The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

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
Weekly, one year	1.50
Sunday, one year	2.50
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—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 16 to 28 pages, 2 cents; 30 to 40 pages, 3 cents; 40 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage double rate.
Eastern Business Offices—Verre & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building. Chicago, Steger building.
San Francisco Office—R. J. Bidwell Co., 742 Market street.
European Office—No. 3 Regent street, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1912.

REVOLUTION IN A STATE.

Mr. U'Ren's proposed amendment to Article IV of the constitution of Oregon is the most radical measure ever submitted to the people of the state. Here are some of the results that would follow its adoption:

1. The State Senate would be abolished immediately and the Legislature of 1913, as well as subsequent Legislatures, would consist of a House of Representatives with sixty members, unchecked and unrestrained by any co-ordinate legislative body and privileged to enact any and all legislation at its own pleasure.

2. The veto power of the Governor would also be abolished and the Legislature would be absolutely free from executive control, except through the influence and authority vested in the Governor as an ex-officio member of the law-making body.

3. There would be in vogue a system of proportional representation which would mean minority instead of majority representation.

4. The Legislature would be elected just as the delegates to the recent National conventions were chosen, i. e., the elector would vote for one representative and one only, although his district might be entitled to twelve or fifteen. In other words, electors would be disfranchised from voting for their full quota of candidates for the Legislature.

5. Large areas of the state, particularly the sparsely populated counties of Eastern Oregon, would not be represented in the Legislature, for the reason that these counties would be united with more populous neighboring counties for Legislative purposes, and, under the "vote for one" rule, the more populous counties would dominate.

6. Voting in the Legislature would be by the proxy system, i. e., every Representative would, on every roll call, cast as many votes as were cast for him at the election, and final passage of a bill would require the proxies of a majority of the votes of the state. Under the workings of such a rule, A with 6000 votes would be able to outvote B and C, each of whom had received 2999 in the election.

7. The Governor and certain defeated candidates for Governor would be ex-officio members of the Legislature, and would hold the proxies of all electors who voted for the unsuccessful candidates in their several parties. Under this arrangement a situation might develop whereby the Governor and his defeated rivals for the Governorship would represent more voters than all the regularly elected Representatives.

8. The Governor would have the sole right to introduce appropriation bills. He could and undoubtedly would thus block the whole machinery of the state government by refusing to introduce bills not meeting with his approval.

9. The time-honored distinction between the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Government would be eliminated and there would be an improper interference on the part of the Governor with the affairs of the Legislature.

10. If the Governor should die or resign, there would be no automatic succession to his office and the state would be without a chief executive until after a special election had been held to fill the vacancy and the Legislature had met to canvass the returns.

11. The Legislature would meet annually instead of biennially as at present.

12. A majority of the members, representing also a majority of all the electors of the state, might, at any time, unite in calling a special session of the Legislature.

There are other minor changes; but these will indicate the extraordinary character of one U'Ren measure. Are the people of Oregon ready thus to install an entirely novel method of Government?

The U'Ren plan has been tried nowhere. Is that a sufficient reason why it should be tried here?

GOVERNOR DENEEN'S CHOICE.

A man cannot be a member of two parties any more than he can serve two masters. Governor Deneen is an old enough politician to know this and to act upon the knowledge. Having made a fair fight for Roosevelt at the Chicago convention and having lost, he frankly accepts the result, and all except two candidates on the Illinois State Republican ticket act likewise.

The reasons given by Deneen fully justify his decision. When he accepted the nomination for Governor he bound himself in advance to stand by the party, both in state and National elections, no matter whether the National convention nominated the man he preferred or some other. To withdraw at this late day would be a breach of faith with those whose votes gave him the nomination.

Governor Deneen has well considered the probable consequences of forsaking the Republican for the Bull Moose party and his conclusions are sound. These consequences would probably be the election of a Democratic state ticket and a division of the Legislature among three parties. No one of these three having a majority, the temptation to trade and dicker would be well-nigh irresistible. A repetition of the scandal growing out of the factional split which led up to the election of Lorimer would threaten.

