The Oregonian

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

Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(By Mail.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Sunday, one year	2.50
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 44 pages, 3 cents; 46 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage double rates.

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

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, JULY 26, 1908.

THE CELEBRATION AT QUEBEC.

There have been various theories regarding the origin of the name Canada. It is not probable now that the question ever will be settled. It is said by some of the historians that Canada is the name that Cartier, in 1535, found attached to the land, and that he never attempted to displace it; but navigators and discoverers from France, who followed Cartier, commonly called the country New France. Yet the name Canada was kept alive in the early cartography, and after the country passed finally into English hands this became its sole designation. Likewise the origin of the name Quebec is disputed; some say from a Norman title, others that it is an attempt to put into the form of letters a native Algonquin name; still others, that the first beholders of the promontory exclaimed "Quel bec!" Every theory is as doubtful as the origin of the name "Oregon."

From the explorations of Cartier to those of Champlain there was an interval of nearly three-quarters of a century. During this period innumerable vessels sailed from French ports to various places on the shores of New France; but these were expeditions of adventure and discovery rather than of colonization. The first actual effort for permanent settlement was made by Champlain at Quebec, in 1608. It is the tercentenary of this event that is the occasion of the present international celebration. Settlement of Quebec by the French followed the next year after the settlement at Jamestown by the English. The events were the beginning of the rivalry between the English and French for control in the New World. It continued above one hundred and fifty years, till the final extinction of French power in North America (the episode of Louisiana excepted) by the capture of Quebec by the English, under Wolfe, in 1763.

France, as a colonizing power, has been only a little more fortunate than Spain. Yet France, having lost her colonial empire twice, is now building it up for a third time.

Under Louis XIV. France lost Newfoundland, Arcadia and the Hudson Bay territory; but France, after the treaty of Utrecht (1713) still held Canada and Louisiana (the great Mississippi country); and in India her possessions covered nearly all the points of vantage. But when the War of the Austrian Succession (1740) broke out in Europe, its results were felt afar. There were many French disasters, and when the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was signed (1748) Louis XV., "making war like a King and not like a merchant," gave up Madras to the English. This war was followed after a short interval by the Seven Years' War, which ended with the extinction of French power in India, and with loss of Canada to France. The French colonial empire was virtually at an end. Only a few scattered fragments remained. Thus, the first colonial empire of France, which had been created by Francis I., Henri IV., Coligny, Richelieu and Colbert, was lost by Louis XIV. and Louis XV. Something, indeed, remained to France; but what remained to her was, at that stage of the world's history, of no great importance.

A second colonial empire was outlined under Louis XVI.;—for this unfortunate monarch had many able men to serve him. But the development was hampered and its future ruined by the Revolution, followed by the final sacrifice to the continental policy of Napoleon. Yet Napoleon understood the value of colonies to France, as the Bourbon Kings did not. He continually declared that it was not European conquest he desired, but ships and colonies. But Great Britain, with her power at sea, stood in his path; and since he could not prevail at sea, he undertook to subdue England by destruction of her continental allies. This was the secret of his long and aggressive military career, after he came to supreme power; and even before he came to supreme power it was the secret of his expedition to Egypt. To us he sold the Louisiana country, to prevent it from falling into English hands. He had incorporated Holland with the French Empire, and Southern Africa was thereby lost. The English took it, and the recent Boer War, a remote consequence, that has cost England so dearly, may afford some satisfaction to the shade of Napoleon.

One of the most ambitious of all the attempts of France was that made under the second empire upon Mexico. It was based on the belief that the Civil War in our country would result in permanent division of the United States, and that France thereby could obtain a new foothold in America. Collapse of the Confederate States, after four years of war, dispelled this hope or illusion. The French were forced to get out of Mexico, and the failure, with the consequent humiliation, weakened Napoleon III., in France, and became one of the main causes of his overthrow. Yet something had been done during his reign to strengthen the hold of France upon Madagascar, and in Tonquin and other parts of Farther India;—but the third colonial empire which France is now laboring to create or build up, is almost exclusively the work of the Republic, since 1870. France had been a partner with England in the Suez Canal and other Egyptian enterprises; but her overthrow in the war with Germany caused the Republic to hesitate then in regard to Egypt, and England proceeded alone. France thus lost an opportunity which, of course, she will never recover.

