Senator the Republican chosen as such at the June election. Every Democratic legislative candidate should do likewise, then the United States Senator would be elected on the first ballot from the two Senatorial candidates presented to them by a popular vote of the people.

That feature of the primary law which gives the voters the right to make choice of Senatorial candidates within their own party lines to be voted on by the Legislature, is all right and should be continued until such time as, by Federal enactment we shall have a constitutional amendment, vesting in the voters the sole authority in naming direct the choice for United States Senator. It eliminates political bosses and admits free expression of the public will in the matter and eventually, when the Federal amendment is adopted, both the old parties will be purged of bosses and scheming politicians and party lines will be drawn more closely in the Senatorial struggle than they are today, for the individual voter will take pride in the power his vote exercises just as he now exemplifies that pride in election of President of the United States, and therefore clings more closely to his partisanship in a Presidential election than in any other party contest. But until such time as this Federal change takes place, the only way to prevent degeneracy of both parties is for the legislative candidates in this state to stand by party principles which the primary law declares is necessary and utilize that principle in voting for United States Senator.

PROTECTION FOR VANISHING ELKS

Mercy for Hunted Animals Is Asked by Oregon Audubon Society.

PORTLAND, Feb. 4.—(To the Editor.)—In last Sunday's Oregonian I read an account of an "Exciting Elk Hunt in the Nehalem Mountains." It described how three men, aided by dogs, killed an entire family—the bull, the cow, and the calf. This was exciting from some points of view, interesting from other standpoints, but I can't help saying it was full of pathos to me.

I have no criticism to offer against the hunter, when he keeps within the limits of the law. The Oregon law permits the killing of elk. Our sister states know well that the elk needs protection to save it from extermination. It is a crime to kill one of these animals in California or Washington. Not so, in Oregon. Some people even thought the last Legislature would give protection to the scattered remnants of this noble species.

It is commonly known that elk are exceedingly scarce in this state. Dr. T. S. Palmer, of the Biological Survey, has been making an effort to locate the last few bands that are now left in our mountains. A few were reported in the Nehalem country, but this number is evidently reduced. A band was reported about the head waters of the Clackamas, but some of them likely fell during our last open season. Some were seen in the Alsea country, but a number of skillful hunters went after these.

Our last few bands of elk are wild and are making a stubborn fight in the wildest mountain haunts where they have been driven. But to every elk in the State of Oregon, there are hundreds of hunters equipped with the best long-range rifles, and dogs well trained to do the work.

I have no doubt we shall in the future elect law-makers who will protect our elk. As the years pass, sentiment crystallizes until we get results. Even if the last wild elk has been shot, a few of his weakened brothers may still find a lingering existence in our park. The name will always be perpetuated in the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks. Our children can read histories and visit the museums to see the mounted specimens. But even then, I suppose, some of us will not be satisfied, but will turn from the pictures, the statues, and the well mounted specimens and go back into the rugged mountainous parts and try to find some pleasure tramping the trails the elk have trod.

WILLIAM L. FINLEY,
President Oregon Audubon Society.

Saves and Takes Home a Marooned Dog

Philadelphia Inquirer.

Into the ice cold water of Cooper Creek, Samuel Floyd, of Sixth and Leid streets, Camden, N. J., plunged and swam to the opposite bank, a distance of 200 feet, to rescue a stranded dog that was almost dead from starvation and exposure. Floyd is employed in the Camden Iron Works, and while eating his dinner he saw the dog marooned on a small island. It aroused his sympathy, and putting aside his dinner pail, he removed his coat and jumped into the water, seized the dog, swam back with him, gave him part of his meal, and took him home when he quit work.

Schumann-Heink's Sons to Sing.

New York Times.

Madame Schumann-Heink, the famous contralto, says: "I have a secret for you. Two of my sons, Henry and Hans, are at present studying in Chicago and both are going to have wonderful bass voices. They will both be singing in opera before I myself have finished. Isn't it marvelous? I am so happy about it. All my life I have worked hard, but at last I have arrived at my goal. I have a home for my family and I am thoroughly happy. And I think that it has made my voice deeper and more settled, the knowledge that I myself am settled at last."

A FEW SQUIBS.

"Only a million. I got the Duke cheap." "But you must remember, dear, that it isn't the first cost that counts."—Louisville Courier-Journal.

"I always try to treat my maid as if she were a member of the family." "Gracious, how do you get her to put up with it?"—Chicago Record-Herald.

"Is your husband averse to taking the initiative in any energetic action?" "No, sir, he ain't nothin' o' the kind. He's jest plain down lazy."—Baltimore American.

Passenger—Boatman, hadn't we better bail her out? She's half full of water, Irish boatman—Och, niver mind, sor. Sure she'll run over when she's quite full—Punch.

"It's just an ordinary bolt, you say," said the man. "You ought to be able to duplicate it for 25 cents or so." "Oh, I guess, so," replied the machinist. "It's for Mr. Bleddy's motor car, you know," continued the man. "Oh, er—that bolt will cost you $2.50"—Philadelphia Press.

"There have been times," said the actor manager, "when I have shed real tears." "Ah, when you have been in great sympathy with the part you were playing," suggested the matinee girl. "No, when I have had my own money in the show," replied the actor-manager, with a tinge of sad remembrance in his tone.—Philadelphia Record.

BOOKS

ABSENT-MINDEDNESS largely rules the life of an eminent Berlin, Germany, philosopher-author, so much so that it is with difficulty his wife can induce him to attend to his meals and even pay slight attention to his social duties. The professor can't bear any social function that means separation from his beloved books. Not so very long ago, his wife announced that their silver wedding anniversary would occur on a particular day, and suggested that a society tea be given in honor of the occasion.

