32 PAGES

The Sunday Oregonian.

PAGES 1 TO 8

VOL. XX.—NO. 51. PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 22, 1901. PRICE FIVE CENTS.

A SEVERE CENSURE

General Miles Reprimanded by Secretary Root.

FOR DISCUSSING SCHLEY CASE

He Is Informed That He Had No Business in the Controversy and No Right to Express Any Opinion on It.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21.—A determination on the part of the Administration absolutely to terminate further discussion of the Sampson-Schley controversy took shape in the publication today of some remarkable correspondence that has passed between Secretary Root and Lieutenant-General Miles, relative to the latter's interview, published in a Cincinnati paper, commenting upon the Schley case. When the interview appeared it attracted much attention officially, but after the lapse of two days without any sign of official action, the conclusion became general that the interview would be ignored. Therefore the publication this afternoon of the full correspondence on this subject created a sensation in Army and Naval circles. It is seldom that so severe a reprimand is administered to an officer of high rank in either service. What the result will be cannot be foretold, although it is assumed that General Miles will submit without further comment.

The nearest parallel of this case of recent years, excluding the incidents connected with the celebrated beef inquiry, was that of Rear-Admiral Richard Meade, who, upon returning from a cruise in Venezuelan waters with the white squadron, accorded an interview to a New York newspaper, severely criticising the Administration for its lack of vigor in dealing with the Venezuelan question. The outcome of that case was the early retirement of the Rear-Admiral from active service.

That General Miles appreciates the situation is shown by the deep concern he manifested today and his frequent visits to the office of Secretary Root. It was necessary for him to write two letters to meet the demands of the department, and even then there was no expression of satisfaction on the Secretary's part at the second explanation. However, Secretary Root himself regards the incident as closed. At least, he does not purpose to take any further action unless obliged to do so.

The text of the correspondence which passed between the Secretary of War and Lieutenant-General Miles follows:

"War Department, Washington, Dec. 19.—Sir: I am instructed by the President to call your attention to the enclosed report of an interview with you, appearing in the Associated Press newspapers of Tuesday, December 17, and to inquire whether the observations upon the action of a co-ordinate branch of the service in a matter now pending in the Navy Department were made as reported, and if so, to afford you such opportunity for explaining in writing as you may desire. Very respectfully,

"ELIHU ROOT,
"Secretary of War.

"Lieutenant-General Miles, Headquarters of the Army."

General Miles' Two Letters.

To the Secretary's letter General Miles made this reply:

"Headquarters of the Army, Washington, Dec. 20.—The Honorable the Secretary of War, Washington—Sir: Replying to your note of the 19th inst., I have the honor to state that my observations, as substantially reported, had no reference to the action, pending or otherwise, of co-ordinate branches of the service; they were merely my personal views, based upon matters set forth in various publications which had been given to the world, and concerning which I conceive there was no impropriety in expressing an opinion, the same as any other citizen, upon a matter of such public interest. My observations were in no sense intended as a criticism of any action taken by a co-ordinate branch of the service, and the statement that I had no sympathy with any efforts tending to disparage a distinguished and gallant officer likewise had no such reference. Very respectfully,

NELSON A. MILES,
"Lieutenant-General."

General Miles supplemented this letter with the following, handed to the Secretary today:

"Headquarters of the Army, Washington, Dec. 21.—The Honorable the Secretary of War—Sir: Referring to my note of yesterday, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding, I desire to say that for several years a distinguished and gallant officer has been assailed by parties who have endeavored to write him and other high officials down, until finally he appealed against such assaults to a co-ordinate branch of the Government. That co-ordinate branch of the Government granted him a court of inquiry, and, as I understood it, they unanimously exonerated him from such epithets as coward, poltroon, etc., and their opinions were given to the public for the information of all citizens. When I said that I had no sympathy with those who had endeavored to destroy the reputation of a high officer, who, like all other officers, regards his honor more sacred than life, I had in mind and referred to those assaults against which the Admiral appealed for protection and justification, and certainly not to a co-ordinate branch of the Government.

"I request that this not be laid before the President, and have no objection to it being made public. Very respectfully,

"NELSON A. MILES,
"Lieutenant-General."

Secretary Root's Reprimand.

The reprimand is contained in the following letter of Secretary Root to General Miles:

"War Department, Washington, Dec. 21, 1901.—Sir: By direction of the President, I communicate to you his conclusions upon your course in the interview to which your attention was called by my letter of 19th.

