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; Empire News Stand.

St. Paul, Minn.—N. Ste. Marie, Commercial Station

Colorado Springs, Colo.—H. H. Bell.

Denver—Hamilton & Kendrick, 906-912 Seventeenth street; Pratt Book Store, 1214 Fifteenth street; H. 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.

Cincinnati, O.—Yoma News Co.

Cleveland, O.—James Pushaw, 307 Superior street.

Washington, D. C.—Ebbitt House, Fourteenth and F streets; Columbia News Co.

Pittsburg, Pa.—Fort Pitt News Co.

Philadelphia, Pa.—Ryan's Theater Ticket Office, Penn News Co.; A. P. Kemble, 3735 Lancaster avenue.

New York City.—Hotaling's news stands, 1 Park Row, 38th and Broadway, 42d and Broadway and Broadway and 29th. Telephone 6374. Single copies delivered; L. Jones & Co., Astor House; Broadway Theater News Stand; Empire News Stand.

Ogden.—D. L. Boyle; Lowe Bros., 114 Twenty-fifth street.

Omaha.—Barkalow Bros., Union Station; Mageath Stationery Co.; Kemp & Arenson.

Des Moines, Ia.—Mose Jacobs.

Fresno, Cal.—Tourist News Co.

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; Steipeck Bros.

Long Beach, Cal.—B. E. Amos.

Pasadena, Cal.—Amos News Co.

San Diego.—B. E. Amos.

San Jose.—Emerson, W.

Houston, Tex.—International News Agency

Dallas, Tex.—Southwestern News Agent, 344 Main street; also two street wagons.

Fort Worth, Tex.—Southwestern N. and A. Agency.

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 Agency, 14½ Eddy street; B. E. Amos, manager three wagons; Worlds N. S., 2625 A. Sutter street.

Oakland, Cal.—W. H. Johnson, Fourteenth and Franklin streets; N. Wheatley; Oakland News Stand; B. E. Amos, manager five wagons; Wellingham, E. G.

Goldfield, Nev.—Louie Follin.

Eureka, Cal.—Call-Chronicle Agency; Eureka News Co.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1908.

THE BILL FOR FREE PASSES.

One measure enacted by the recent Legislature is properly "held up" by the referendum. This is the compulsory pass bill. Every member of the Legislature who voted for it ought to be ashamed of the act. It proposes to make it necessary for the transportation companies of the state to grant passes to all the state and district officers in Oregon, to members of the Legislative Assembly, to Judges of the Supreme, Circuit and County Courts, and to the Sheriffs of all the counties. All these are to have passes, during their terms of office, from all transportation companies that file petitions for right of way, or right to cross or to connect with any other railway, or to appropriate materials for construction—of course on payment therefor. The first section, or preamble, is a miserable fiction or subterfuge, invented for the purpose of compelling free passes to officials, on pretense that such act is necessary for exercise of the state's power to control or regulate corporations. But since it is so shameless an act, it is scarcely unfit that a false excuse should be assumed as the basis of it.

The people decreed the abolition of the free pass system because it was a source of general injustice to them, and a source especially of corruption of politics and of public officials. Political managers could get passes practically without limit for themselves and for their workers, and business men who had the proper influence could get advantages through passes over others who had it not. But greatest of all the evils was that of issuing passes to members of the Legislature and to their retainers and friends. It not only had an influence—not always silent, either—over members dealing with matters in which corporate interests were concerned, but filled the lobbies of the Capitol with persons for whom members had solicited passes. On legislation the effect had long been apparent. Members of the Legislature, officials of every grade, politicians, rooters and lobbyists were riding the year round all over the state. It was not merely a public scandal, but was extremely injurious to the public welfare. By command of the people it was stopped, whereupon the Legislature invented an excuse for its re-enactment, for their own benefit, and for that of most other officials—thus continuing the main abuse which it had been the purpose of the state to suppress.

The passes, let it be observed, are not to be limited to the forty days of the session, during which there might be some occasion for the members to travel on official business, but which the state in any event will pay for as part of the expenses of the session. The passes are to run during the whole term of the members, and of course will be used by them for their personal convenience and profit, for the entire two years. To all the other officials the act carries the same favor. But when an official travels upon the business of the state, the expense is invariably charged up to the state under the general laws; and the members of the Legislature have their constitutional fee of $3 for every twenty miles of travel, going to and returning from the seat of government.