What is true of Illinois is true of Oregon and other states. Those whose devotion to Roosevelt is so great that they are prepared to divide the Republican party in his interest should sever their relations with that party entirely and give the voters a fair opportunity to choose between candidates of the old and new political complexion by nominating a separate ticket from head to foot. But before taking this irretraceable step, they should well consider consequences. Division among Republicans means Democratic victory. Are the points of difference between the Roosevelt men and the Republicans who stand by the Chicago convention's action so vital that the election of a Democrat is to be preferred to that of a Republican? Deneen, Hadley, La Follette, Cummins, Borah and many other progressives who have proved their faith by their works prefer the success of Taft, with whom they do not entirely agree, to that of Wilson, with whom they almost entirely disagree. They have enough confidence in the wisdom of the mass of the Republican party to believe that ere another Presidential election they can secure the adoption as party principles of those measures on which they are at issue with the Chicago platform, and that they can bring about the nomination of candidates pledged to and in sympathy with those measures. The example of these men is worthy of emulation, for they have borne the burden and heat of the day, unlike those new converts who began their labors in the progressive vineyard at the eleventh hour.

The Republican party has the clear right to declare that those who are not with it are against it. In making that declaration, it calls upon every man who has hitherto counted himself a Republican to deliberate long whether he desires, by turning against his old party, to render aid to that other party with which it has always contended.

THE DISEASE OF ANTI-TAFTITIS.

The Oregonian feels that somehow it will be useless to reason with its exasperated ex-Republican friend, Mr. Leeper, who offers another letter today; yet it is reluctant to give him up as an incurable case of acute anti-Taftitis. He is in almost equal alarm about Dr. Wilson, however, and regrets that the Democratic party was not buried in 1865. Those were the days when a large number of Republicans shot as they voted; but evidently Comrade Leeper has voted straighter than he shot, else he might not now be suffering from regret for the oversights of long ago.

Mr. Leeper has voted the Republican ticket for forty years and more, and now he is going to quit and be a Bull Moose, for Taft was nominated "by a National committee elected four years ago, very few of them having been elected by popular primaries."

Mr. Taft was nominated by a National convention controlled by the same influences and methods that nominated Taft in 1908, when Mr. Leeper voted for him. In all the long line of illustrious Presidents named by the Republican party, not a single one is the product of the popular primary. If there had been a popular primary in 1860, for example, does Mr. Leeper fancy that Mr. Lincoln could or would have been nominated? Or Garfield, or Harrison, or even Roosevelt in their order?

Will Roosevelt defeat both Taft and Wilson? Mr. Leeper thinks so. We are unconvinced. How can it be done by merely wrecking the Republican party?

THE CASE OF JUDGE HANFORD.

The motive of Judge Hanford in tendering his resignation will be variously interpreted; but it seems to be for the most part assumed that it is a confession of guilt. Yet the question may fairly be asked what obligation to his reputation and his family a man has who faces the odds that evidently confronted Hanford and appeared certain to crush him in the end? The Oregonian has no idea that Hanford deems himself guilty, or intended by resignation to acknowledge gross misconduct, or worse. Undoubtedly it is true that he felt unequal to the strain of a long impeachment trial; undoubtedly he was tired of seeing his name, his conduct and his record a subject of continued discussion and criticism; and undoubtedly he desired to relieve his friends and his family of the dreary strain to which they had long been subjected. He felt, too, that, whatever the opinion of the country at large, his fame in his own home, where he had lived for nearly 60 years, was to an extent secure. Why should he at his age care greatly what the rest of the world thought?

This is not at all an excuse for Hanford, but it may serve as an explanation. He did well to resign. He was far from an ideal judge. The Oregonian thinks he was honest, though highly imprudent in his dealings with litigants. He was prejudiced, opinionated, and reactionary. He saw all things in the light of its influence on the little circle which surrounded him. He was easily persuaded to take the side of property against mere human rights. The new political dispensation meant to him revolution, anarchy and chaos. He believed that a judge has a sort of divine title to the unquestioning reverence of the masses. He loved his country, and he thought the man who did not love it ought to be in jail. The existing order appealed to him; the dreams and hopes of reformers and idealists he abhorred. Hanford was a survival of the medieval ages, and belonged elsewhere than on the bench.

Probably Judge Hanford drank more than was good for him. But he seems nevertheless to have been industrious and diligent. Industry and diligence, however, do not excuse gross self-indulgence. We hope it is true that he has been much maligned as to his habits; but apparently there is too much truth in the charges. The sober man never has to defend himself from the charge of excessive drinking.

The Hanford case has been a painful episode. It is well over. The public will wish the judge peace in his retirement, and happiness in the consolations and confidences of his friends.

THAT MICHIGAN PLATFORM.