"Your explanation of the public statement made by you is not satisfactory. You are in error when you say that you have the same right as any other citizen to express publicly an opinion regarding the questions pending in the course of military discipline. The established invariable rules of official propriety necessary to the effective discipline of the service impose limitations upon the public expression of military officers with which your long experience should have made you familiar. Your duty is to express your opinion on official matters when called upon by your official superiors or in the due course of your official reports and recommendations, and not otherwise.

"The first article of the regulations governing the Army of the United States provided:

"'Deliberations or discussions among military men conveying praise or censure or any mark of approbation toward others in the military service, are prohibited.'

"This provision has been a part of the Army regulations for at least half a century, and the highest obligation to observe it rests upon the officers whose high rank should make them examples to their subordinates. Any other rule of action in the military service would be subversive of discipline. It would not be tolerated in a subaltern and it will not be tolerated in any officer of whatever rank.

"The present facts are that for several years there has been unfortunate and bitter controversy in the Navy Department—a controversy generally deplored even by the participants as tending to bring the service into disesteem at home and abroad and to destroy those relations of mutual confidence and friendship between naval officers which the interests of effective service require. In this controversy the Army has not been involved, and no bar has been raised to that good feeling and friendly relation between all the officers of the Navy and all the officers of the Army which is essential to the successful and harmonious co-operation of the two services in preparation for and in action. A court of inquiry has been held on the matters in controversy, and a report had been made in which one member of the court had dissented in some particulars from the majority, and the report was pending before the reviewing authority. At this point the Lieutenant-General of the Army saw fit to make a public expression of his opinion as between the majority and the minority of the court, accompanied by a criticism of a most severe character, which could not fail to be applied by the generality of readers to the naval officers against whose view your opinion was expressed. It is of no consequence on whose side your opinion was, or what it was. You had no business in the controversy and no right, holding the office which you did, to express any opinion. Your conduct was in violation of the regulation above cited and the rules of official propriety; and you are justly liable to censure, which I now express. Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
"Secretary of War.

"Lieutenant-General Nelson A. Miles, Headquarters of the Army.

"P. S. Your second letter of explanation, dated today and received since the above was written, does not change the case. The necessity for repeated explanations, but illustrated the importance of the rule which you have violated.

"ELIHU ROOT.
"Secretary of War."

The fact that simultaneously with the publication of the Miles correspondence, Secretary Root gave out a copy of Secretary Long's letter, directing that Maclay's resignation be requested, taken in connection with the publication this morning of the final chapters of the Schley controversy, so far as it has figured before the Navy Department, is taken as an indication of the President's purpose to clear the official records of all pending issues in that matter. Secretary Root's publication of the Maclay letter is explained by the fact that he left the White House some time after Secretary Long had been there, and thus was in position to carry out the President's latest wish in the matter.

POSSIBILITIES ARE GREAT.

Archbishop Ireland Talks of Labor-Capital Commission.

CHICAGO, Dec. 21.—Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, was in Chicago for a few hours today, on his way home from New York. Commenting with much optimism on the recent formation in the metropolis of the arbitration commission, he said:

"The commission was a great success, both on account of the character of the men who took part in it, the objects which they propose to pursue and the possibilities of the results to follow. It was no small thing to bring together the chief labor leaders of the country, employers representing the largest industrial operations, as well as those men who spoke for public opinion and general principles of justice rather than for the special interests of labor or capital."

SUMMARY OF THE DAY'S NEWS

Schley Inquiry.

Secretary Long approves the findings of the majority of the Schley court. Page 1.

Sampson's application for an inquiry into the question of command is denied. Page 1.

The Schley court is dissolved. Page 1.

General Miles was reprimanded for meddling in the Schley controversy. Page 1.

Foreign.

Panama Canal shareholders want to sell at any price. Page 3.

Emperor William's views on art are not generally accepted in Germany. Page 3.

Half a million Germans are unemployed. Page 3.

Domestic.

President Hill makes a statement of the purposes of the Northern Securities Company. Page 2.

Governor Crane, of Massachusetts, has been offered the Treasury portfolio. Page 3.

Salt Lake police believe Mortensen, the contractor, murdered James R. Hay. Page 3.

Pacific Coast.

Scheme of Chinese to evade exclusion law. Page 4.

Strike at Lucky Boy (Or.) mine proves wonderfully rich. Page 6.