A most effective analysis of this act, and argument against it, have been published by the executive committee of Oregon State Grange. "Corporations," the committee say, "are not supposed to give something for nothing." To members of the Legislature the remark especially applies. Also, say the committee, "The 'condemnation' clause is only a flimsy excuse to legalize the giving of passes." There positively ought not to be a single vote in Oregon in favor of upholding this shameless act. The wonder is the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House should have had the hardihood—or "forgetfulness"—to sign it. The Governor—Chamberlain—is entitled to the credit of vetoing it; but both houses carried it over his veto, and now it is again before the people for their final judgment.

It is one of the few of the propositions on the list that may be easily understood;—though it is not fully or clearly stated in the form on the ballot. Here is the form:

> For an act requiring railroads and other common carriers to grant free transportation to state officers and County Judges and Sheriffs, as a condition precedent to acquiring land for corporate purposes by the exercise of eminent domain, and to prohibit the payment of mileage for such free transportation. Vote YES or NO.

The statement may really confuse the subject, unless the elector shall give it special attention. The proposition before the elector is simply this: "Free Passes for Officials—Yes or No."

PERSONAL LIBERTY AND PUBLIC WELFARE.

The American Brewer's Review is a recognized journal of the liquor trade. It declares that the individual liberty and personal freedom argument, against the right to sell and buy liquors, has lost much of its old force and seems destined to lose more, since "considerations of the public welfare are carrying us from the age of individualism into that of collectivism." In other words, "there is an evident and apparently inevitable tendency more and more to subordinate individual freedom to the larger interests of the community." This, doubtless, is a correct observation. The tendency towards an all-round socialistic view is obvious here, as in a multitude of other ways. The same writer says that the economic side of the subject—that is, the extent of the business and its relation to the public revenues—will not long furnish an argument against restriction and prohibition. What, then, can? Only the conviction that destruction of the trade and the commodity would be in the long run inconsistent with the moral and social public welfare. But is not that very conviction, namely, that the social and moral public welfare does require extinction of the business, assumed as the basis of the whole movement for prohibition?

Yet it remains to be said that effort in the direction of moral reform seldom reaches its full logical ultimate. Restriction of the liquor trade is not prohibition of it. Certain it is that prohibitionists themselves do not think prohibition practicable as a general policy; else they would push it in the large cities, as elsewhere. They do not deem it practicable in Portland as a whole, else they would not content themselves with pushing it in the outskirts, where indeed the trade is wanted little, if at all. Few men are consistent with the logic of their common or occasional action. They will vote for prohibition in the suburbs, where their homes are, but will not insist upon it, indeed do not want it, in the sections where their business is; and so they would vote against county prohibition, and, for the greater reason, against state prohibition. Again, many who have joined in forbidding the trade in their own counties would not vote for prohibition as a state measure or policy.

Perhaps it is this trait of human nature that the American Brewers' Review thinks about, when it talks of appeal to judgment on the larger social and moral aspects of the question. Certain it is that if the liquor trade is not to be annihilated, it will be because they who will not have liquors sold in their own localities will not join in prohibition of sale in the entire state.

THE GOSPEL OF GOOD FARMING.

In no other realm in the broad world of industry is the truth of the declaration, "Old things have passed away, behold all things have become new," more distinctly verified than in the domain of agriculture. In truth farming of the plodding, haphazard, hit-and-miss type is rapidly passing, and in its place farming with a reason for every step taken, every crop planted, is as rapidly coming to the front.

Formerly it was the man of dreamy, occult science who "wanted to know." The farmer thought he knew already, and when land, worn out from long cropping to wheat or timothy or clover or potatoes or corn, refused to return a profit to the cultivator, he—patient, untutored man—found reason for his wasted effort in the belief that the climate had changed, and, hoping for more favorable weather next year, he gathered his meager crops into his barn, sold the small surplus, plowed his fields again and reseeded them with the same wheat that they had so grudgingly given him the year before.

But all this, or much of it, is of the past, and in due time, owing to practical, intelligent means of disseminating information about soils, rotation of crops, etc., the farmer will, in due time, know his business and prosper in the knowledge thereof.

The demonstration railway train, such as the O. R. & N. Railway Company is now running through Eastern Oregon, is not new in the Middle West. For several years past farmers from the corn fields and orchards and meadows of Iowa, from the dairy farms of Wisconsin and Michigan, and from the wheat fields of Kansas, have flocked from far and near to greet the demonstration trains sent out by the railroads to inspect products that have literally been evolved from the soil by intelligent farming, and to listen to men who accompanied the trains to tell how the wonderful results were attained. The attendance upon agricultural colleges has been substantially increased by this means, and farmers' institutes, to which men and women of all sections and ages flock for instruction, have sprung up as the result of the encouragement that has been given by National and state departments of agriculture to this oldest of industries.

