The Oregonian

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.

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..... 2.00
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—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.

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

PORTLAND, THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1908.

THE INJUNCTION.

The effort of political parties to satisfy the demands of leaders of labor organizations and their allies, on the subject of injunctions, raises questions exceedingly difficult to handle; so much so that no politician can see his way through them, on any plan that will satisfy those on the one hand who demand that there shall be no injunction at all that can have force and effect, and on the other those who insist that government shall not sit idly by and see property destroyed, business ruined and workmen maltreated or killed, by others who are resolved not to permit work and business to proceed except on terms of their own dictation. Yet the injunction, as a means of restraining persons whose action, though destructive of property and business, may not become actually criminal, either under statute or common law, is liable to abuse. Within these limits there is extremely close ground of debate. Injunction is wanted as a means of keeping the peace and protecting property. It is resisted because such restraint is not wanted, and because, moreover, violation of the restraining order may be punishable as contempt, without trial by jury.

All parties ought to agree that the policy that is reasonable in such a dispute ought to prevail. The dispute, however, will continue on differences as to what is reasonable. Strikes never can be unlawful. That was settled very long ago. The whole modern trouble arises from injuries alleged or feared against property or business, from those who try to prevent continuation of the business or operation of the property through employes not members of the labor organizations.

Professor Stimson, of Harvard University, author of many works on the relations of the law to modern industrial conditions, and an authority also on the labor side of the whole question, through his "Handbook of Labor Law of the United States," has just published a treatise on "The Law of Federal and State Constitutions," together with an historical study of their principles, a chronological survey of English social legislation, from which our own has been mainly derived, and a comparative digest of the constitutions of our forty-six states, especially with reference to this general subject. Our Congress, he shows, adopted the full English practice in the first judiciary act (1789); and the Constitution itself expressly provides that Federal judicial power shall apply to all cases in law and equity.

The common law sounds only in damages, and injunction is strictly and wholly an equity proceeding. But it dates far back in our ancestral history—almost to the time of the Norman conquest. It was used in early times to quell disorder, but its use to control the action of bodies of men in labor disputes began perhaps forty years ago, and has had vast extension in the United States, as Professor Stimson shows, due not only to the prevalence of labor disputes and the activity of organized labor, but still more to the inefficiency in many parts of the country of the local courts and the state police; most of all to our state and Federal system and the fact that the Constitution gives the Federal courts jurisdiction for suits between citizens of different states, as railroad, mining and manufacturing industry is with us carried on almost entirely by corporations. Frequently chartered in other states than where the troubles occurred, it was a convenient thing for the corporation which feared prejudice in the local courts, or distrusted their strength or the strength of the local police to enforce their orders, to go into the Federal courts and obtain injunctions for the enforcement of which they could depend in the last resort on the authority of the United States. This, however, to an extent, has been contrary to the English rule, as pursued in later times. The English practice quit the older precedents, but ours has not; just as we stuck to old theories of the relations of King and Parliament after the English Revolution had changed them, and as our own Revolutionary War and the separation from the mother country grew out of the fact that the changes in our old home had not been carried into our new one.

Injunction, in the sense in which it is now discussed in our politics, is prevention, not remedy. How far it will be sustained, in this function, is yet uncertain. The right to a temporary injunction formerly always rested upon the inadequacy of a remedy at law and the irreparable injury to the property belonging to the person asking for the writ. But prosecution for crime calls for a jury; yet the allegation is that punishment for contempt proceedings is gradually taking the place of punishment for crime. The whole subject is one of delicacy and difficulty; for extremely thin partitions divide rights on one side from protection and justice on the other.

Yet the controversy must settle to a basis of even and proportional right and justice. Property and business and non-union labor must have justice; organized labor, as a body, and the individuals composing the body, must have freedom of action, and even balance of justice in the settlement of the contention. But it reaches far and wide. In the Debs case the United States had a property interest in the mails, and the stoppage of trains would injure this property right, and would also be an interference with interstate commerce. Obstruction of the mails and a conspiracy against interstate commerce is a crime. It was also held that the receivers of a railroad company actually may enjoin their employes for refusing to haul cars, or from even leaving the receivers' employ so as to cripple the road, or by any device to hinder its operation. The intent to hinder the management of a railroad by the receiver has been held sufficient to authorize the issuance of a temporary injunction. In states where the Legislatures have enacted public statutes declaring saloons to be public nuisances, and their existence and continuance a crime, injunctions have been issued at the instance of the state, and the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained them.