Washington Agricultural College and fruitgrowers will make united effort to exterminate fruit pests. Page 6.

Interesting discovery regarding work of a fly in vinegar-making at Oregon Agricultural College. Page 6.

Commercial and Marine.

Copper kept New York stock market unsettled last week. Page 23.

Portland has shipped 18 foreign cargoes since December 1. Page 22.

Ship Nelson libeled by tugs Wallula and Tatoosh. Page 22.

Heavy arrivals cause shrinkage in en route grain fleet. Page 22.

Wreck of French bark Ernest Reyer may be sold next week. Page 22.

Portland and Vicinity.

Parkkeeper Myers killed in a street-car accident. Page 17.

Unsuccessful applicants for dental certificates protest against severe examinations. Page 1.

Oregon Historical Society meets, hears papers and elects officers. Page 10.

Captain Jamieson exonerated by Pinmore board of inquiry. Page 11.

R. K. Warren elected School Director to succeed the late D. P. Thompson. Page 24.

Port of Portland Commission will probably give drydock contract to M. T. Donnelly. Page 24.

Sons of Herman will celebrate tenth anniversary today. Page 9.

Features and Departments.

Christmas sermons by Laity. Page 25.

Miss Dolph's prize Christmas story. Page 26.

A Little Child Led Them Home. Page 27.

Two Christmas Celebrations, by Edward Everett Hale. Page 26.

Rev. John Watson's Christmas sermon. Page 25.

King Edward's $1,000,000 Christmas. Page 32.

Mary E. Wilkins' Christmas story. Page 29.

College Women, Past and Present. Page 27.

George Ade's Christmas Fable. Page 27.

Children's Christmas Stories. Page 28.

Dramatic and Musical. Page 20.

Social. Page 18.

APPROVED BY LONG

Findings of Naval Court Against Schley Indorsed.

MAJORITY REPORT WILL STAND

Sampson's Application to Enter Upon an Inquiry Into the Question of Command Is Denied.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21. — Secretary Long has approved finally of the Schley case, so far as the Navy Department is concerned, by acting upon the findings and conclusions of the court of inquiry. He approves the findings of fact and the opinion of the full court; he approves the majority opinion where there is a difference in the court; he holds that the court could not have entered into consideration of the command at Santiago, and finally he accepts the recommendation that no further proceedings be had. The Secretary also has declined the application of Admiral Sampson's counsel to enter upon an inquiry into the question of command, and has notified Admiral Schley's counsel of that fact as a reason for declining to hear them on that point. Secretary Long's approval of the majority report was as follows:

"The department has read the testimony in this case, the arguments of counsel at the trial, the court's findings of fact, opinion and recommendation; the individual memorandum of the presiding member; the statement of exceptions to the said findings, and opinion by the applicant; the reply to said statement by the Judge-Advocate of the court and his assistants; the brief this day submitted by counsel for Rear-Admiral Sampson, traversing the presiding member's view as to who was in command at the battle of Santiago, and after careful consideration the findings of fact and the opinion of the full court are approved.

"As to the points on which the presiding member differs from the majority of the court, the opinion of the majority is approved. As to the further expressions of his views by the same number with regard to the questions of command on the morning of July 3, 1898, and of the title to credit for the ensuing victory, the conduct of the court in making no finding and rendering no opinion on those questions is approved. Indeed, it could with propriety take no other course, evidence on these questions during the inquiry having been excluded by the court.

"The department approves the recommendation of the court that no further proceedings be had in the premises.

"The department records its appreciation of the arduous labors of the whole court.

JOHN D. LONG,
"Secretary of the Navy."

The text of the Secretary's letter to Admiral Sampson's attorneys, and to Admiral Schley, follows:

"Navy Department, Washington, Dec. 20.—Gentlemen: In view of the department's approval this day of the recommendation of the court of inquiry in the case of Admiral Schley, that no further proceedings be had, and of the fact that the question of command was excluded from consideration by the court, the department will take no action upon the brief filed by you in behalf of Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson. Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
"Secretary.

"Messrs. Stayton & Theall, Johnston Building, New York."

"Navy Department, Washington, Dec. 21.—Sir: Referring to the department's letter of the 13th inst., you are advised that action today has been taken upon the findings, opinion and recommendation of the court of inquiry in your case, and upon the minority opinion of the presiding member, and a copy of the indorsement embodying such action is herewith transmitted for your information.