This is practical science, supplemented by an enthusiasm that is contagious and by farming that pays. No more blind following of the plow, nor doubtful scattering of the seed, nor wistful hoping for an unusually favorable season, nor helpless anxiety of the farmer—

> Lest on the threshing floor
> His hopeful sheaves prove chaff.

If certain conditions of feeding the soil, of rotation of crops and of careful cultivation are secured, there is practically no doubt of the returns from agriculture in this state within the radius of its assured rainfall, while in the semi-arid districts the same certainty of satisfactory returns for the intelligent effort is assured, contingent upon irrigation. Farmers are coming to know this, just as horticulturists have come to know that with intelligent selection, planting and treatment of orchards the returns in first-class fruit are certain, whether the orchards are located in the Hood River, the Rogue River or the Willamette Valley, or in the irrigated valleys of Eastern Oregon.

Coming close to Nature, men have studied and learned to understand her. They no longer run furrows on her face with a plow, scratch it with a harrow, scatter seeds in the wounds and sit down divided between hope and doubt as to the returns that will follow their blind though vigorous onslaught. So far as they have learned her ways and conformed their effort to meet them they have been rewarded with harvest abundance.

A BAD WAY.

From Salem, Or., comes a story which seems to show that the capital of this state retains some at least of the characteristics of a backwoods village. The tale runs that a socialist orator who began to make a speech on the street corner was silenced by a shower of eggs. We do not imagine that this speaker had anything very valuable to say, but he was either breaking the law or he was not. If he had permission to speak on the street it was an act of sheer rowdyism to break up his meeting by mob violence. If he had no permission, then it was the business of the police, and not of the rowdies, to silence him.

No doubt the persons who threw the eggs thought they were aiding the cause of property and government by their action, but we earnestly assure them they were mistaken. This Government is strong enough and good enough to endure all reasonable criticism which the socialists or anybody else may see reason to direct against it. The United States is not afraid to hear the truth about itself, and the rowdy who silences criticism by throwing eggs is no friend to law and order.

Moreover, the only protection property or "capital" has in this country is respect for the law. Destroy this respect and the last barrier is removed which fends off spoliation. The rowdy who assaults a speaker on the street shows much less respect for the law than does the socialist who criticises existing institutions. After all, the socialist employs nothing but words, and unless what he says is based upon fact and reason, it will fall without effect. Since the American people can read and think for themselves, they are in little danger of being misled by the logic of socialists or anybody else But the rowdy who throws eggs at a speaker defies decency and order. He is a practical anarchist. He demonstrates by his conduct that he cares nothing for the law and prefers the rule of mob violence and ruffianly passion. Intolerance of views which differ from the majority usually lingers in country towns and remote hamlets long after it has disappeared from centers of civilization. It is a sign of sound citizenship to listen patiently to all sides of a question and oppose false opinions by reason rather than violence.

MR. HUGHES AND THE GAMBLERS.

There is an article in the constitution of New York which declares that gambling ought not to exist anywhere in the state and orders the Legislature to abolish it. All state constitutions contain similar orders either about gambling or the location of public institutions or something else, but they are usually rather futile because there is no way to make the Legislature obey them unless it wishes. A Legislature cannot be indicted and sent to prison for disregarding the constitution. If it passes laws which the constitution forbids, of course the courts can annul them; but if it refuses to pass laws which the constitution demands, what are you going to do about it? The only remedy is to elect another Legislature and another, and so on indefinitely until one is obtained which will do its duty. In case one is never found willing to obey orders, the orders will never be obeyed. This is one of the many beauties of representative government.

In New York up to the present time it has never been possible to elect a Legislature that would obey orders. But that is not quite correct, either. The Legislature was quite willing to take orders from its bosses, but not to follow the constitution. In this it did not differ much from other Legislatures.

Upon the whole, the New York Legislature obeyed the constitution pretty well. It made gambling illegal everywhere in the state except upon race courses. Here betting was not outlawed because certain wealthy interests throve and grew fat upon it. These interests gave themselves a fine name, "The Horsebreeders' Association," and covered their greed with the customary cloak of lofty intentions. They said they lived and died for the sole purpose of improving the breed of farm horses in New York; that they cared nothing whatever for sordid pelf, but were consumed with a burning zeal for the good of the tillers of the soil. Hence their gambling business at the races was really a piece of self-abnegating charity which ought not to be interfered with. For a due consideration successive Legislatures agreed with them. Nobody seemed to care much for the edict of the constitution, and for many years the millionaire gamblers flourished in peace and replenished their pockets with that serenity of soul which nothing but a good conscience can produce.