It is a subject like many another that is drawn into politics, on which powerful appeal can be made to interest, passion and prejudice. Doubtless it will be "worked to the limit" during the next few months, by those whose view of it will be restricted wholly to one side of it or the other, without study of or comparison with the opposite side.

NO SYMPATHY.

A Pendleton paper (East Oregonian) says: "The Oregonian is giving out a lot of maudlin sympathy to those Republican members of the Legislature who have signed the Statement No. 1 pledge, because they will be forced to vote for a Democrat who happens to be the people's choice for United States Senator." But The Oregonian is not giving out a lot of maudlin sympathy, or sympathy of any kind. Those persons, calling themselves Republicans, who have been entrapped into a pledge to vote for a Democratic Senator, are not worth sympathy from any quarter. They have no political principles. It doesn't hurt them to profess to be one thing or another. They are merely mollycoddles of politics. And in the next place a Democrat is not the people's choice for United States Senator—that is, unless Oregon has become Democratic and intends to vote for Bryan.

The whole thing was a game, a juggle, in which "the people's choice" for Senator was not expressed at all—no matter what anybody may pretend the contrary; for even those who pretend the contrary know the pretension to be without foundation. But let it pass. "Statement One Republicans" of the Legislature are Democrats, to all intents and purposes; and to hold the respect of anybody, of either party, they must stand for Bryan. But that doubtless will be easy to men of accommodating principles. With their help and with that of their supporters, Bryan may carry Oregon.

But excuse The Oregonian from imputation of sympathy with men who allow themselves to be so completely buncoed in politics. Cake played the game and brought his own defeat, by his insistence on "the statement" as the leading principle of the canvass. He didn't see and couldn't see that the absurdity would prove his undoing. Let us have plain speech. It is the only luxury left to man in a world of humbug, insincerity, claptrap and delusion.

RECORD YEAR FOR WHEAT.

The greatest year in Portland's history as a grain port closed Tuesday, with shipments by water reaching a grand total of approximately 16,000,000 bushels of wheat and 1,000,000 bushels of barley, while nearly 5,000,000 bushels additional were represented by the flour shipments from Portland. In round numbers this represented nearly 700,000 tons of grain brought into Portland by the one transportation line now serving the port. This enormous traffic has all developed within the past 35 years, a single boat line supplying ample facilities for handling all of the business for several years after wheatgrowing was commenced east of the Cascade mountains. If this enormous amount of grain could be massed at points along the river where it could be reached by boats, it would require the services of half a dozen of the largest river steamers running continuously night and day for nearly two years to bring it down to tidewater at Portland.

But this great tonnage has been moved so easily and quietly that it has passed through this city en route from the farms of the interior to the world's markets without attracting more than passing notice. The wheat trade, regarded apart from the long train of industries which are so largely dependent on it, is no longer the overshadowing influence in Portland's trade that it was many years ago. But it is the relation it bears to other lines of trade which still gives the premier cereal and its products pre-eminence over any other factor in our commercial growth. From the first days of the industry in the Willamette Valley the farmers and inland merchants have purchased their goods where their wheat was marketed. The practice is still followed in nearly all localities tributary to this city.

Our dilatory policy regarding the deepening of the channel between Portland and the sea about twenty years ago diverted a portion of the trade of the Inland Empire territory to Puget Sound, but the country still tributary to Portland continued to increase its output of wheat to such an extent that all of the immense business that has since been drawn to Puget Sound ports has not served to cut down receipts at this port. Unfavorable climatic conditions have cut down the yield of the 1908 crop so that the output of the Pacific Northwest will this year be about 25 per cent less than that of last year. Portland, however, will feel this shortage less than other ports, for the reason that the new North Bank line will bring into direct communication with this port more than double the amount of territory that is now tributary to Portland.

All of this new trade can be held at Portland if we do not repeat the mistake which drove the grain business to Puget Sound about twenty years ago. We needed a twenty-five-foot channel from Portland to the sea at that time, and our failure to provide it cost us much of the trade that sought deeper water. We now have a twenty-six-foot channel, but we are in greater need of twenty-eight feet than we were of twenty-four feet a dozen years ago. The problem of bringing the traffic down to Portland over a water-level haul has been solved, but it is of vital necessity to the port that we place the river and bar in shape for passing it on to sea in the same type of carriers as have easy access to other ports. With deep water on the bar and river, we can continue to break records as a shipping point. Without it we may witness a repetition of the trade diversion of twenty years ago.

HOW MUCH CAN STATE AFFORD?