"In response to your request of the 18th inst., heretofore acknowledged, that if a protest should be filed by Rear-Admiral W. T. Sampson, relative to the question of command of the American naval forces during the battle of Santiago, and credit of the victory won in that battle, that you be accorded an opportunity to present, through your counsel, oral argument against such protest, you are advised that a brief on this subject has this day been filed by Messrs. Stayton, Campbell & Theall, counsel for Admiral Sampson. In view, however, of the department's approval of the recommendation of the court of inquiry that no further proceedings be had, and of the fact that the question of command was excluded from consideration by the court, no action will be taken on said brief, and reply to that effect (copy enclosed) has this day been made to counsel for Admiral Sampson. A copy of the report from the advocate of the court and his assistant on your communication of the 18th inst., objecting to the approval of the findings of the court, is also herewith transmitted. Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
"Secretary of the Navy.

"Rear-Admiral Winfield S. Schley, United States Navy, retired, the Richmond, Washington, D. C."

SCHLEY COURT DISSOLVED.

An Order to That Effect Sent by the Secretary to Admiral Dewey.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21. — Secretary Long this afternoon issued a formal order dissolving the Schley court of inquiry. The order was communicated at once to Admiral Dewey, president of the court, who acknowledged its receipt and said that in conformity with the order of the Secretary he had announced the dissolution of the court. Following is the text of the letter sent by Secretary Long to Admiral Dewey, dissolving the court:

"The court of inquiry, of which you are the president, convened by department's order of July 26, 1901, for the purpose of inquiring into the conduct of Rear-Admiral (then Commodore) W. S. Schley, U. S. N., retired, during the recent war with Spain, and the events connected therewith, is this day dissolved. You will inform the other members of the court and the Judge-Advocate accordingly. Very respectfully,

"JOHN D. LONG, Secretary

"To the Admiral of the Navy."

When seen at his hotel this afternoon Admiral Schley stated that he did not care to make any comment whatever on the action taken by Secretary Long on the findings of the court. The Admiral said he would leave Washington next Monday for New York, where he will remain for an indefinite period. Messrs. Raynor & Teague, of counsel for Admiral Schley, were in Baltimore today, and in their absence the Admiral was not prepared to say whether any further action would be taken in his behalf at the Navy Department or in Congress, or whether or not a final appeal to President Roosevelt would be made.

RAYNOR IS INDIGNANT.

Declares the Whole Proceeding Is Arbitrary and Tyrannical.

BALTIMORE, Dec. 21.—Isador Raynor, Attorney-General of Maryland and counsel for Admiral Schley, when shown the decision of Secretary Long today, manifested the greatest surprise and indignation.

"The court decided the case," said he, "without considering the testimony of Admiral Schley and his witnesses, and Secretary Long seems to have decided it without so much as permitting us to file a reply to the protest filed by Admiral Sampson's attorneys. Now I understand that the Secretary has decided against Admiral Dewey and adverse to Schley's being in command at Santiago, and virtually in favor of Sampson, without even permitting us to produce before him the conclusive proof, admitted at the hearing by consent, that the command practically and officially devolved upon Schley. The whole proceeding is too arbitrary and tyrannical for me now to discuss. I really wonder whether the people who live under free institutions will tolerate the exercise of such despotic measures.

"You ask me what our next step will be. I do not know unless the President intervenes. There is a power in the courts to compel the Secretary to file the dissenting opinion of Admiral Dewey, whether he agrees with it or not. We will determine next week what proceedings will be adopted."

General Pearson's Status.

NEW YORK, Dec. 21.—A dispatch to the London Times and the New York Times from Brussels says that General Samuel Pearson, who has been reported to be an accredited Boer representative in the United States, has no standing as a Boer General, and merely acts as a private individual, anxious to forward the interests of peace.

Gift to Kruger.

UTRECH, Dec. 21.—Rev. Mr. Schaeffer, a Protestant clergyman of Remschied, Rhenish Prussia, presented to Mr. Kruger today a purse of 10,000 marks, subscribed as a Christmas gift to the Boer children by the children of the Rhine Provinces and Westphalia.

WHY DID NINE FAIL?

Dental Board Turns Down All Applicants But One.

EXAMINATION IS VERY HARD

The Chemical Questions, for Most Part, So Impracticable That Expert Chemists Would Be Puzzled, Says Dr. Binswanger.