Direct legislation is put to the front as a National issue in the platform of Michigan's Bull Moose party. If the National convention of the new party should give the Oregon idea equal prominence, we may expect to see it divide attention with the tariff in the National campaign. In general, there is little difference between the Michigan declaration of principles and that put forward by Senator La Follette, whom Roosevelt supplanted as the progressive leader.

In one respect, however, Michigan breaks away from Roosevelt and follows La Follette, unless the Colonel has revised more of his opinions. That is in its advocacy of physical valuation of railroads. La Follette in his autobiography says that Roosevelt, as President, committed himself to support of the principle, which is the Senator's particular hobby, but failed to carry out a pledge to recommend that Congress embody it in the rate bill of 1906. Roosevelt later, in his speeches, upheld the contention of the railroads that their property was worth the amount at which they are capitalized. Should he now change front and adopt the Michigan platform, he may fall foul of his capitalist backers, Perkins and Hanna, and his speeches may be quoted against him. Should he oppose or ignore physical valuation, he will give the Wisconsin man an opportunity to deny his progressiveness.

But that would not trouble the Colonel or his blindly devoted followers. He changes his platform to suit the exigencies of the moment. He can do no wrong.

THE CASE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The anti-suffrage argument which has been sent to the Secretary of State for publication in the voters' pamphlet is signed by some very capable women. It is fair to assume, therefore, that it presents as strong a case as the nature of the subject permits. If upon examination the arguments prove to be trivial and many of the statements of fact erroneous, it is not the fault of the compilers, but of the cause for which they speak. If they had had a strong cause they would doubtless have made a strong argument for it, but when a cause is weak and obstructive, it requires more than human ingenuity to give it the appearance of strength and justice. Hence one can readily understand why the arguments offered by the anti-suffragists are feeble without in the least impugning the ability of those who have advanced them. They did the best they could. Angels could do no more. The document seeks literary grace and dignity by quotations from Ida Tarbell and Marie Corelli. Miss Tarbell tells us in her forceful way that "the labor of the world is naturally divided between the two different beings that people the world."

Miss Tarbell does not trace for us this natural line of division. Would she had. We should then know definitely where to look for a country in which it has been followed. Is it Germany, where the woman is harnessed to the plow and the man drives? Is it Switzerland, where the woman mows hay on the mountain side and carries it home at night on her back? Is it the United States, where 8,000,000 women earn their living side by side with men in the industries? Miss Tarbell, or some of those who rely for their opinions upon her knowledge of social facts, would confer a favor by telling the public just how she learned about this "natural division of labor" and where she has ever found it in practice. She is herself one of the best proofs anyone could ask that the division of work she makes so much of is wholly imaginary.

Miss Tarbell has done "man's work" ever since she began to write upon economic subjects and it is commonly conceded that she has done it superlatively well. She can express a sound judgment upon the tariff with her pen and publish it broadcast, but for some subtle reason she fancies it would be unwomanly to do the same thing with a ballot.

Marie Corelli is quoted to show that women ought to teach men "in the nursery and schoolroom and not at the polling booth." Why not in all three places? Certainly he needs instruction in them all. But we are struck with the poverty of literary support which compels the anti-suffragists to resort to a writer of the caliber of Marie Corelli. Had they consulted any of the real leaders of thought and expression of their sex they would have found them all on the other side. Jane Addams, Ellen Key, Selma Lagerlof, women of their caliber are uniformly suffragists. To find opponents of the reform we must seek out the Marie Corellis or the pampered parasites of aristocracy like Mrs. Humphry Ward. The ignorance which Ida Tarbell displays of the essentials of the suffrage question suggests that if she had ever taken the pains to study it she would have joined its advocates, for we believe that she is intellectually honest, even though she makes blunders sometimes.

The arguments against suffrage which are relied upon to persuade Oregon voters to reject the amendment are summed up in ten "becauses" at the end of the document.

The first three amount to this, that suffrage is a duty from which women have heretofore been exempt. They wish to remain exempt. But "conferring suffrage upon the women who claim it would impose it upon many who" do not want it. Hence these tears. Here is clearly some confusion of thought. The amendment would not require any women to vote who do not wish to do so. They would have the privilege of staying at home if they desire, precisely like men. More lucidly stated, this part of the argument would read, "A few of us women of means and leisure do not wish to vote. Therefore we propose to do all we can to prevent any women from voting."

The next "because" is to the purport that "doubling the vote by giving women the franchise", will not improve its quality. Perhaps not. It depends, of course, upon the stand women take after they are enfranchised. In our opinion they will work for better social and political conditions. That is what they are doing in California and Washington and it is what they would naturally do in Oregon. We cannot convince ourselves that the women of Oregon are morally inferior to their sisters in other states.