The Oregonian understands well enough that loss of the Normal School at Drain is a serious matter for Drain. It understands how both the sentiment and interests of the community in which such an institution is placed may be deeply involved. It will be glad to see successful any effort to make the Drain school a local academy or normal school with private support if the state shall decide to make no further appropriations therefor. Yet it must commend the action of the Oregon Board for Normal Schools in deciding to cut out the institution at Drain, thus limiting such schools in Oregon to three. We think it would be wiser and better for the number to be cut to two. But that appears to be impossible now. It may be done later.

The State of Oregon has undertaken to give the State University $125,000 per year, making $250,000 for the biennial term. At Corvallis there is an Agricultural College and experiment station with more than one thousand students, twice as many, and more, as attend at Eugene. It is safe to expect that at the next Legislature there will be a powerful appeal for more generous support of the Corvallis school on the ground of its growing importance and the unquestioned value and merit of its work, and on the ground, too, that the people of the state, having displayed a most generous attitude toward the Oregon University, will desire a similar liberality to be shown towards Corvallis. It will be seen, therefore, that the people of Oregon, having undertaken to maintain various establishments of higher education, must use judgment and discretion in apportioning their funds among the various institutions.

The normal schools are doing good, no doubt. Twice as many would do more good. But that is no reason why we should have twice as many. The question is going to be how much money the state can afford to give all these institutions. It will be up to the next Legislature to decide.

OUR MEDICINE MEN.

A physician who hinders the enforcement of quarantine in cases of smallpox and diphtheria must be an interesting specimen. One would think it might be profitable to put him on exhibition in a dime museum. It is almost incredible that creatures of this sort are to be found in a city like Portland, but they are here and once in a while they have a chance to show how disregardful they are of everything and everybody except number one. Most people were surprised to learn from the papers yesterday that an epidemic of smallpox had existed in Portland for a couple of months and that every pupil in one of the public schools had been exposed to the disease.

But they were still more surprised to learn that this state of affairs had been caused by the carelessness, timidity or greed of certain physicians. It appears that those who attended the first few cases diagnosed the disease incorrectly, either from ignorance or some other reason. The patients were sent back to school with the infection still about them and thus before the pestilence was stayed some seventy-seven children were ill. Fortunately there were no deaths, but that was not the fault of the extraordinary physicians who had the patients in charge, for they seem to have resisted quarantine even to the point of breaking the law and to have conducted the whole affair like barbarian medicine men instead of educated doctors. The epidemic has now been stamped out, but it was done through the efforts of the city health officer and against the opposition of certain local practitioners.

Surely there ought to be some way to bring to justice men who pose as physicians and at the same time act with so little sense of what is right and decent. Very likely they knew their duty in the premises, for they hold state licenses, of course. But is a man who knows his duty and shirks it any better than one who sins through ignorance? If the state license system produces fruit of this variety, how does it benefit the public?

COST OF WASHINGTON RAILROADS.

The Washington Railroad Commission and the Washington State Board of Tax Commissioners have determined the present value of the property of the Northern Pacific, Great Northern and O. R. & N. Co., used for operating purposes within the state, to be $186,000,000. An assessment for taxes will be levied on the basis of 60 per cent of this value. In compiling these figures the Washington Railroad Commission secured some very interesting data showing the amount expended by the railroad companies in the state and the cost of reproduction of the property used for railroad purposes. In the case of the Northern Pacific, which is credited with a valuation of $111,000,000, exclusive of commercial, dock and warehouse property, the cost of reproduction is given at $109,959,458.60, compared with $83,382,722.49 expended in the state to June 30, 1907. For the three roads the cost of reproduction determined by the Railroad Commission is $87,500,000 less than the figures claimed by the railroad men.

If the railroads accept the ruling of the State Tax Commission and pay taxes on the 60 per cent valuation, there will be an enormous increase in the size of their tax roll. In this respect they will hardly be satisfied with the results of the Railroad Commission investigation, but the figures are not all adverse to the railroad interest. If, as shown by the Railroad Commission figures, there has been such heavy increase in cost of railroad building and equipment as is reflected in the figures showing the cost of reproduction, the contention of the railroads that advances in rates were justified would seem to be warranted. In the case of the Northern Pacific the commission admits an increase of more than 30 per cent in the cost of reproduction as compared with the amount already expended within the state. The Railroad Commission has not yet taken up the matter of salaries and other expenses in connection with the operation of a railroad, but it is highly probable that there has been nearly as heavy an increase in this direction.