Then Governor Hughes appeared upon the arena. The Governor is one of the most irritating figures in American politics because he is an iconoclast. The established system of government does not satisfy him. He is forever trying to innovate upon the good old ways. In the established system the gambling and other syndicated interests rule the people through the flunkies and rascals in the Legislature. Mr. Hughes has always insisted that the Legislature ought to make laws for the whole state instead of for a privileged class, and that, above all, the constitution ought to be obeyed. In pursuance of these astonishing principles he has urged the New York Legislature to pass one law after another for the public good alone. Of course the Legislature has always declined to do so. Mr. Hughes has then invariably taken the revolutionary step of appealing to the voters. He has gone from one end of the state to the other, met the people in great public gatherings, stated the case to them and returned to Albany with a mandate which the flunkies and rascals dared not disobey.

In this way he forced the insurance laws through the Legislature, the law for the public-service commission also. It is a kind of clumsy, indirect and slow but fairly efficient referendum. When the will of the people is brought squarely before the legislators it usually frightens them. The flunkies forego for the moment their inbred devotion to the millionaires while the rascals do not dare to stay bought. Mr. Hughes is now applying this awkward referendum method to his anti-racetrack gambling bill. It failed in the State Senate by just one vote. At the critical moment Senator Cassidy received an order from his boss to vote against the bill, and naturally he had to obey. His vote defeated it. Now the Governor has gone to the people. He has traversed the entire state, spoken in the large cities, and laid the question before the voters, asking them whether they wished the Legislature to follow the constitution or the gamblers. The answer has been unmistakable, and at the special session which is soon to convene Mr. Hughes will again present his anti-gambling bill, backed by the unanimous mandate of the people of the state. There is little danger that the mandate will be disobeyed. This method of using the referendum works very well so long as New York has a Governor like Mr. Hughes; but suppose it had the other kind? Suppose the Governor were a man like the late lamented Mr. Higgins? It is greatly to be feared that the constitution would go a-glimmering as of yore, while the millionaire gamblers would continue to dominate the Legislature.

A special business edition of the Baltimore American was recently issued under the head "Seven Hundred Thousand Baltimore," indicating the near approach of that city in population to the mark set. Baltimore was not a rapid grower in its early years. From a population in 1790 of only 13,503, it had barely climbed in 1840—half a century later—into the 100,000 class. The census of 1890 showed for the first time half a million of people to the credit of Baltimore, and today, according to figures furnished by this business edition, the population of the new-old city is 680,810—only about 19,000 short of the goal set by the American for Greater Baltimore. That newspaper is 135 years old. During all these years it has been a potent factor in the city's growth in commerce, industry, wealth and influence. The special issue contains forty pages and is the largest business issue of a newspaper ever published in the South.

Frequently it occurs that court decisions vary so widely from the plain intention of makers of constitutions that there is doubt as to the thoroughness of the education of the judges in the use of the English language. This doubt must arise when a court declares that a provision of the fundamental law means something different from what it says and what everybody else understands it to say. But courts sometimes take judicial knowledge of the exact meaning of language even though not couched in expressions commonly found in law dictionaries. For example, it recently became necessary for the Nevada Supreme Court to decide what an injured man meant when he said "I am all in." The court decided that the man who used this expression meant that in his opinion his life was practically at an end. The decision will be generally commended as correct.

At North Platte yesterday Admiral Evans, at the call of the people, hobbled to the rear end of the car and made this short though mighty speech:

> We will always have war as long as we have anything worth while to fight over, and the more battleships and the fewer Statesmen we have, the longer we will have peace.

That was enough. It just did the business. The way Robley Evans puts things reminds one of the brief, sententious and pregnant sayings of U. S. Grant. Elaboration of a speech like that delivered at North Platte would spoil it.

There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of a number, more or less, of murderous thugs to exterminate the pawnbrokers and junk dealers of this city. The leading feature of each of the three attacks upon the lives of men of this vocation within little more than a week is their unexampled brutality and boldness. Perhaps the law of suggestion is at work here. However this may be, there is a similarity in these crimes and in the business of the men who have been struck down that is startling.

Salem has a Methodist minister who looks like Taft. As everybody knows, Portland has a minister, Bishop Barkley, of the United Brethren Church, who bears a very striking resemblance to Bryan. Now if these two can be induced to stump the state in behalf of the candidates they resemble in personal appearance, perhaps we can imagine that we are the center and circumference of the National campaign.

Mr. Manning is criticised for engaging special counsel to help him convict Banker Ross. But successful prosecutors universally have assistants. Heney is an example. The Attorney-General of the United States is another. Mr. Cameron thinks, if elected Prosecuting Attorney, he will never need special counsel. Then he will surpass the achievements of any of the big prosecutors.

