

The Oregonian

Published at Portland, Oregon, Pacific coast Second-Class Mailer. Subscription Rates: In Advance.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 3, 1880, under Post Office No. 100, Portland, Oregon, Post Office of Special Delivery.

Portland, Saturday, May 6, 1911.

McNAMARA AND THE UNIONS.

Mr. Roosevelt's Outlook editorial on the McNamara case contains three statements which ought to be read and heeded by union labor men and everybody else as well.

The one and only question is as to the guilt or innocence of the men accused. Any man who seeks to have them acquitted if guilty is as guilty of a crime against the state as any man who seeks to have them convicted if they are innocent.

The incident will serve to show the Eastern freights and fallacies of the McNamara case. The policy of Pinchot is not popular where it is in practice.

The feeling was and is, as we have said, widespread among labor union men. The Socialists are doing all they can to foment it.

CIRCULAR ARGUMENT.

The report of the Board of Army Engineers against the proposed dredging of the channel in the Columbia River from the mouth of the Willamette River to Vancouver shows that that body needs the infusion of a few modern ideas.

This is the same old argument which was used as an excuse for not building a railroad into Central Oregon. Short-sighted railroad men said there were no settlers to produce traffic.

It is the same with river and harbor improvements as with railroads. A few pioneers settle on a bay or at the mouth of a river, and the great wealth of timber, agricultural lands and minerals is tributary.

The fact that there has been an ocean-shipping lumber mill at Vancouver is reasonable ground for presuming that, if it were made accessible to ships, another would be built.

Without free wool, says Mr. Bryan, tariff reform will not amount to much for the spinner that would head Congress to the effect that wool would be made in the United States.

when the work of improvement began which has made it one of the world's greatest cities. Half a century ago the Clyde at Glasgow was a mere creek across which a 10-year-old boy, with his trousers rolled up to his knees, could wade at low tide without wetting his clothes.

THE ALASKAN COAL DEMONSTRATION.

Imbued by the same spirit that caused their forefathers to throw overboard a tea cargo in Boston harbor more than a century ago, a party of red-blooded Americans at Cordova, Alaska, on Thursday dumped into the bay several hundred tons of British Columbia coal which has been imported because the United States policy of conservation prevented the use of Alaska coal.

FINANCIAL NEUTRALITY.

War has become a costly game. At the present rate of progress it promises in the near future to absorb so much of the world's resources actually needed for other purposes that it may cease for lack of sustenance.

The difficulty of some "peppery" nation, over-ready to engage in war, in securing the necessary funds under the proposed "financial neutrality plan" is explained by Mr. Speyer in this statement: "We find today in Europe that in times of peace foreign governments will not allow their bankers to place foreign loans in the home market unless the purposes for which the loan is to be used are known and approved, and at least part of the proceeds are used by the borrowing nation for expenditures in markets of the lending country."

The Hessian fly, that time-honored friend of the bull operators in the Chicago wheat pit, has appeared at Vancouver, Wash. The wheat crop in the Puget Sound section has amounted to much since the Hudson's Bay Company went out of business several decades ago.

According to Sir Donald Mann, of McKenzie, Mann & Co., founders of the Canadian Railway, the three northwestern provinces of Canada will this year have an increase in population of between 400,000 and 500,000.

The laws of Oregon are sufficient, however, without any rules. Section 871 of Lord's Oregon Laws provides, in substance, that "it is the right of a witness to be protected from irrelevant, insulting, or improper questions, and from harsh or insulting treatment, and from any such abuse as the court may deem proper to enforce the plain provision of the law."

OREGON DIVORCE LAW.

Suppose a husband and wife separate. The man has property, bought with his money, in his name. The woman has property, bought with her money, in her name. If the woman obtains a divorce, how is the property divided by Oregon law?

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—Mr. Rushlight's official newspaper organ has been boosting him as the only shining light on the political horizon. At the same time it has persistently lambasted both of his opponents in the Mayoralty race.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate. The situation warrants much stronger treatment.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.

Portland, May 5.—(To the Editor.)—The editorial in The Oregonian of today on the subject of the Maryland courts adopting rules to protect witnesses was appropriate, but rather inadequate.