"Excellent idea," said the professor, and he graciously promised to lend distinction to the event by attending in person. The fateful evening came, and the guests began to arrive, when it was discovered that the lion of the occasion wasn't there. The professor's wife started to search for him and discovered him in the library, with the door locked.

"Heinrich," she called in a stage whisper, as she vigorously rattled the door, "come out. The people have arrived."

"Johanna," answered a deep, bass voice, "I am busy finishing such-and-such a chapter of my new book, and I don't want to be so often interrupted. Tell those people to come back when we have our golden wedding, and I shall then try to attend. Auf wiedersehen!"

* * *

Harper's Weekly has a great drawing card for the ensuing year when it announces the serial publication in its columns of a new novel by Robert Hichens, entitled "A Spirit in Prison." After "The Garden of Allah," anything that Mr. Hichens writes in fiction is of more than ordinary moment.

* * *

Some of the humor in Rudyard Kipling, the novelist, must surely be traced to his maternal grandfather, Rev. G. B. MacDonald. The story is told that as a young man, Mr. MacDonald wooed and won the daughter of a strict Methodist. The latter was a man of ice-cold propriety, and looked on demonstrations of affection as acts of the devil. One evening, this ultra-moralist happened rather suddenly to enter his family parlor, where young MacDonald and his daughter were, and was inexpressibly shocked to find that the two young folks were occupying the same chair!

"Mr. MacDonald," said the agitated father, "when I courted my wife she always sat at one side of the room, and I at the other."

"Well," said the unabashed lover, with cutting sarcasm, "that's what I should have done, if I had courted your wife."

* * *

Of the combination of Putnam's Monthly and The Reader, now under the management of the Bobbs-Merrill Company, of Indianapolis, the Publishers' Weekly says: It is announced from Indianapolis that a reorganization has been effected in connection with the Bobbs-Merrill Company which will bring $150,000 new capital into the business and provide for its continuance under the same management. The amount involved in the settlement is, approximately, $750,000, and most of the merchandise creditors have acceded to the proposition for settlement of 25 per cent in cash within 30 days and 25 per cent in one, two and three-year notes, with interest. It is understood that the banks of Indianapolis, which are involved to the extent of about $250,000, have also made arrangements which will insure their continuous support of the concern. The tangible assets, exclusive of plates, are understood to be approximately $650,000, leaving a deficit of $125,000 to be offset by plates, copyright and other intangible assets estimated as high as $300,000, and by the new working capital. The business of the firm especially in law books and miscellaneous books, has shown a profit approximating on the average $45,000 a year for the past nine years."

* * *

Justin McCarthy in a London letter to the Independent tells of some remarkable novels just published there, the chief of which he considers to be "The Dance of Love," written by Dion Clayton Calthrop, a grandson of Dion Boucicault, the actor.

* * *

Quite a group of new books on economics and sociology is promised before long. In a measure, Professor A. Lawrence Lowell's "England" belongs to the same mental class as Bryce's "The American Commonwealth." Professor Archibald Cary Coolidge, of Harvard, makes a critical study of the international position of the United States in "The United States as a World Power." Putnam Weale has written with his accustomed insight concerning "The Coming Struggle in the East." Dr. Hannis Taylor has gathered the fruits of many years' study into his book on "The Science of Jurisprudence." In sociological works, the discussion of socialism is naturally prominent. H. G. Well's "New Worlds for Old" and Robert Hunter's "The Socialists at Work" are specifically devoted to phases of this topic. Professor Edward A. Ross' "Social Psychology" opens up a new field, while Professor Hutton Webster's "Primitive Secret Societies" is a notable study in anthropology. John Graham Brooks' "As Others See Us" is primarily a critical work from a novel point of view. Professor William Bennett Munro's "The Government of European Cities" is supplemented by Professor John A. Fairlie's "Essays in Municipal Administration." Practical considerations are to the fore in Professor Charles Sumner Lobingier's "Popular Participation in Law Making," and Robert H. Fuller's "Government by the People."

* * *

So, Jack London has turned up, with a new novel of 140,000 words. To tell the truth, he arrived from the South seas sooner than expected.

* * *

The title of Winston Churchill's new novel, which is to be published this Spring, is "Mr. Crewe's Career."

* * *

The publishers of Miss Zona Gale's "The Loves of Pelleas and Etarre" have just sent the book to press for a new edition. They report that Miss Gale's book, which was published early in the Fall, is now selling better than at any time before Christmas.

* * *

Readers who remember the book called "An American Girl in London," and a great many will remember it, for it was one of the popular books of ten years ago, will welcome the announcement that Mrs. Everard Cotes has written another story on a theme not altogether different, "A Canadian Girl in London." The new book is said, however, to differ not only as to plot, but in point of view, and to contain in the form of a witty story.

* * *

Sir Gilbert Parker recommends a simple method whereby one may possess the books one would like to possess. "I have often said to myself," he remarked recently to a London audience, "'I cannot afford to buy that book.' And then I have said again, 'My dear fellow, if you will fast for one day you can buy three of them.' It is a book for a meal."

* * *

The Chicago Madrigal Club is offering a prize of 50 for an original poem to be used in its musical competition of 1908. The conditions of the competition, which should interest all poets, whether they mean to try for the prize or not, may be had by addressing D. A. Clippinger, 410 Kimball Hall, Chicago.