We read in the next place that women do not need to vote because "the vast majority are represented by household suffrage," whatever that may be. We never heard of any household going to the polls and voting. Can the anti-suffragists possibly mean by "household suffrage" the act of the saloon bum without house, home or intelligence who slinks to the polls and barters his vote for a drink of gin? Does the sot whose wife supports him at the washtub "represent" her and her children when he votes? It would be pleasant indeed if the anti-suffragists would take a casual glance at the patent facts of life before they compose another argument against the right of their sisters to vote. The notion that one person can "represent" at the polls half a dozen others who differ with him in every possible way is a very old one. It comes down directly from the feudal theory that the lord of the manor represented all his serfs when he cast his ballot. In the countries where it originated this false theory has been rejected, but we still see it quoted in Oregon against the elementary human rights of working women.

The argument then proceeds to say that the few women "who are not represented by household suffrage suffer no practical injustice" which the ballot will remedy. Whoever wrote this fine bit of unconscious satire would find it profitable to read the life of Clara Woerishoffer. During a strike of working girls in New York she found the police arresting the girls "practically without cause" and haling them into court where they were held for bail regardless of justice. This the officials dared to do because the girls had no votes. Male strikers are never thus treated in New York. Fortunately Clara Woerishoffer was rich enough to give bail for the girls, but with the suffrage the "practical injustice" would not have been inflicted.

The following "because" appeals to another exploded dogma of feudalism, that of "divine right." "Women are divinely ordered to be different in the state as in the home." Two centuries ago we should have been told that the great mass of males were "divinely ordered" to obey king and lords without protest. When a cause is driven to call in the doctrine of divine right for its backing, the natural inference is that it has found a hard row of stumps. It would be interesting to learn how the anti-suffragists discovered with so much assurance what the wishes of the Lord are in the matter of suffrage. Are they quite certain that they have not mistaken him for another and less respectable source of authority? In the next place we are told that the present occupations of women engross all their energies so that they have no time to vote. What are these occupations? For some 8,000,000 women they are shirt-making, laundering, selling goods and so on. These women want to vote. Is it not true as a matter of candid fact that many of the women who are too "engrossed" to find time for the ballot are childless wives whose days are passed drinking weak tea, playing bridge and gossiping.

The argument closes with the futile remarks that the right to vote would "deprive woman of special legal privileges" which she now enjoys and that it would require her to hold office and serve on juries. Is it likely that woman with the ballot would lose any legal privileges which she has acquired without it? As to office-holding, who ever heard of a man being thrust into an office against his will? Women may as well calm their timid fears in that respect. The offices will not pursue them. No doubt some would be obliged to serve on juries, but in many cases their presence there is highly salutary and they ought not to shirk the duty.

The promised construction of a power plant at the falls of the Kalama River presages the building of electric railways throughout Southwestern Washington, which may equal in extent those of Western Oregon. The embargo on coal production in Alaska is not likely to be raised this year, owing to the preoccupation of Congress with politics and the tariff. Before it is raised we may have developed the "white coal" resources of the Northwest to such an extent that we can dispense with much black coal.

With a properly developed parcels post a free public market would be less useful than under present conditions, but there will always be a place for it. The luxury of purchasing supplies from the producer himself will be appreciated by Portlanders when they have learned what it is. The gain will be twofold. Farmers will get better prices and consumers will pay less for edibles than they now do. The saving will be made by eliminating superfluous handling of goods.

The mild-eyed cow is in bad repute. Time was when she was regarded as the baby's best friend. Now she is accused of transmitting to him tuberculosis, typhoid and various other diseases. She is viewed with suspicion and is inspected and has her milk tested by prying scientists. Thus is science destroying another of our illusions. We miss them, but we are a healthier race and have reduced the death rate. That is some consolation.

Despite constant ringing of the alarm, about as many people die of bovine tuberculosis as catch trichinosis by eating pork. Yet the hog product is a pillar in the foundation of business and the "roast beef of old England" is just as palatable as ever, and both will be consumed by the men who make the world go.

Reciprocity would cure the ills of Seaside and Los Angeles. Let Seaside send some surplus men south and Los Angeles send some surplus girls north and the balance between the sexes will be restored.

The hail and rain storms are a greater calamity to the consumer than to the farmer. While they destroy a large proportion of the wheat crop, they thereby enhance the value of what remains.