The present colonies and dependencies of France have an area roughly estimated at 4,000,000 square miles, with a population of about 56,000,000. Of these about 24,000,000 are in Africa, including Madagascar and islands, and 21,500,000 in Asia. In America there remain French Guiana, Gaudeloupe, Martinique and St. Pierre, having in all about one-half million inhabitants. In Oceanica, a few small establishments. But the people of the French possessions in Asia have in them little principle of progress; and in Africa, except along the Mediterranean, still less. There can hardly be much future to the colonial empire of France. She lost her opportunity a long time ago—mostly to England.

Besides, the French are not an efficient colonizing people. They do not like to leave their country, and in the United States there are fewer people from France than from any other great nation. In all times the French colonist has been disposed to depend too much on the mother country, and the home protectorate has always enfeebled the colonial administration. Hence the French colony does not develop those stores of force and energy which it needs. On the contrary, English colonies have usually had the help of the mother country's wise neglect. It was pre-eminently so with the English colonies in America, through all the early time. France has failed because the genius or the spirit of her people has not been adapted to support of enterprises far from home. All Frenchmen who leave France desire and expect to return sometime, to enjoyment of life in their native land. It is beautiful to think of it; but it doesn't supply the stuff that makes colonial empire.

The celebration at Quebec is no celebration of the triumph of England over France. It is historical in its character; it presents itself as an international occasion, upon which England, France and the United States may talk together. At the beginning of our Revolution a prodigious effort was made by our people to take the thirteenth colony (Canada) with them. It failed, largely through the indifference or hostility of the French in Canada. They could not forget that the Revolutionary colonies had been a main force in the conquest of Canada by the English and in the triumph of the English over the French. During the course of the war that had ended in the conquest of Canada, and capture of Quebec by the English, the English thirteen colonies had furnished no less than thirty thousand fighting men. Hence the French in Canada were less incensed against the English than they were against the colonists of England to the south of them; and General Richard Montgomery and Colonel Benedict Arnold, who, at the beginning of our Revolution, tried to stir the French of Canada against the English, completely failed. Montgomery was killed and Arnold was repulsed from Quebec. The French population was not friendly to our people. They didn't like the English very well, but they liked us less.

To this day the province of Quebec remains very largely French. In the city of Quebec the French language, spoken by everybody, is a reminder every hour of the old history. Language, once established, persists in the strangest way. Though outwardly it is but sound, it is the most permanent of all things. Strange that the utterance of the tongue, which is but sound, should be the most durable or persistent of things in human history. Nearly all our household words are handed down to us from a time that antedates all other memorials. We are all using words today which are older than the historic pyramids or the legendary flood of Noah or Deucalion.

NO WAY TO STOP SUCH AN EXODUS.

The Des Moines, Iowa, Capital laments over the fact that the best young men of that city are going elsewhere to seek their fortunes. The merchants of the city have taken the matter up and will try to stop the exodus, which, according to the paper mentioned, is a "costly drain upon the state's strength."

But you can't stop the exodus from Iowa. Already several thousands of Iowans have come to Oregon and all of them are sending back reports of the beauties and attractions and opportunities of this rapidly growing state. In the letters to their friends and former companions, they tell of a land free from cyclones and blizzards. They tell of temperatures excessive in neither Winter nor Summer. They tell of a land where cherries grow in abundance and to a size of one and one-eighth inches in diameter. They tell of a region not dependent upon one or two industries, but having a multitude of resources from which to draw increasing wealth. They describe thinly-settled districts where land is cheap, but where all kinds of fruits can be grown successfully. They give an account of an undeveloped portion of the country in which abundant water powers will make progress rapid so that in the next few years land values will increase many fold.

The Des Moines Capital and the merchants of that city can succeed in halting the exodus whenever they can change the climate of Iowa or stop the Iowans in this state from writing back home. And not till then.