It would thus appear that, while the expenses for taxes may have been increased by the finding of the Railroad Commission, it has incidentally supported the contention of the railroads that changed conditions since some of the rates now in effect were established have warranted advances in rates. It is quite plain that the rates were either unreasonably high when they were established or else they are now too low, if based on the increased cost of reproduction and of operation.

The commission is about to take up the division of the market value of property used by the railroads for state and interstate business, and the findings in this direction will undoubtedly have an important bearing on the present lumber rate contest. Under the decision in the Nebraska rate case, the commission cannot take notice, in considering the returns to the road, of the profit derived from interstate business. Its findings, however, in connection with those just completed, will have an important bearing on the lumber rate problem. By the time the courts, the State Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Assessors complete their railroad investigations, most of the secrets of the business will undoubtedly be bared to the public, and it will be much easier to determine the merits of the seemingly unending contests.

Lord Curzon and Viscount Morley in oratorical outbursts in the House of Lords yesterday discussed the growing trouble in India. Lord Curzon held the opinion that the Japanese victory over Russia was the principal cause of the unrest. "That was the triumph of Asia over Europe," he said, "and the reverberations of that conflict have spread like a thunder-clap through the whispering galleries of the East." There are other causes, however, and one of them has been the extravagance and wastefulness of the English rulers in India. This same Lord Curzon was the central figure in the most gorgeous pageant ever seen in that land of spectacular festivals and entertainments. His reception when he became the ruling power in India cost the "poor, benighted heathen" who paid the taxes more than $250,000 at a time when thousands were starving to death. The present unrest in India is in part a reaping of the whirlwind which has followed the sowing done by Curzon and his royal predecessors in India.

Dr. Davis has explained again what he is not going to do when he goes to Salem. He hasn't said he was going to vote against Governor Chamberlain. Certainly not, certainly not. And he hasn't said that he would vote against the people's choice, either. Yet it will be admitted that the doctor has had a great deal to say, and some of his utterances sounded just a trifle as if he might be a little doubtful about what he might or might not do when he gets to Salem. The doctor is certain that he signed Statement No. 1 and certain that he is going to keep his pledge. We are glad that somebody is certain.

Nearly $200,000,000 in semi-annual dividends and interest payments was due in this country yesterday, most of it from railroads and big industrial enterprises. This enormous amount of money will be reinforced in a steadily increasing stream for many months as the crop movement expands. Money seems plentiful both at home and abroad, and with a restoration of confidence which was somewhat badly shattered a few months ago, there will be a revival of business that will penetrate every part of the land. Not even the uncertainties of the political contest can serve to stay the return of good times.

If you were to ponder for an hour you could not think of more than a dozen new state laws for which there is an actual need or demand. Yet when the next Legislature meets there probably will be some 300 bills introduced. And yet, perhaps the legislators may take an unusual view of their duties. Possibly they will remember that the people voted down the amendment increasing their pay from $3 to $10 a day and in order to "get even" they will introduce only one-third as many bills and put them through in about twenty days and adjourn. Then, again, possibly, they won't.

If, then, "nobody ought to blame the Governor for dodging the constitution a little" in order to draw larger emoluments, why should any one blame Secretary of State Dunbar for "dodging the law a little" in grabbing fat and unlawful fees? Why should anybody blame anybody at all for taking what he is not entitled to?

The new-dry towns had a great time celebrating the new dessicated era. Today they are wrapping cold towels around their heads, sending for the doctor and wondering why man can be such a fool. The dry period will not really strike deep until the period of convalescence sets in.

Something is due the enterprising and enthusiastic citizens of Denver, the home of the original 16-to-1ers, for their hospitality and liberality, and we may look for a ringing declaration in that forthcoming platform in support of the heaven-born ratio. Sure.

The Minnesota Republicans have nominated a citizen named Jacobsen for Governor. Jacobsen ought to run well with the Norwegians. Evidently the Republicans don't intend to give the Minnesota Democrats a chance this year.

At Pendleton and other towns there was a sound of revelry by night. The inhabitants hilariously drank up all the whisky, and hastened to do it before 12 o'clock. The towns will get over "the wake" in a day or two.

There are times and occasions when an indefinite season of rest in a penitentiary is looked upon as a positive pleasure. Take the cases of Murderer Orchard and Murderer Blodgett, for example.

Tom Platt is not going to be satisfied until he has Mae Wood safely out o' the way in jail. Even then it takes half a dozen people to keep the aged Tom out of the hands of designing women.