The mimic war now being fought in the Grays Harbor country has the merit of causing no worse injury to the soldiers than a few blisters on their feet and a healthy "tired feeling" all over.

By and by, when the tuberculosis peril drives all the cows into beef and the lacteal supply is derived from the immune goat, what a dreadful lot of buttinskies the race will become.

Let it be said of John Lemp, pioneer brewer of Idaho, that he made good beer, which in the days long past helped much in solving territorial problems.

If Oregon oats are best for trans-Pacific shipment, as testified by a former Quartermaster, why does not the Government buy more of them?

Now that Japan is to spend a million on her exhibit, San Francisco will welcome all the brown children to her schools.

The Young Men's Christian Association has more than half a million members in America, each a unit for good.

Britain will have the largest navy, though it overtaxes the resources of the empire. Rule Britannia!

When lightning strikes in the Valley the only possible inference is that Nature is short-circuited.

Whatever else is done, keep congestion off the Burnside bridge.

The bush league nine gave the Beavers a scare.

Seagirt is edging Oyster Bay off the map.

No flies in the grocery today.

POLITICAL WAKE IS PICTURED.

Correspondent Wishes Funeral of Republican and Democratic Parties.

PORTLAND, July 23.—(To the Editor.)—Referring to my communication on the political situation recently published in The Oregonian, and the editorial on the same subject in The Oregonian of July 19, I am not the least bit in a "dilemma" as to what to do in deciding how I shall vote next November.

The political lines were never so clearly drawn between right and wrong as they are now.

"For the good of the party" I have swallowed some pretty bitter pills in the past 50 years but, like millions of other Republicans, I draw the line on Mr. Taft. He does not represent true democratic ideas. He was placed in nomination by a National committee elected four years ago, very few of whom having been elected by popular primaries. A large number of them were turned down at the late elections for delegates. Consequently, they should have had no voice in organizing the National convention. There is not a doubt in my mind but what the committee members were liberally paid for the dirty work they did. I know the sentiment of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and I know that there has for many years been a growing resentment against the Republican party, and Mr. Taft and his backers caused this feeling to break into a flame in 1909. It was not so much what the party did, but what they failed to do.

I certainly believe in the recall of the judges—and their decisions, but I would go a step or two further and include the President and members of Congress. The records do not show that men are infallible, because they happen to be so lucky as to have a "pull" and gets a life position on the Federal bench. Ex-Senator Mason, of Illinois, stated publicly two years ago that 75 per cent of the members of Congress held their positions by the illegal use of money.

The passage of the Aldrich-Payne (not the P. and A.) tariff bill proved that there were only ten men in the Senate that had the courage to vote as they thought people wanted them to.

I shall do all in my power to elect Mr. Roosevelt. I hardly know which would be the greatest calamity—the election of Mr. Taft or Mr. Wilson. If Mr. Wilson is elected, it will be just what the Republican party deserves. For more than 20 years the party has been growing more and more corrupt. The principal leaders of the party are grafters of the worst kind. Of course, the "crooks" are afraid of Mr. Roosevelt and they have good cause. He has sent so many of them to prison. They know that he will clean out the rest if he can get honest court officials to prosecute them.

Don't have any anxiety as to the result. "Teddy" will be elected. The people have awakened and in November they will show Mr. Taft what they think of his policies. During the last six months I have talked with hundreds of Republicans in Washington, Oregon and California, and without a single exception they said they would vote against Mr. Taft. In fact, I don't believe there are any Taft men—save Federal office-holders. It's a good time to clean house and start anew.

The Democratic party ought to have been buried in 1865, and now is a good time to put an end to both parties. Let's have a double funeral and a "wake" and then start anew. I am simply voicing the sentiments of millions and millions of voters.

W. M. LEEPER.

DOSE OF LAW IS TOO GREAT

Lawyers Bring Law Into Contempt by Their Absurdities.

PORTLAND, July 21.—(To the Editor.)—It was indeed with some pleasure that the writer perused the "early" history of legal jurisprudence as typified in the experiences of "Cormorant." Motley tells us, when Peter the Great, while visiting the courts at Westminster, asked: "Are these all lawyers?" and, being answered in the affirmative, he asked: "What can be the use of so many lawyers? I have but two in my empire, and I mean to hang one of them as soon as I get back." His words conveyed much truth then, for his lawyers were valueless to him because "his country, without law, had little use for or need of lawyers."