MONOPOLIES.

Among the many beautiful aspirations of the Democratic platform is one for a law "which shall make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States." It is interesting to speculate how such a law would read. Suppose a man should find a deposit of radium on his farm. Since there are no other deposits of that mineral in the country he would have a private monopoly, which is "indefensible and intolerable," according to the Denver sages. But how would the law go about to break up his monopoly? Would it deprive the man of his farm? Would it confiscate his radium? Would it compel him to sell his mine to the Government?

The problem of monopolies is by no means so simple as Mr. Bryan and his distinguished fellow philosophers seem to imagine. If ten men have a certain article to sell there is no power on earth to prevent them from making a secret agreement as to price or as to the amount they will offer the market. And if these ten own all there is of the given article they will have a monopoly, and they will keep it in spite of all the laws in the universe. It is tyranny to compel a man to sell his property for less than he can obtain for it in the open market.

Monopolies cannot be destroyed by legislation, but they can be controlled. One way of controlling them is for the Government to enter into competition with them. This has been advocated by many economists, but it is not in accordance with American ideas. Another method of control is for the Government to license monopolies and subject them to rigorous conditions by the terms of the license. Thus prices could be held down and fair treatment to consumers assured. At least, it is supposed that this could be done. It has never yet been tried in practice, and it might not work out quite as Mr. Roosevelt and others imagine. Still it is much more promising than the Democratic theory that monopolies can be eradicated. If it finally turns out that private monopolies can not be controlled, the common sense of the country will make them public monopolies; it will not be so foolish as to try to destroy them.

MAKING ASSESSORS DO THEIR DUTY.

For many years the state of Kansas had exactly the same trouble with its assessed valuations that Oregon experienced prior to the adoption of the fixed ratio system of apportioning state taxes. Though the tax laws of Kansas, like those of Oregon, required that all property be assessed at actual value, the Kansas City Journal says that county assessors, in order to relieve their counties from a just share of the state taxes, learned to violate the oath of office by assessing real estate at one-third, one-fourth or one-twelfth of what the law required. The Legislature of 1907 re-enacted the old law, with a few additional provisions to aid in enforcing it, and then created a tax commission to see to its enforcement. Says the Journal:

> The prediction was freely made that the law and the commission would utterly fail. What these men had to overcome was not only the universal disposition of mankind to dodge the tax gatherer, but the habit and custom of forty years' standing. The commissioners certainly had a tremendous task before them, but by hard work, good judgment, good nature and an iron determination they have been remarkably successful. The assessed value of all the property in Kansas last year was a little over $400,000,000; the assessed value for this year will be somewhere between $2,200,000,000 and $2,500,000,000. In other words, the total assessed value of all the property in Kansas this year will be between five and six times what it was last year.

The success of the tax commission, it is safe to say, was due almost entirely to the intelligence and fearlessness of the members. Some credit may be given, perhaps, to the attitude of the people, who may have given the law their support, but experience in this state leads one to believe that, individually, property-owners desire their assessed valuations kept as low as possible. Oregon's experience with a State Board of Equalization, presumably about the same in jurisdiction as the Kansas Tax Commission, so far as valuations of property are concerned, was not a very satisfactory one. The Kansas commission probably went about its business with a determination to make each county bear its just share of the burden of taxes, and, though the time for litigation has not expired, there is reason to believe that they attained the desired result to some degree.

The whole difficulty of assessing property and apportioning state taxes would be removed if some means could be devised of compelling county assessors to do their duty honestly. When an assessor has taken an oath to perform his duties and the law requires him to assess property at actual value, he should be indicted for malfeasance in office if he violates the law. But a charge of that kind must come before a grand jury and trial jury made of property-owners in the county, and who, therefore, are likely to take the view that the assessor has placed valuations high enough. To compel one assesor to do his duty is unjust if others are permitted to evade the law. A tax commission, if given sufficient authority, could supervise the work of the assessors and bring proceedings against them if they prove unfit for their positions. There have been too many public officials in Oregon, as elsewhere, who believe it their right to ignore the plain requirements of the law and perform their official acts in any manner they may see fit. Impeachment of a few such might have a salutary effect.