Of the 10 applicants who were before the State Board of Dental Examiners last week, nine failed to pass the examinations, and the only one who maintained the necessary average of 75 per cent was Dr. O. F. Ireland, who was granted a license to practice dentistry in the state. The nine who were unable to pass the examinations make no secret of their dissatisfaction over the result, and they charge that the questions were unusually and unnecessarily hard, particularly those submitted in the chemistry examination.

The sessions of the State Board were held in Portland Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of last week, and the following members were present: Dr. J. L. Reavis, president, Portland; Dr. G. S. Wright, secretary, McMinnville; Dr. W. C. Logan, Astoria; Dr. A. L. Beatie, Oregon City; Dr. W. A. Wise, Portland. Following are the names of the applicants who took the examination, so far as they could be obtained yesterday: Earl Wilson, Heppner; William Amos, Albany; John Johnson, Astoria; Mrs. Dr. Adams, Albany; Edwin L. Ross, Cincinnati; O. F. Ireland, H. H. Geiger, G. W. Smith, J. B. Kiefer, Portland.

The examination papers were prepared by the members of the board, and the assignment of topics was as follows:

"Dental Pathology, Therapeutics and Anaesthetics," Dr. J. L. Reavis.

"Operative Dentistry," Dr. G. S. Wright.

"Physiology and Anatomy," Dr. W. C. Logan.

"Prosthetic Dentistry," Dr. A. L. Beatie.

"Chemistry," Dr. W. A. Wise.

It was the chemistry examination that floored the applicants who failed. While all of the questions submitted were difficult, the applicants are devoting their denunciations and protests against the questions propounded by Dr. Wise. They allege that the examination was unfair in its severity, that the questions were impractical, and that to cover a course that would qualify them to answer correctly would be equal to a senior year course in a scientific school. In the protests against the impracticability of the questions in chemistry, the applicants are sustained in part by Dr. Otto S. Binswanger, professor of chemistry of the faculty of the North Pacific Dental College, and one of the best-known authorities on chemistry on the Pacific Coast. In discussing the questions submitted to the applicants, Dr. Binswanger said:

Hard Even for an Expert.

"I consider most of the questions impracticable to such an extent that even expert chemists would have great difficulty in answering them in entirety."

Dr. Binswanger explained that much of the information necessary to answer the questions correctly was not of a nature to be committed to memory, and, even if it had been memorized, an expert would not trust his recollection, if he had occasion to use the figures, but would consult his books to insure accuracy. Following are the questions submitted by Dr. Wise to which exception has been taken, on the ground of their impracticability:

1. Into how many groups are binary oxides classed? Name them? What is meant by the term radical? The galvanic current? Name the halogens?

2. What is copper? What is its melting point? What is cuprous chloride? What is cuprous oxide? What is meant by the native sulphide?

3. Name the rare dyad metals? Give their symbols? Atomic weight? Specific gravity? Fusing point?

4. What is an element? About how many are there? Give symbol and atomic weight of each? For what is sulphurous acid used? What is $C_{17}H_{19}NO_3$ plus H_2O?

5. To what group of metals does gold belong? Give its symbol, atomic weight, specific gravity and melting point? What acids act upon it and Ag.? What is boron? What is H_2O_2?

6. What is meant by thermal units? What is a chemical combination? What metals do not rust? What is meant by corroding? Which of the dyad metals volatilize, and at what degree?

7. How many elements are, at ordinary temperatures, solids? What is affinity? What is nitric acid? Give the density and boiling point of chloroform? What is bromoform?

8. What is N_2O? How is it prepared, and for what is it used? What is HCl, and by whom discovered? Give its physical and chemical properties? What is cupric oxide?

9. What are the hypochlorites? How is salt formed? What is the notations of compounds? What is hydrogen sulphide? Give its chemical properties?

10. H_2O, SO_3 equals what? What is the symbol for water? Name a portion of the Berzelin's electro-chemical series? What is analysis? What is chlorine?

Protest May Be Filed.

It is quite on the cards that the applicants who failed to pass the examination will file a formal protest with the Board of Examiners, asking that another examination be held because of the unusual severity of the one just past. Dr. J. L. Reavis, president of the board, said yesterday that he did not know what action would be taken if such a protest was sent to him. He said that he would call a meeting of the members to consider it if the law sustained him in the action. "To my knowledge, the situation has never before come up, and therefore it is difficult to say just what will be done."