Judge Gray declines to run for the Presidential or Vice-Presidential nomination on the Democratic ticket. But that is a long way from declaring that the judge doesn't want to be President.

EX-GOVERNOR GEER ON HIS PAY

Says Others Did It, Too, and the Law Upheld Them.

PENDLETON, June 30.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian of yesterday you comment rather caustically in an editorial entitled, "Chamberlain and the 'Others,'" roasting the present Governor for taking more than the original constitutional salary for his services, saying "he has placed himself in that indefensible position assumed by ex-Governor Geer, to which reference has been made in these columns."

But whether a man's position is indefensible or not always depends upon who is the judge. In 1896 Mr. Watterson said Bryan's position on the free coinage of silver was utterly indefensible, while Mr. Bryan retorted by saying nothing could be more indefensible than the position of Mr. Watterson on the same question. The mere statement that what one man thinks is indefensible doesn't make it so, nor ever did.

Your assertion that the taking of more than $1500 by a Governor of Oregon is directly in violation of the Constitution of the state is certainly a little shy of the fact and lacking in sufficient support. In the Constitutional convention on September 17, 1857, when the question of salaries was under discussion there were so many motions made to fix them at ridiculously low figures that Mr. Watkinds became disgusted and to throw ridicule on the efforts in that direction, offered this resolution:

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this convention, $12.50 is an ample salary for the Governor, provided, that after the good old schoolmaster fashion, he boards around, and that the committee of the whole be instructed to so report, which resolution was decided in the negative."

But after various sums had been proposed and those now in the Constitution finally agreed upon Mr. Peebles, of Marion County, during the afternoon of the same day, offered this amendment:

"Provided, further, That the salaries of the judges shall not be subject to increase; and the salaries of the Governor and Secretary shall never exceed $2000, nor that of the Treasurer exceed $1500."

This amendment providing that the salaries of state officers should not be increased by the Legislature was defeated upon roll call by a vote of 15 for and 35 against.

This one action of the Constitutional convention alone establishes the fact that it was intended to leave the matter with the Legislature.

But within ten minutes after the above proposed amendment was lost by a vote of more than two to one Mr. Packwood moved to amend section 1, relating to salaries of state officers, as follows:

"Strike out all after word 'offices' in the fifth line and insert the words 'nor shall the pay of any officer in this state be diminished or increased, except as provided for in the first section for the making of amendments to the Constitution.'"

And this, also, was disagreed to, thus clearly showing that the convention refused to say that the salaries of state officers should not be increased except by amending the Constitution, leaving the matter wholly in the hands of the Legislature.

Judge Reuben P. Boise, who was a member of that convention and served longer on the judiciary of Oregon than any other man, frequently said it was the meaning of the framers of the Constitution of Oregon that placing the salaries of the states officers at $1500 was merely a guarantee that it should be that much—"the Governor shall have an annual salary of $1500," meaning that he should never have any less.

The extracts from the proceedings of the Constitutional convention given above plainly show what was intended and that the matter was left with the Legislature to decide, as Judge Boise said and as every member of the Oregon Supreme Court for 20 years has said when he accepts nearly twice the amount each year which the Constitution says shall be the minimum amount.

Every time a member of the Supreme Court accepts his quarterly salary he delivers an opinion to the effect that it is within the power of the Legislature to "fix" the salaries of the state officers.

And, in his message to the Legislature in January, 1899, Governor Lord, in discussing this very question, said:

"Nor is the objection to an act directly increasing the salary of the Governor of any constitutional weight. It is entirely within constitutional province of the Legislature to raise the salary to such sum as is just and proper in its judgment, and the best lawyers and judges—some of whom served in the convention which framed the Constitution—have expressed opinions on this subject with a unanimity which could not exist if there were any doubt of the constitutional power of the Legislature to do so."

Besides being Governor for four years, Judge Lord was on State Supreme Bench for 16 years and no member of that august body either before or since his connection with it has made a better or more enviable record as an exponent of constitutional law.

In view of the facts here stated it seems that the doctrine that a man is justified in doing a thing because "others have done it" is not necessarily a censurable one, as you assert. It depends who "the others" are. When I entered the Governor's office I found that my predecessors there, as well as the Supreme Court members themselves, had declared that, in their judgment, the Legislature has the unquestioned power to "fix" the salaries of state officers, and as a set of "others" who were prominent guides and counsellors, it appeared they were both safe and sane.

In fact, it is difficult to do a good thing, or a bad one, either, in these times except where some "others" have paved the way and the last actor is compelled to follow somebody's suit.