AN UNDELIVERABLE VOTE.

The assumption that Mr. Samuel Gompers can drive the solid labor vote into the Bryan corral with no more trouble than is encountered in rounding up a herd of cattle is hardly warranted, in view of recent political developments. There is Tom Watson, for example, a man who has always had a pretty strong hold on some of the labor vote, and who is now denouncing Bryan with a vigor and venom seldom equalled so early in a campaign. The personality of Mr. Watson alone will draw a good many thousand labor votes away from the Nebraska man, and the Socialist Labor party has a candidate of its own. The fact that this candidate is in the penitentiary for a long term for murder, and is otherwise ineligible for the office, will not prevent his friends from voting for him. The greatest deflection of the labor vote from the candidate which Gompers has selected, however, will be in the ranks of labor that does its own thinking, and votes in accordance with its own convictions.

The labor vote cannot be swung as a unit to any candidate, for the simple reason that laborers are just like other persons. They have their likes and dislikes and their preferences, and are moved to action by the same impulses as govern other people. In certain cities where labor unions are strong, and tyrannical in accordance with their strength, "labor" can be swung into line quite effectively by persuasion, moral and otherwise, but at the polls all of the helplessness which the individual laborer may show during a strike, vanishes and he votes in accordance with his own wishes, frequently cherishing a secret joy at the safe opportunity to express his disapproval of the Gompers methods. If Mr. Gompers' campaigns in the state of Maine and elsewhere, had failed to teach him that labor could not be handled like "dumb driven cattle," he might at least have learned something by consulting the statistics on the National labor vote in the past.

The best showing ever made by a labor ticket was in 1888, when the union labor ticket polled about 151,000 votes out of a total of about 11,500,000. Four years later the labor candidate polled 21,000 votes out of a total of more than 12,000,000. In 1896, the vote stood a little more than 36,000 for labor, and about 14,000,000 for the other candidates. Mr. Debs appeared on the scene in 1900, and, posing as a champion of labor, secured about 99,000 votes, leaving about 34,000 for the regular Socialist labor ticket. In 1904, the Debs vote was 391,000, and the Socialist Labor vote 53,000, these combined forces of labor representing a voting strength of about 3½ per cent. of the total vote cast and in no state in the Union did the ticket approach a plurality.

It is obvious from these figures that "labor" has never yet voted for its own ticket, and that unknown numbers from its rank have voted the regular tickets of the two old parties with which they have always affiliated. Mr. Gompers cannot deliver the labor vote to Bryan because the labor vote is deliverable only by the voters, and many of them object to the peculiar ideas which are entertained by Mr. Bryan and which have twice been responsible for his defeat.

ENGLISH SPELLING CONTEST.

At the recent session of the National Educational Association in Cleveland there was held a spelling contest which has been the subject of considerable comment in the educational press. The contestants were teams of fifteen children each, from the cities of Cleveland, Erie, Pittsburg and New Orleans. Noteworthy features of the contest were that twelve of the children in the winning team were girls and that most of these were of foreign parentage, as conclusively shown by the following names: Maude Lesmer, Hilda Moskowitz, Sylvia Sicha, Irene Langlois, Etta Epstein, Rosa Meier, Leo Goldriech, Ida Fantana, Colette Litet, Leah Bratburd, Freda Markowitz. Perhaps the children of American parentage would explain the superiority of their foreign classmates by saying that the latter, having been drilled on the spelling of their own outlandish names, can master the mysteries of English spelling the more easily.

Another incident which caused surprise was that one of the two children who made perfect records was a colored girl. She was a member of the Cleveland team, and when the New Orleans team heard that she was to be one of the competitors they talked of withdrawing from the contest. It would be interesting to know how they were received on their return to the South after having been surpassed in an intellectual contest by one of the members of the detested colored race.