Oswald West thinks they have a rather tame style of conducting land-fraud trials in Washington. He is an Oregonian and expected too much from the effete East. Perhaps he expected Easterners to show the same energy and industry in prosecuting land thieves that the Eastern thieves display in grabbing Western lands.

The Astorian is very severe on those fishermen who take salmon at the Cascades and Dalles. Justly so, no doubt. But it seems to every impartial observer that too many are taken in the lower river and about Astoria. The proportion of those taken above must be as 100 to 1.

That public official is wise in his policies who, when defeated in his undertakings by other officials who oppose him, can confidently appeal to the people for indorsement of his acts or recommendations.

FIGURES AS AMERICAN DREYFUS

Case of Colonel W. F. Stewart Dubbed "Temperamentally Impossible."

Washington, D. C., Dispatch to the Brooklyn, N. Y., Eagle.

The curious and somewhat mysterious case of Colonel William F. Stewart of the Artillery Corps may become the subject of a congressional investigation, if not a court of inquiry. Members of the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, have become interested in his case and have taken steps to determine whether, as alleged, he is the subject of persecution and is figuring as an American Dreyfus, as some of his friends contend.

Just now Colonel Stewart is on his way from Fort Francis Barracks, Florida, to an abandoned army post in Arizona, surrounded by cactus plants, where he will have a command consisting of one soldier dying of consumption. The officer has been assigned to this isolated point because he refuses to apply for retirement, as instructed to do by War Department officials. Senator Rayner, of Maryland, has written a letter to the President protesting against the department's harsh treatment of Colonel Stewart and urging that the latter's request for a court of inquiry be granted.

An air of mystery surrounds this unusual case. Seekers for information as to the exact reason for the War Department's desiring to force Stewart onto the retired list obtain unsatisfactory replies to their requests at the department. The officials there do not care to discuss the matter, giving as their excuse the fact that it is under consideration by the President. No attempt is made to hide the fact that the department has officially sought to force Stewart to retire, and that his assignment to a command not suitable for a second lieutenant is the result of his determination to remain on the active list until forced off by operation of law.

* * *

From hints and unofficial admissions by administration officials, it appears that the War Department regards Colonel Stewart as "temperamentally impossible." It is said that officers and enlisted men find it next to impossible to get along with him; that he is "cantankerous," as one Republican Senator was informed at the department. It is not alleged that he has violated the regulations in any respect, or that he is guilty of an offense which would warrant punishment. Apparently the department has resorted to the "exile policy" as a means of getting rid of an officer deemed to be "undesirable."

The first attempt to force Colonel Stewart off the active list was made some time ago. Republican Senators assert that they have seen a letter from the War Department to Colonel Stewart asking him to apply for retirement. It is asserted by the same Senators that Stewart's reply was that he would be willing to retire if promoted to be a Brigadier-General. It is the custom of the department in arranging matters of this sort to retire an officer at the rank higher than the grade occupied at the time of applying for retirement. In this case, however, it was proposed to force Stewart to retire as a Colonel. The latter refused to cut off his pay and allowances 25 per cent, merely to please the department officials, and said he would serve until reaching the legal retirement age of 62 in 1911.

Republican Senators declare further that a letter from the Department exists warning Stewart that if he did not retire he would be sent to an abandoned Army post in the deserts of Arizona. This threat was carried out and for an extended period Stewart was on duty at Fort Grant, Arizona, with a command, it is said, of one soldier afflicted with tuberculosis. A few weeks ago he was ordered to a comfortable post at St. Augustine, Florida. The Florida Congressmen had other plans for filling this assignment and at their request the War Department the other day, ordered Colonel Stewart to return to the cactus plants of Arizona, to which point he is now proceeding.

* * *

Colonel Stewart has influential friends in Congress and they have instituted an inquiry into his treatment. Mrs. Stewart is related to the late Senator Pinkney Whyte, of Maryland, and Senator Rayner of that state, is championing the officer's cause. Senator Rayner drafted a resolution the other day providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate the affair. The President, it is said, heard of this and invited Senator Rayner to come to the White House and talk the matter over with him. As a result of this conference Rayner decided to withhold his resolution for an investigation.

Colonel Stewart has made formal application to the President for a court of inquiry to determine whether he has been guilty of an offense sufficient to warrant the punishment to which he has been subjected. It seems that an official report exists in the Department condemning him on certain grounds and recommending that he be "retained" at Fort Grant until he can be compulsorily retired in 1911. It is stated that Colonel Stewart has had no opportunity to confront his accusers or to defend himself and that he has not even been furnished with a transcript of the record in the case.