Therefore the question naturally arises to one of the lay minds as to whether a Peter the Great of this modern day would have the same contempt for the legal profession, knowing the country to be suffering from too great a dose of laws. If the legal profession is weakening its own bulwarks of tradition by allowing its followers to disregard the established (?) codes of ethics which rule the profession, what weight, may we ask, will be attached to the opinion of a lawyer a few years hence?

We are even now endowing our spirit of current ridicule with a touch of serious contempt when we refer to a follower of Blackstone. No longer does the mention of such Latin terms as habeas corpus or corpus delicti frighten us into convulsions, but rather do we indulge in sweet bandinage over our teacups as we read of some new and novel plea set forth by some defender of the erring in one of our American courtrooms.

What truant boy, who had fallen into a stream while fishing invented to his parents one-half as laughable and ridiculous an excuse as that plea which is daily handed into a somber courtroom, before a sober-minded judge and in the presence of a jury which gives it respectful consideration?

Though of lay mind and unversed in the procedure of the courtroom, still the writer would reflect upon the state of mind of one who, having committed a serious crime, and while still being fearful of the consequences of a conviction, watches the ponderous, unwieldy machinery of the courtroom working around him, with many loopholes of escape, and grinding out new straws for some future erring man to cling to. Therefore, it may, perhaps, be within the province of the writer to say that the criminologist may find that the criminal thus finds his business fairly safe, due to the fact that some lawyers manufactured their own code of ethics to fit their own particular case which may happen to be on the docket. Or, perhaps, there are no ethics which govern the lawyer in his profession. Could The Oregonian enlighten?

CHARLES M. GOODMAN.

Shower of Gold Rings.

Baltimore American.

Because of the stirring appeal of Bishop W. F. Oldham, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for funds to be used in mission work among the Filipinos, a shower of gold rings and earrings fell at his feet on the stage of the Red Rock, Minn., camp-meeting grounds. The women present had no money with them, but responded with hundreds of dollars' worth of such valuables.

One of the First Families.

Philadelphia Record.

Attired in the clothing of a gentleman of early days, James M. Mifflin, member of one of the oldest English families in Pennsylvania, will drive a garbage cart in the pageant to be held at Philadelphia. Mr. Mifflin has ascertained that the ancestor who brought wealth into the family was a dump-cart owner.

One Bank Account for 75 Years.

Hartford (Conn.) Cor.

Mrs. Edna H. Chase, of Kansas City, Mo., has a savings-bank account with the Norwich, Conn., Savings Society which has been in that bank constantly for 75 years. The account was opened by her father, William Swift, January 1, 1837.

AT THE CAFETERIA

By Addison Bennett.

It being Friday, the little blonde cashier's place at the cash register in the cafeteria was occupied by another, but not the stout girl. The proprietor had decided that she would never become proficient in her duties, apparently having but two aims in view—one, the desire for more pay; two, a longing for closing time. Those two thoughts occupied all of her brain power, so there was no energy left for her duties.

The little blonde had recommended a chum of hers, a nice-looking young lady, apparently sweet dispositioned, with a face that bespoke intelligence, neither vain nor forward. When the blonde hired her she had said that perhaps the place might be hers permanently if she gave satisfaction, and she was cautioned as to various pitfalls and warned against certain guests inclined to be fresh.

"If I were in your place," said the little blonde to her, "I would put all of my mind on the business during business hours; that is what you are paid for. You are not to be an automaton, to sit there and take the money and mutter 'thank you' to the customers, meantime watching the clock for closing time. This will come quicker if you forget about it and keep your mind on your business. You will think your pay very small, but you will find the boss ready to pay more as you show a disposition to earn more; you will never get more by trying to see how little you can do. Try always to earn more than you get, and you will mighty soon find you are getting more than you earn. When you can come to feel that way, and live up to it, you will be a fixture in my old chair as long as you choose to stay."

As Miss Brown Eyes was thinking these things over, and saying over and over to herself, "Blondie certainly gave me good advice, and I am going to do my level best to live up to it," the three poultrymen came in and were soon devouring their food at their accustomed table.

* * *

"I see," said Bones, "that we are going to have a pretty fat ballot at the November election, some thirty or forty bills to vote on, besides the candidates. Which reminds me that our old friend Obsession had the thing down pretty pat when he said that the ordinary voter could not master the ballot sufficiently to vote intelligently, and was just as likely to vote wrong as right."

"Do you think Obsession was more fit to frame laws than those who have framed these that we will find on the ballot in November?" queried Fat.