Possibly the superiority of the children of foreign extraction may be explained by saying that they are accustomed from youngest childhood to perform the tasks set for them without asking the reason why. Foreign parents place obedience near the top of the list of juvenile virtues. Consequently their children promptly and faithfully studied their spelling lessons at school while the American children, contemplating the waste of time our spelling involves, shirked the task as unreasonable.

IRRIGATION IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY.

Those who read the pamphlet recently issued by the Department of Agriculture setting forth results of irrigation experiments in the Willamette Valley will notice that methods of cultivation play a large part in producing conditions that make irrigation necessary, and there is a strong indication that a change of methods would in part improve the conditions. Mr. G. R. Bagley, of Hillsboro, who conducted one of the irrigation experiments, gives an account of his operations, and by way of introduction says that his land had been used for grain growing for many years, and that at a depth of about eight inches a plow sole or artificial hard-pan had formed and that this was so hard and impervious as to hinder growth of roots to a greater depth. His first work was to subsoil part of the land to a depth of twenty inches. The result was noticeable before any irrigation was attempted, for during the Winter vetch crops in the vicinity were injured by freezing weather, but no injury was sustained on the land that had been subsoiled. Vetch and red clover had been sown and the vetch was taken off early in July. Water was then applied to the clover, and a crop produced the same year. A portion of the land seeded to clover had been subsoiled and part had not. In 52 days from the time water was applied, clover on subsoiled land had reached a height of three feet, and was of a deep green and healthy color. That upon the land not subsoiled reached a height of only ten inches and was light green and sickly.

Lack of humus, decaying vegetable matter, makes the soil hard and impervious, and causes it to dry out quickly. Though restoration of humus to the soil will not by any means accomplish all that can be secured by irrigation, it will go far toward relieving the unsatisfactory conditions. Deep plowing permits the roots of a leguminous crop to go deep, thereby aiding in keeping the soil porous. If a crop of vetch or clover can be plowed under this will greatly aid in restoring humus. Better still, if it can be had, is the use of barnyard manure on a field where the soil has become hard and lifeless. A soil thus rejuvenated will immediately show results in increased yields of any kind of crop, and, if irrigation can then be added, crops maturing late in the season, such as the second crop of clover, can be successfully produced.

There is little trouble in the Willamette Valley in getting a good early crop—in fact there is scarcely any place in the United States where crops in general are more reliable than they are in the Willamette Valley. Only crops making a late growth need irrigation, and even this need can be greatly lessened by proper care of the soil. Loose soil with plenty of humus will absorb and retain moisture like a sponge. The subject of irrigation is one of interest in the Willamette Valley, but when one considers the area of land that can be irrigated as compared in extent with the area that can be improved by proper care, the subject of soil preservation becomes of greatly more importance. The farmer who has land and water in such relative position that he can apply the latter to the former during July, has a very valuable property. In any circumstances, the farmer who makes a practice of keeping his soil loose and porous can safely depend upon harvesting a good crop every year.

ONE PHYSICIAN'S PLIGHT.

The public has read the story of another physician's misconception of his duty, of his yielding to the pleas of the wayward and of his exposure and possible ruin. Sympathy for the physician, somewhat widely expressed, is based upon the apparent fact that he was not actuated by a mere desire to procure money by unlawful practice, but that he listened to the entreaties of a distracted mother and sister striving to save a daughter from public disgrace when he should have been guided by the laws of the state and the ethics of his profession. But sympathy cannot smother that detestation which all must feel at the commission of a crime far too common—a crime the successful accomplishment of which multiplies demand for its repetition, and encourages a species of vice that threatens to undermine the social system.

The subject is an unpleasant one. It is more easily discussed before a medical society than through the public press; yet if an evil is to be rooted out, mere considerations of delicacy cannot be permitted to withhold from public view the facts as they exist or to suppress that candid comment and criticism necessary to impress upon all concerned the measure of a physician's duty to his patient and the extent of his obligation to society. Let those who may find themselves confronted by similar circumstances learn the lesson offered by one of the most pathetic cases of this character ever brought to the attention of the people of Oregon.