Senator Rayner in his letter to the President, urged that Colonel Stewart's request for a court of inquiry be granted. If the President refuses to order this court it is likely that the matter will be taken up in the Senate. Some of the anti-Roosevelt Republican Senators have become interested and are waiting to see what the administration's course is to be. Senator Rayner takes the position that Colonel Stewart is entitled to a court of inquiry under the articles of war and that to refuse such a request is not only unjust, but of questionable legality. In his letter to the President the Maryland Senator cited the Schley case as one of a number of precedents to support Colonel Stewart's request.

* * *

The strongest and clearest precedent for forcing an inquiry of this sort is the action of Congress of 1874 in passing a joint resolution calling for a special court of inquiry for General Oliver O. Howard, a distinguished veteran of the Civil War, to fully investigate charges in a communication from the Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House in the Winter of 1873-1874 in connection with the closing up of the affairs of the Freedmen's Bureau, of which General Howard had charge.

Serious charges were made affecting the character and standing of General Howard. Under the Army regulations the President had power to order a court of inquiry. General Howard was anxious that such an inquiry should be held. He had been placed under a cloud and was anxious to vindicate himself. The Attorney-General gave an opinion expressing doubt as to whether General Howard could be court-martialed even if such a court should determine that he was at fault, because the statute of limitations had run.

The Senate took the view that the statute of limitations had nothing to do with the matter; that General Howard was a gallant officer, whose record had been impugned, and that he ought to have the right of confronting his accusers and such evidence as they might be able to produce. Men like Roscoe Conkling, Allen G. Thurman, John Sherman, John A. Logan, Lot M. Morrill, of Maine, Charles Sumner and others took the lead in the debate in the Senate in insisting upon the passage of the joint resolution which had come from the House of Representatives; and the court of inquiry was ordered. It sat in Washington. The result was a complete vindication of General Howard.

As if You Owned a Touring Car.

Ohio State Journal.

Another advantage the gasoline shampoo has over all competitors is that it makes you smell as if you owned a touring car.

CURBING LOWER FEDERAL JUDGES

New Bill Asked to Prevent Their Nullifying State Laws.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

The bill reported unanimously from the Senate judiciary committee, restricting the powers of the lower Federal judges in suspending or nullifying state laws, ought to be enacted. It does not deny to these courts their equity jurisdiction in such cases. But it does undertake to deny to single Federal judges, sent out from Washington on a life tenure of office, the right to elevate themselves at will into a power overshadowing that of a whole state. If the bill attempted to take away from the lower Federal judiciary all power to suspend the operation of state laws when Federal questions are raised, its constitutionality might be seriously questioned. But when it goes only so far as to require three lower court judges to sit in such cases and give notice and grant a hearing with direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court from the ensuing judgment, there can at least be no more question of its constitutionality than of a somewhat similar provision contained in the recent railroad rate law in relation to the rate orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This is the answer which the lawyers of the Senate committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, would make to the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court sustaining the performances of lower Federal judges in their off-hand, ex-parte suspension of state laws and state judicial processes at the snap of the finger of some corporation doing business in the state. It is the answer which Congress should and doubtless will make; for even that political party which has stood for the enhancement of the National power as against that of the states, is beginning to feel that centralizing tendencies in the Government of the United States are going too far, while the other party promises to make a direct and strong issue of the matter in the coming elections.

Something indeed might well be done to force into the state courts these preliminary suits to test the Federal constitutionality of state enactments, where such suits used to go in the days of the republic prior to the war amendments of the Constitution. When a corporation instead runs off to a Federal court, it insults the courts of the state where it is doing business and pays no compliment to the Federal judge appealed to; for it in effect assumes that justice cannot be had in the one court, and that possibly something more than justice can be had in the other.

But the bill reported to the Senate, if enacted, might have some influence in this desired direction of restoring to the state courts that position of greater dignity and importance generally held by them, respecting state legislation in relation to the Federal Constitution, throughout the life of the republic down to within about 40 years. If this should not prove to be the case, the more effective device may finally be insisted on of absolutely denying to the lower Federal courts jurisdiction in such cases.

A JUDGMENT OF AMERICA.

Nowhere Are the Signs of Youth, but Everywhere Old Age.