"No," said Bones, "but the whole trouble is that men of the Obsession stamp have the same opportunity, if they have the price, to get an evil bill on the ballot as anybody has to get a commendable one on; and one is just about as liable to pass as another."

"I remember," remarked Veg, "that when the advocates of the initiative and referendum were haranguing the people in the campaign when we had it up for adoption or rejection that a good deal of stress was laid on the fact that the initiative was to be used only in cases where the Legislature failed to act. It was to be a sort of adjunct to and the referendum a brake on the Legislature. In other words, the initiative and referendum were to be the tail and the Legislature the dog. But it has turned out that the Legislature is the tail and the initiative the dog."

"It is too blamed hot to talk politics," chipped in Fat. "When the pot gets to boiling along in October we will take these matters up and see if we can understand what we are going to vote on in November. In the meantime what do you fellows think about—"

* * *

"Hold on, just a moment while we are on this subject," said Bones. "It may be hot or it may be cool, just as a fellow gauges our temperature when compared with that of Alaska or with the cities of the East. Up north people are freezing, in New York and Chicago thousands are dying with the heat; here it is a trifle warm, perhaps you might even say hot, during the latter part of the day. But it is never so warm at night that a fellow can't get a good night's rest and be fresh and rejuvenated in the morning, ready for a full day's work. So much for the weather. Now as to politics we have a campaign on about half the time, more than that in the cities, and we have to work overtime to find where we are at and who is who and which is what—or words to that tenor and effect.

"Here we have had the primaries and have made our nominations; so apparently that part of the trouble is a thing of the past. Now up bobs the Bull Moose and his backers and say we must make more nominations. There is Bourne; he was nicely and decently and fairly defeated for the Senate and Selling nominated. And this was done by the direct primaries law, and Bourne has said over and over that the law and the people were on trial, and supposedly the outcome of the primary election would settle the nominations. Now comes Bourne and says he will make another try to defeat Selling. Where in thunder are we at?"

* * *

"Well," replied Fat, "nobody seems to know just how Bourne can get in the game again, but as a friend of the Bull Moose he will find a way, a way which he will declare and proclaim is an upholding of the direct primaries law. If he fails to get on the ticket by the next attempt—why the campaign is young and he will find some other way before November, even if he has to call an 'assembly' to get a nomination."

"Which reminds me," said Veg, "of a circumstance that happened soon after Cleveland was elected to the Presidency. Big Tim Sullivan, of New York, was then, I think a member of Congress. Tim went to the newly-elected President and asked him to remove a certain Republican official and appoint as the successor a Democratic friend of his. 'But,' said Cleveland, 'the Constitution of the United States stands in the way.' 'What does the Constitution amount to among friends?' replied Tim."

"There you have it," said Fat. "The direct primaries law was made to defeat its enemies and perpetuate its friends in office; what does it amount to if it cannot keep Bourne in the Senate? Nothing. It is a dead failure if it cannot provide a way to defeat Selling and elect Bourne. And as he has tried once for the nomination and failed, so he will try again. If he fails the second time he will doubtless find another opening before November comes, even if he has to resort to an assembly for the nomination."

Warning for Athletes.

Washington (D. C.) Star.

"What do you mean by laying hands on this young man?" asked the policeman.

"Why," replied Mr. Corntossel, "them clothes——"

"That's all right. He's a Marathon runner."

"Excuse me. I thought he was walkin' in his sleep."

Wireless Telegraph in 1865.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

Interest has been revived in the claims of Dr. Mahlon Loomis to the invention of wireless telegraphy. July 30, 1872, he took out a patent for an invention made in 1865, involving, it is now claimed, every principle of the present wireless telegraph. Congress granted him $50,000 in a special bill signed by General Grant in 1873, but he never received the money.

The Tedjan Moose

By Dean Collins.

(Cribbed from Homer.)

The wily Theodore, who strove to win
A third term breach the White House walls within,
When from Chicago fled his bird of hope,
Mixed up a new line of strategic dope:
"I'll boldly fashion for my campaign use
To win inside the walls, a great Bull Moose;
In its vast frame I'll hide my trusty men,
Toss my bandana to the breeze again
And from its back proclaim myself the one
Destined to put the Int'rests on the run,
Friend of the masses, he who hath the pills
That hold the cure for all the public ills;
And when the people hear my lusty shout,
Hailing me as their savior, beyond doubt
They'll rally round me with triumphant roar,
And shove the Moose right through the White House door.
Thus, with no check, I and my bunch shall glide,
Shoved by adoring masses to th' inside.
Truly my scheme," he chortled in his joy,
"Will be a horse on the wood horse of Troy."