Dr. Reavis said that he knew nothing of the questions asked by Dr. Wise in the chemistry examination, and when the list was shown to him he declined to discuss the matter, because of his official position at the head of the board. Dr. Reavis suggested that in the future it might, perhaps, be an excellent idea to have the questions submitted to a body of capable men, either the board or others to be selected, and have the examination tests reviewed by them. Under existing conditions each man prepares the questions in the subject assigned to him and marks the papers, the other members being in complete ignorance of what is being done except in his own department.

His Ohio Certificate Not Good.

Edwin L. Ross was one of those who failed to pass. He holds a diploma from the Ohio College of Dental Surgery, Cincinnati, O., granted in 1892. He also has a certificate issued by the State Board of Dental Examiners of Ohio, and was in active practice of his profession in Cincinnati for 10 years before coming to Oregon. He was up for examination before the Oregon State Board, and believes that the test was altogether too severe. In discussing the questions, Mr. Ross said:

"I had been out of college for some time, and therefore was rather rusty on theories, but I think I am as well versed in active practice as a man could be with 10 years' experience. I was given to understand that allowance would be made for the lapse of time since my graduation, but evidently I misunderstood what I thought was an intimation to that effect. Every man in professional life loses much of the rules and theories absorbed in college when he gets into active practice. I was ready and anxious for an exhaustive examination in practical dentistry. There were five examinations, four of which were written and confined largely to theories; the fifth was a practical demonstration, but was confined to a simple gold filling of an ordinary cavity. I had hoped to practice my profession in this city, but it seems that, while I was capable of practicing in Ohio, I am not competent to practice here."

Yesterday afternoon Mr. Ross called upon Dr. J. L. Reavis, president of the board, and asked that he be told what marks he had received in the different subjects in which he was examined. He told Dr. Reavis that his reason for requesting the information was that he might study the subjects in which he was deficient. President Reavis told him that it would be impossible to inform him, because of a rule adopted by the board, prohibiting the members from making public the standing of candidates who failed.

"Suppose I demand that I be shown the average I received in the examination and the markings in the different subjects?" asked Mr. Ross.

"The result would be the same," replied Dr. Reavis. "I will not give the information for which you ask." And the interview was closed. Mr. Ross expresses himself as much astonished that the information was denied him.

Smith's Fruitless Efforts.

George W. Smith, who is attending the North Pacific Dental College, has been before the examiners three times, and he says that the examinations are growing harder each year. He has had 10 years' experience in dental work, and is regarded by his employer as a capable and competent practitioner, but he could not pass the examination, and will be compelled to wait another year. The fact that he tried for a license while still attending college has precedent in cases of two men on the State Board who are not college graduates, but went into practice directly from the offices of the dentists with whom they studied.

Mr. Smith says that it appears that an effort is being made to practically prohibit new men securing licenses. "If the examinations continue to be more difficult in the future," said Mr. Smith, "on the same ratio that they have in the past, it will be impossible for one to pass in any of the studies. The chemistry examination was particularly severe, and it was out of the question to pass it. The queries were not practical ones, such as would have daily, or even occasional, application in the active practice of dentistry, but were theoretical and of a nature to puzzle experts who have devoted a lifetime of study to chemical research."

Experience Did Not Count.

Dr. J. B. Kiefer, formerly of Philadelphia, was graduated from the dental college of the Vanderbilt University, in Nashville, Tenn., about 15 years ago. For 14 years he was an active practitioner of dentistry in the Pennsylvania metropolis, previous to which he passed the examination prescribed by the examining board of that state. He was a prominent member of the State Association of Dentists, and served for several years as a member of a committee to see that the laws were complied with prohibiting the practice of dentistry in the state without a license. He was one of the nine who failed.

"The examination was not only severe," said Dr. Kiefer yesterday; "it was unjust. My practice in Philadelphia was among the best people, and I rather thought I knew my profession, and was a competent dentist. Apparently, I am not, for I could not answer the questions submitted by the State Board. The chemistry questions were impossible to such an extent as to prohibit one answering them from memory. As a matter of fact, the severity will be practically prohibitory, and new men will be unable to secure a license to practice."

Three Times, and Still Out.

H. H. Geiger is a graduate of the Northwestern College of Dental Surgery, in Chicago, and has been before the board three times for an examination. He received a diploma from his alma mater and stood well in the different departments, but he cannot reach the standard maintained by the Oregon State Board, and is consequently debarred from practicing for himself. He had but little to say yesterday, other than that he was disappointed at the apparent desire of the State Board to submit questions that

(Concluded on Third Page.)