Charles Whibley has been publishing in Blackwood's a series of studies on America. In his final paper he makes these remarks, which certainly are well done, whether one thinks them sufficiently discriminating or not. Or are they whimsical and paradoxical? Any way, they are worth reading:

> As he (the traveler) leaves the shores of America he forgets for the moment her love of money and of boodle, he forgets her superb energy and hunger for life, he forgets the exquisite taste shown by the most delicately refined of her citizens. He remembers, most vividly that, he is saying good-by to the oldest land on earth. It is an irony of experience that the inhabitants of the United States are wont to describe themselves as a young people. They delight to excuse their extravagances on the ground of youth. When they grow older (they tell you) they will take another view of politics and of conduct. And the truth is that old age long ago overtook them. America is not, never was, young. She sprang, ready-made, from the head of a Pilgrim father, the oldest of God's creatures. Being an old man's daughter, she has escaped the virtues and vices of an irresponsible childhood. In the primitive history of the land her ancestors took no part. They did not play with flint knives and set up dolmens where New York now stands. They did not adorn themselves with woad and feathers. The Prince Albert coat (or its equivalent) was always more appropriate to their ambition. In vain you will search the United States for the signs of youth. Wherever you cast your eye you will find the signal proofs of an eager, grasping age. Youth loiters and is glad, listening to the songs of birds, wondering at the flowers which carpet the meadow and reckoning not of the morrow. America is grave and in a hurry.

Race Horse Loves the Democrats.

St. Louis Dispatch to Cincinnati Enquirer.

Jim Chessen, of Alton, and his famous stallion, Chessen Wilkes, sire of many fine race horses, have just met for the first time in three years. Chessen taught the horse many tricks, and they were boon companions. Three years ago Chessen went to England, leaving the horse with John Perkinson at West Alton. Yesterday Chessen went into the field where the stallion is kept. Seeing his old master, the horse ran to him and laid his head on Chessen's shoulder.

Chessen asked the horse if he was a Republican, and the heels of the stallion were turned on the owner, but when Chessen yelled "Hurrah for the Democrats" he again laid his head on his shoulder.

The horse is one of the finest in Illinois and Missouri, and is known over the two states by horsemen.

Optimistic To the End.

Philadelphia Ledger.

Some time ago there was a flood in Western Pennsylvania. An old fellow who had lost nearly everything he possessed was sitting on the roof of the house as it floated along when a boat approached.

"Hello, John."

"Hello, Dave."

"Are your fowls all washed away, John?"

"Yes, but the ducks can swim," replied the old man.

"Apple trees gone?"

"Well, they said the crop would be a failure, anyhow."

"I see the flood's away above your window."

"That's alright, Dave. Them winders needed washin', anyhow."

The School Child Up to Date.

From Life.

Make haste to school, my little child,
Or else you will be late;
Your books are all asceptic now,
And here's your sterile slate.
Your pencil has been boiled an hour—
'Tis germless, now, I hope;
And don't forget to wash your desk
With this carbolic soap.
And lest about the schoolroom floor
Some unseen microbes lurk,
Just sprinkle formaline around
Before you set to work.
You'd better put, for safety's sake,
Bichloride in the ink;
And water that has not been boiled
You must not dare to drink.
Of course, when recess comes around,
Some food you'll want to munch;
So in this disinfected box
Is predigested lunch.
And since 'tis said that in a kiss
Bacteria may dwell,
I may not give you, as I'd like,
A mother's fond farewell.

Initiative and Referendum Measures

For the information of voters there will be published on this page from day to day brief summaries of the initiative and referendum measures to be submitted to the people at the June election, together with a short statement of the arguments for and against each.

NUMBER 11.

The "Open-Town" Proposal.

The proposed constitutional amendment giving cities and towns exclusive control of theaters, race tracks, poolrooms, bowling alleys, billiard-halls and the sale of liquor on Sunday is a measure which has aroused considerable discussion and will probably be the center of a vigorous contest at the election in June. The proposed amendment affects section 2 of article 11 of the constitution, prescribing the manner of creating municipal corporations and fixing their powers. The section as it stands now reserves to the people of every city the exclusive power to adopt, repeal or amend their city charters, subject to the constitution and criminal laws of the state. The proposed amendment leaves out the limitation "subject to the constitution and criminal laws of the state" and further provides that cities shall have "exclusive power to license, regulate, control, tax, suppress or prohibit theaters, race tracks, poolrooms, bowling alleys, billiard-halls, and the sale of liquors subject to the local option law of the state." This limitation as to the local option law would not prevent the opening of saloons on Sunday.