Oh! Fates perverse, who with stern "Nix!" and "Not!"
High hopes of earthly heroes ofttimes swat.
With loving hands the great symbolic Moose
Was framed, and on the breezes was turned loose
Great Teddy's fiat, ringing far and wide;
"Let those who love to serve me get inside."
La Follette heard the cry and Cummins, too,
Borah was told by Teddy what to do;
And other heroes heard the rallying call—
But shook their heads and never crawled a crawl;
And though, full stern, he bade them make the switch,
The great Moose stood, still hollow, in the ditch.

Still hollow, said I? Not entirely so.
Pinchot was there, with eagerness to go;
Dixon and Johnson joined the sturdy crew,
And to the rescue Flinn and Munsey flew,
And if one listened carefully, I ween,
The clicking of a harvester machine,
From the dark cavity a clew turned loose
As to the motive power of the Moose.

Then from the great jaws of the statue broke,
As though a Delphic oracle had spoke,
The sharp stage whisper of the plotters: "Ted,
We're ready, open up and go ahead—
But do be careful, lest the people's eyes,
Prying about, may lead them to get wise
To who's inside—if so, it is a cinch
They'll never shove the bally brute an inch."

Portland, July 23.

Half a Century Ago

From The Oregonian of July 24, 1862.

Florence, July 11. — Many claims here continue to pan out rich. Kimball & Reid took out of their claim on Miller's Creek the other day 164 ounces, and have averaged about 30 pounds per week, and about 4000 ounces have been taken from the claim above expenses. Preachers, lawyers, doctors, and indeed all professions and nearly all races are represented in the mines, but of all classes I believe the lawyers do the least work.

Springfield, Mo., July 17.—An expedition under command of Major Miller attacked the combined forces of Rains, Coffee, Hunter, Hawthorne and Tracy, 1600 strong, eight miles beyond Fayetteville, Ark., Tuesday morning, completely routing them with heavy loss. Our force did not exceed 600.

Washington, July 14.—In Congress today a message was received from the President, enclosing and earnestly recommending a bill for the compensation of states which may abolish slavery.

Mr. Wesley Gosnell has been in this city for several days past, having pursued a couple of horsethieves from Olympia to this place.

The play at the theater last night was very creditable. Mr. John Wood, in his comical character of Crepin in "The Wonderful Woman," was decidedly the best thing we have seen on this stage, while Miss Belle Devine sustained her character as Hortense, or the ambitious widow, admirably. The singing of Miss Belle Devine was truly excellent.

The resolution to create the rank of Lieutenant-General, to be conferred by brevet only, on the most meritorious officer of the war, has passed.

Naming the New Party.

San Antonio, Texas, Express.

"What name will Roosevelt's party bear?"
The anxious voter cries,
"Without a name that creature rare
We might not recognize.
It cannot be Republicrat,
Nor yet Democracan, that's flat;
Perhaps the Party of the Hat
Would be about its size."

The title Monopopulist
Sounds like the very thing;
It might be called the Fuss-and-Fist,
Or else the Bingbangbing.
Orlet it show the Roosevelt ways
In one concise and compact phrase
Until its members, full of praise,
Proclaim it as The Ring!

The Antimalefactor bluff
Suggests a fitting name;
The Bull Moose isn't big enough
(The Mastodon the same);
The Oysterettes might fill the bill
In honor of his domicile,
Although this man of mighty will
Says oysters are not game.

"Ho, Ormsby! Perkins! wily lads
Who ne'er advised me wrong,
What say you to the Teddytads
As being odd and strong?
Or why not raise our clarion shout
Below the title Inandout?
There is the theme, without a doubt,
To make a campaign song.

"No, wait! my loving subjects, wait!
I have the name for ye.
It's bully! fine! de-lightful! great!
'Twill suit the people free;
It's short and pointed, snappy, clear,
A word to split the atmosphere,
Let the new party now appear
With its fit name, the Me!"

A Breath of Politics.

Chicago Record-Herald.

"I dreamed last night that I had just made $1,000,000."

"How did you dream you made it?"

"By owning the bar in a big hotel that had been selected as political headquarters during a convention week."

Triumph of Hat Wearing.

London Chronicle.

Ten years ago Rev. Thomas Smith, vicar of Greenhill, Harrow, England, resolved not to wear a hat until the debt on his church was paid off. He is now wearing his hat again.