As we jog along through life there are necessarily a great many good men who radically differ from many other good men, and that, too, without being grabbers or grafters. T. T. GEER.

To all this it is only necessary to add the statement of the Constitution itself. It is known that the convention was very indifferently reported, and there can be nothing conclusive in such statements as those cited from the meager report of the debates. The salaries of state officers are fixed by the Constitution, Article XIII. No one who can read English with understanding should be unable to construe the following, to wit:

The Governor shall receive an annual salary of fifteen hundred dollars. The Secretary of State shall receive an annual salary of fifteen hundred dollars. The Treasurer of State shall receive an annual salary of eight hundred dollars. The Judges of the Supreme Court shall each receive an annual salary of two thousand dollars. They shall receive no fees or perquisites whatever for the performance of any duties connected with their respective offices; and the compensation of officers, if not fixed by this constitution, shall be provided by law.

Mr. Geer's excuse or apology that he took the increased pay because some of his predecessors had taken it can be no more valid in his case than in that of Governor Chamberlain. These state offices were not forced on anybody and nobody who sought them, or any of them, ever made the plea that the salary wasn't enough and he expected or hoped to "dodge the Constitution a little" in order to get as much money as he thought he should have. Indeed, Governor Chamberlain explicitly pledged himself against "unconstitutional emoluments," and went right ahead drawing them.

The schoolboy excuse that "Bill done it, too," is no justification for Geer, Chamberlain or any other Oregon Governor who has winked at the Constitution and taken all the money from the treasury he could get under unconstitutional laws or the privileges accorded him by custom.

WHY NOT HAVE PERFECT ROSES

Neglect of Plants by Careless Growers Threatens All Others.

PORTLAND, June 30.—(To the Editor.)—Portland is rapidly becoming known as the Rose City. She has earned this distinction by years of patient toil on the part of home-loving and enterprising citizens. Something must now be done to protect her reputation from the carelessness of property-owners, who are neglecting their plants, allowing them to become diseased. The lover of the rose who tries to grow it to perfection has learned by experience that it must be cultivated, pruned and sprayed to keep it free from disease.

I have in mind a beautiful hedge of roses, choice varieties, well cared for, the pride and joy of its owner, now being exposed to diseased plants on the other side of the fence. The neglected bushes are covered with "black spot." This first attacks the leaves, causes them to wither and fall, when they are carried by the wind throughout the neighborhood, scattering this affection broadcast.

There should be some way of preventing this carelessness on the part of property-owners. Better not to have a rose bush than neglect a sick one. We have a city ordinance compelling property-owners to care for vacant lots. Why not something of this kind to protect these ornaments of our city? The proper authority in the hands of our Park Board might solve the problem. We need a radical and thorough cleaning of our city gardens by proper spraying. During our Rose Carnival the writer saw beautiful rosebuds upon the coats of members of the Carnival committee, the foliage of which was blighted by ugly black spots. If we are to be the Rose City let us by some means have perfect roses upon healthy, clean plants. This also, applied to other plants and shrubs and other pests and diseases which could be handled by the same authorities.

X.

PAID $500,000 FOR ONE PAINTING

American Railway Magnate Secures Van Dyck's Reputed Greatest Work.

New York Times' London Cable.

I am able to announce on authority that negotiations have just been concluded by which America becomes the home of what many experts consider Van Dyck's greatest painting. This is the portrait of a woman with a negro page holding her train, which is universally recognized to be the gem of the famous Cattaneo collection.

With two other Van Dycks of the same collection it has been purchased by P. A. B. Widener, of Philadelphia, and may ultimately become the property of the citizens of the Quaker City. For the three canvases Mr. Widener paid a tremendous sum, the price of the one picture alone being not far short of $500,000.

Mr. Widener is now in London, but will return to America soon, and may take his acquisitions back with him.

Ever since the disappearance of the Cattaneo collection from Italy the whereabouts and ultimate disposition of the Van Dycks composing it have been the subject of the keenest interest in the art circles of both continents. Two of them were acquired last year by the British National Gallery and formed the subject of a controversy as to whether they should not be restored to Italy.

There have been various speculations as to what had become of the others. I am in a position to state that they all remain in the possession of a well-known art firm doing business in Europe and America, with the exception of the three now the property of Mr. Widener, one acquired by H. C. Frick and the two owned by the British National Gallery. These two last are perhaps the least important of the Cattaneo collection, the gem of which, as stated, goes to Philadelphia.