It is generally known and conceded that the purpose of the amendment is to ..t each town decide for itself whether it shall be a "wide open" town or not, regardless of the constitution and the criminal laws of the state. The amendment was proposed by petitions circulated under the direction of J. F. Reddy, Mayor of Medford, who also filed an argument in support of it, urging that each city should govern its own local affairs. Against the measure the Portland Municipal Association and the Oregon Anti-Saloon League have filed arguments, asserting that, while the amendment pretends to obtain practical home rule for cities, its real purpose is to suspend the criminal laws of the state as to certain practices in cities. Say the opponents of the measure, "The proposed amendment would undermine the supremacy of the state. It would create an authority within municipal bounds independent of and in many cases opposed to the authority of the state. It is essentially vicious and anarchistic in its tendency. There can be no doubt that the petition for the enactment of the proposed amendment had its origin among those who are intent upon exploiting the vices of city life for their own profit, and who care little or nothing for the integrity of the state and the moral welfare of its citizens." The arguments against the amendment are thus summarized:

It is a saloon measure intended to intrench the saloon and nullify the local option law.

It makes the cities principalities, independent of the criminal laws and police powers of the county and state.

It assumes for the city independence from the county, yet does not propose to provide for expense of vice and crime to be borne by cities alone.

It is a violent reversion of the entire structure of our government.

THIRSTIER SINCE LIQUOR FIGHT

Spread of Prohibition Sees Uncle Sam Drink More Than Ever.

Chicago Journal.

In spite of the admitted spread of temperance sentiment, in spite of the vast areas that have been added to Prohibition territory, and in the face of a tremendous crusade that has swept the South and extended into the Middle West, Uncle Sam is thirstier than ever. This startling discrepancy is shown by a statistical report just issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor. This shows that in 1907 Uncle Sam drank 283,716,857 more gallons of beer than in 1905, 22,679,131 more gallons of wine and 19,214,787 more gallons of whisky. Practically the same proportionate increase in the National thirst has been going on since 1880. In 1907 the consumption per capita of wines and liquors was 23.53 gallons. In 1905 it was 20.38 gallons per capita.

In other words, the united citizen of the United States consumed 3.15 more gallons of wines and liquors in 1907 than in 1905. And this in spite of the remarkable campaign of the Prohibitionists.

The report shows that the average consumption of intoxicating liquors has doubled since 1882. The thirst of the American people has come very close to increasing an average of one gallon per capita a year.

In 1870 the consumption of wines and liquors was only 7.7 gallons. In 1880 the average person was drinking 10.68 gallons; in 1890, 15.53 gallons; in 1900, 17.68 gallons.

The total consumption of wines and liquors in 1907 was 2,019,690,911 gallons, against 1,874,321,388 in 1906, an increase of 145,369,523. The increase of 1905's consumption was 325,610,775. Of the total consumption 57,738,848 gallons were wines, 1,821,887,627 gallons were malt liquors and 140,084,436 gallons were distilled spirits.

In 1907 the average person drank .67 gallons of wine, 21.23 gallons of beer and 1.63 gallons of whisky.

There are many causes for the increased consumption of liquors. Brewers and manufacturers spend larger fortunes for advertising every year. Since 1880 an average of 1,000,000 foreigners, a large per cent of whom were heavy liquor consumers, came into the country each year. The number of amusement parks adjacent to large cities, at which liquors are dispensed, has doubled in five years.

In the Bryan Class.

Boston Herald.

The statement that Alton B. Parker will be the first defeated Democratic candidate for the Presidency ever chosen as a delegate to a subsequent Democratic National Convention seems to be open to correction in that a delegate by the name of William Jennings Bryan was a delegate to the Democratic convention four years ago. This puts Parker in the Bryan class.

A FEW SQUIBS.

"Do you ever buy poetry?" "Well, I did buy a copy of Tennyson once," admitted the editor.—Philadelphia Ledger.

"Well, what's on the bill-of-fare today?" inquired the genial drummer. "Beg pahden, sah—Ah guess dey's flypecks. Ah'll git yo' anudder, sah."—Judge.

European scientists are discussing the question whether there can be life without mind. Why don't they examine the Democratic party?—New York Evening Post.

"Did you ask that man why he paid rent instead of owning his own home?" asked one real estate agent. "Yes," answered the other. "He said he didn't. He kept moving."—Washington Star.

Borus (struggling author)—That last book of mine agreeably surprised you, did it? I am glad to hear that. Naggus (literary editor)—Yes, I expected to devote an entire evening to reading it. It put me to sleep in five minutes, old fellow.—Chicago Tribune.

"Ge whiz!" said George for the 20th time, "it makes me mad every time I think of the $16 I lost today. I actually feel as if I'd like to have somebody kick me." "By the way, George," said the dear girl dreamily, "don't you think you'd better speak to father this evening?"—Philadelphia Press.