GREAT NAVAL DRAMA

Latest Phase Seems to Alarm Republican Leaders.

THE MARYLAND COMPROMISE

Changes in the Cabinet—Root May Eventually Succeed Hay—Roosevelt Bothered by Office-Seekers.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21.—The censure of Secretary Root upon General Miles for sustaining the opinion of Admiral Dewey and criticising the findings of Benham and Ramsey is another step in the great naval drama which is developing into a political nightmare for Republican politicians. One of the most prominent Senators of that party said today, that Schley was already as good as nominated by the Democrats and that the American people were likely to vindicate him at the polls, no matter what other issues were brought out in the campaign. Miles is already popular outside of Washington. The Alger beef episode only made him more so. Root's censure, by direction of the President, will tend simply to exalt both Miles and Schley. Republican leaders here fear that a grave political blunder has been committed.

Long seized with avidity the opportunity to uphold the findings of Benham and Ramsey and attempts to discredit the opinion of Dewey; another popular idol. His position can be credited to New England narrowness and utter disregard of the popular voice of the people. It is feared by Roosevelt's best friends that he will be held responsible for the acts of both his secretaries.

Schley may appeal to Roosevelt against Long's decision and if turned down by the Chief Executive, may decide to seek vindication at the hands of a political party before the people.

Republicans from Maryland are seeking to compromise the matter by rewarding both Sampson and Schley together with Clark, of the Oregon, with Vice-Admirals' commissions, but with the present attitude of Secretary Long that is impossible, unless Long is reversed by the President.

What Miles may do is another serious question. Should he resent the censure he could be summarily retired by order of the President or court-martialed, but the result of a court-martial would be doubtful, and a Presidential retirement would tend to add fuel to the political flame. A ticket composed of Schley and Miles is suggested, with a campaign cry to right the wrongs of the Nation's defenders. It is possible that this is but the flurry of the moment, but wise men of the Republican party are decidedly alarmed now.

Changes in the Cabinet.

It is not the intention of President Roosevelt to allow his Cabinet to be stampeded or to have vacancies created before he is ready to fill them. It is noticed that Mr. Smith does not go out until Mr. Payne is ready to take hold. The same will be true of Secretary Gage. When the President finds a man that he thinks is satisfactory, he will let Secretary Gage retire. Until then he has made it very plain that any man who leaves will be engaging in an act of possible desertion, and in a manner treating the President unfairly.

There is some difficulty in finding a suitable person to fill Secretary Gage's place. Eastern interests want an Eastern man. High protectionists feel that Gage is not such a man as they would like on account of his well-known moderate tariff views. Governor W. Murray Crane, of Massachusetts, is the man whose name seems to be the most talked about at present, but no definite authority is given to say that he will be Gage's successor.

If the everlasting Sampson-Schley controversy could be settled so that Long's retirement would not be coupled with it, there is no doubt he would be the next man to go. Nobody seems to know whom Roosevelt has in mind for that succession.

The positive declaration that Hay is not to retire is a part of Roosevelt's plan to have changes made in the cabinet, but gradually. Hay's close friends believe that before the end of the next year he will be out of the Cabinet. Root may be his successor as it is believed to be easier to find a Secretary of War than a Secretary of State.

W. R. Merriam, now Director of the Census, and ex-Senator Carter, of Montana, are mentioned as possible successors of Hitchcock, should the latter leave.

White House Alive With Politicians.

The large amount of time that President Roosevelt is giving to appointments, removals and office-seekers is causing a great deal of comment here. It is the opinion of some that a man who is so devoted to civil service reform should clear the White House of office-brokers and assert that he will consider appointments on their merits and at his own convenience, instead of hearing from everybody who wants office. The White House is a rendezvous for politicians who make charges and counter charges against the men who are in and against those who want to get in. In his second term, Cleveland found it necessary absolutely to bar the doors against the office-seekers. Roosevelt will have to do so or will break down in health.

M. J. MacMahon Indorsed.

The Oregon delegation has united in indorsing M. J. MacMahon, of Portland, for a foreign diplomatic appointment, and he also has strong support from Wisconsin, Illinois and Michigan. He was presented to the President by Senator Mitchell. Mr. MacMahon left for Oregon today.

A. W. D.

Captain Francis S. Brown.

FORT MONROE, Va., Dec. 21.—Captain Francis S. Brown, U. S. N., retired, died Friday night apoplexy, aged 60 years.