Fighting Bob and the Kaiser.

San Francisco Call.

When Fighting Bob Evans attended the opening of the Kiel canal in 1905 Emperor William one day boarded Evans' flagship and in course of conversation asked the Admiral how long it would take him to close all water-ports ready for action.

"Two minutes," said Evans.

The Admiral was somewhat astonished when the Kaiser said: "Let me see you do it—do it yourself." Evans tried the siren but there was not enough steam to blow it.

"Aha!" said the delighted Kaiser, "You cannot close your bulkheads!"

Evans then touched a general alarm button and in an instant men came swarming up from every part of the ship, while Emperor William held his watch. In one minute and a half all doors were closed and the ship was ready for action.

"Fine!" said the Emperor, with a look of chagrin. "Fine!" And then, to celebrate the feat, wine and cigars were brought into the Admiral's quarters. The Kaiser liked the wine and the Admiral so much that he stayed until 2 o'clock in the morning, when Evans thought he had seen the last of him. But at 6 o'clock the same morning an orderly knocked at his door, and, touching his cap respectfully, said: "I have the honor to inform you, sir, that the Emperor of Germany is just passing the ship in his yacht and the Emperor is steering."

"What!" demanded Evans, entirely forgetting his dignity as an Admiral for the moment. Then, looking out of an air port, he saw the Kaiser in his white flannels, steering the Meteor as if he had never taken a drink in his life.

"Well, I'll be ——!" said Fighting Bob as he rolled back into his bunk. But he could not help thinking "Where has the Kaiser spent the time between 2 and 6 o'clock?"

Dr. Davis Explains Some More.

PORTLAND, June 30.—(To the Editor.)—In this morning's Oregonian, one D. Miller, says: "No doubt those who pledged themselves to Statement No. 1 knew at the time what they were doing, and what the pledge meant." I speak for myself—I did; and have no desire to shirk the responsibility; have made no such intimation. I have not been deceived in Governor Chamberlain and have not said I would not vote for him. The Governor says he is a nonpartisan; I guess he knows. When Miller, or any one else, says that I have said I would not vote for the people's choice and in accordance with my pledge, they are making a mis-statement, whether wilfully or mistakenly, I am at a loss to know. I am deceiving no one. L. M. DAVIS.

Taft on Government Ownership.

(From an interview with Mr. Taft by Broughton Brandenburg in Van Norden's Magazine.)

"You are opposed to government ownership?"

"I am, and for the following reasons, as I have given them at another time and place. First, because existing government railways are not managed either with the efficiency or economy of privately managed roads, and the rates charged are not as low and therefore not as beneficial to the public. Second, because it would involve an expenditure of twelve billion dollars to acquire interstate railways and the creation of an enormous National debt. Third, because it would place in the hands of a reckless executive a power of control over business and politics that the imagination can hardly conceive and would expose our popular institutions to danger."

Framing Up the Winning Ticket.

Brooklyn (N. Y.) Standard-Union.

The ticket that is going to sweep the country has been framed up in secret. It is as follows:

For President, Thomas W. Lawson, of Massachusetts.

For Vice-President, Mr. Dooley, of Chicago.

Platform—All us magazine writers have got to stand together.

FROM A FOLLOWER'S STANDPOINT

Principles of Christian Science Set Forth by Publication Committee.

PORTLAND, Or., June 30. — (To the Editor.) — Your columns have given considerable space of late to opinions upon Christian Science, arising from a series of sermons by Rev. S. C. Lapham, and since so much has been said for and against this teaching, a brief summing up of the matter is due to your readers from the standpoint of the Christian Scientist.

Our critic declares that he has studied the Christian Science text-book. This we will not dispute. Perhaps his failure is due to a want of comprehension more than a want of study. It may encourage him to know that many have comprehended it and have successfully demonstrated it. In the ranks of Christian Scientists one is expected to be able to heal sin and sickness successfully for a number of years before he can be authorized as a teacher of the science. We assume that our critic has had no experience whatever as a practitioner of Christian Science, for if he had he would thus have proved the truthfulness of its teaching and would therefore have no occasion to speak adversely of it.

What sort of standing would a critic of mathematics have who claims that he has read a text-book on the subject, but admits that he has never solved a problem or demonstrated a proposition according to its rules, and has no other qualification as critic than the mere fact that he has read the book and does not believe in it?

The classification of Christian Science under the head of mental suggestion or suggestive therapeutics betrays an unfamiliarity with the teaching and practice of Christian Science, for it must be evident to the most casual reader that self-suggestion is quite different from healing which is based upon the consciousness of the supremacy of God. Physicians are coming of late years to admit one of the points emphasized by Christian Science, namely, that the human mind is the cause of disease. With this much granted, how can it be supposed that that which causes disease can be its cure? If the human mind produces disease, something outside of, above and superior to the human mind must be invoked for a remedy. Christian Science is planted squarely on the Biblical statement that God is the "healer of all thy diseases." The healing is but the natural outcome of the moral and mental reformation and regeneration which precede it. In her book "Rudimental Divine Science," Mrs. Eddy states: "Healing physical sickness is the smallest part of Christian Science. It is only the bugle-call to thought and action, in the higher range of infinite goodness. The emphatic purpose of Christian Science is the healing of sin."

Dr. Lapham will be glad to know that Christian Science is doing the healing works which he challenges it to perform, and without suggestion, and if he is earnestly in quest of such proof he will not have far to seek. While Christian Science practitioners at this time do not claim to effect invariable cures, this does not disprove the efficacy of Christian Science treatment, but rather indicates—as with the failure of the mathematician to solve a given problem—a lack of understanding. They are ready, however, to have the results of their present immature understanding measured with those of other curative systems, and by the scriptural test: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

This is not the first time Christian Scientists have been challenged to produce proof of the healing of so-called incurable disease. Within the last few months such a challenge was answered before the committee on public health at the Massachusetts State House, the healing of Dr. G. W. Barrett, of St. Louis, of leprosy being cited and authenticated and admitted as evidence before this committee.

Our friend seems to be in trouble about what he thinks he has found in the teaching of Christian Science regarding the impersonality of God and man. Christian Scientists would indeed be in a bad way if they were in the state of nonentity to which his process of reasoning would appear to reduce them. The proposition of the unreality and unsubstantiality of matter has long ago been settled and accepted by natural scientists, and the admitted unreliability of the physical senses is filling a niche beside it. Christian Science gives no ground for the assumption that consciousness is ever disembodied or obliterated. Its teaching that there is no matter does not mean that creation is unreal, nor that man is unreal, but it means that it is not what it seems to material sense, that in our present immature condition we do not see things as they are. Paul says: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." It is the misconception and not the thing itself which is repudiated by Christian Scientists. Science teaches one to look beyond the material, mutable things of life to the spiritual and immortal; to look beyond the material sense of sustenance to spirit, in whom, as the scriptures declare, "we live and move and have our being." It has regard to the saying of the master: "The life is more than meat, and the body than raiment." It teaches that existence is not dependent, as it appears, upon material substance, but upon God, who not only creates, but upholds all things.

Let me ask the question: Where shall we look for the omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence which Mr. Lapham's Bible accords to God, save as unfolded in the teaching of Christian Science of one divine, infinite principle, mind, spirit, supreme incorporeal being. These terms employed to express the unlimited, infinite nature of God, do not conflict with St. John's definition that "God is Love," nor detract from, but rather increase, man's dependence, his sense of the tenderness, nearness and availability comprehended in the Fatherhood and Motherhood of God.

Regarding the question of marriage, which has been brought into this discussion, the attitude of Christian Scientists and of their leader is very different than Dr. Lapham's observations have led him to believe, and we are pleased to set the matter right with a few quotations from Mrs. Eddy's published works:

"Marriage is the legal and moral provision for generation among human kind."

"Chastity is the cement of civilization and progress. Without it there is no stability in society, and without it one cannot attain the Science of Life."

"Marriage should improve the human species, becoming a barrier against vice, a protection to woman, strength to man, and a center for the affections."

"The good in human affections must have ascendency over the evil and the spiritual over the animal, or happiness will never be one. . . . The scientific morale of marriage is spiritual unity."

The intimation that Mrs. Eddy's reference to the Motherhood of God has been made in order to foist woman in general and herself in particular, into presumptuous prominence, is entirely at variance with her own teaching. To discredit the motive of one whose thought we have not understood, and that through no fault of theirs, is neither logical nor chivalrous. Mrs. Eddy has said of herself: "Today, though rejoicing in some progress, she finds herself still a willing disciple at the heavenly gate, waiting for the Mind of Christ." (Science and Health, preface p. ix.)

Mrs. Eddy's life and character are so well known to the public, her writings and public sayings, as well as her private teachings, have contributed so much toward the health, morality and general well-being of mankind, that they need no defense.

LUTHER P. CUDWORTH.