A girl of the immature age of 15 disclosed to her older sister and mother that improper relations with a certain young man had involved her in trouble. The young man admitted his responsibility and freely offered to marry the girl. This course was advised by the mother and sister, but the girl refused, unless she should first be relieved from that condition which meant disgrace within a few months. Moreover, she threatened to commit suicide unless her wishes were complied with. Argument and persuasion were without avail and finally the physician was called in. In response to the request of the girl, her mother and sister it appears that he performed the operation desired and in a few days left for the East to attend a fraternal gathering. The girl became ill, and, receiving medical attention too late, died from the effects of the operation. The physician was arrested and will be brought back to Oregon for trial on a charge of manslaughter.

The duty of a physician when appealed to in a case of this kind is plain. Notwithstanding some unusual and very pathetic circumstances, he should have refused promptly and absolutely to commit a crime himself in order to cover up the misdeeds of others or even for the purpose of preventing a suicide. If he thought the threat of suicide might be carried out, it was his duty, directly or through the members of the family, to see that proper precautions were taken to prevent such a course. When the facts and the wishes of the girl were made known to him there rested upon him a moral obligation which could not be discharged by merely refusing to have anything more to do with the case. By kindly advice, if possible, by extreme measures, if necessary, he should have prevented the commission of a crime against natural and civil law.

The same may be said of the duty which rested upon the mother and sister. Under the laws of this state an accessory before the fact is a party principal to a violation of law. If they procured the unlawful act to be done, they were apparently as guilty under the statutes as the physician who performed the operation. It is difficult to see how the law can discriminate between the physician and those who employed him, when prosecutions are had. But, entirely aside from the question of legal accountability, it was plainly the duty of the mother and sister to prevent, rather than aid or consent to, the act which meant certain death to the child and possible death to the girl, though it must be added that affection for the unfortunate girl, ignorance of the law and the consequences of their act, and the desire to shield the family name from disgrace constitute the greatest possible extenuating circumstances for them.

Though it may be admitted, so far as the physician is concerned, that the circumstances are different from those cases in which mercenary motives alone are involved, yet there is nothing, so far as now disclosed, that affords a justifiable defense for the operation performed. It is safe to say that physicians are frequently appealed to in matters of this kind, and it is deplorable that in far too many cases members of the medical profession have rendered the service desired. To be fair to the profession it must be conceded that requests of the kind are generally refused, though these refusals, of course, seldom come to public attention.

HOPE FOR MANY LAWBREAKERS.

If the decision of the Federal Court of Appeals in the Standard Oil case is to be accepted as law, there is much in it of interest to many small offenders against the criminal laws of the state. The court holds, for example, that each separate shipment at special reduced rates does not constitute a separate offense, but each settlement should be counted an offense. Heretofore, it has been assumed that when a liquor dealer sells liquor in violation of law each sale constitutes a separate offense, but apparently this can be avoided if the buyer will have his purchase charged and settle once a month. Mr. Hembree, who was convicted of killing his wife and then tried again on the charge of killing his daughter, should be able to find in the Standard Oil decision support for the argument that only one crime was committed, for the evidence does not show that he lighted more than one match in setting fire to the house in which they were burned.

Then, too, many a man of small means may reasonably look with hope to the language of this decision. The Federal court said: "Can a court, without abuse of judicial discretion, wipe out all the property of a defendant before the court and all the assets to which its creditors look, in an effort to reach and punish a party not before the court—a party that is not even indicted?" Many a poor hobo has been fined a hundred times the amount of his assets in the past, but in the future he can cite the Standard Oil decision in support of his contention that this would be an abuse of discretion. The boy who finds himself convicted and about to be fined heavily may reasonably argue that this action on the part of the court would be a fine upon his father, who had not been brought before the court nor even indicted.

Indeed, when one takes the time to pursue the logical consequences of the decision, it opens marvelous opportunities for the lawyer who makes a specialty of raising defenses for men guilty of crime.

This from the Washington Standard (Olympia) is one of those peculiar deliverances that come from persons who wish to criticise The Oregonian, yet miss all the facts. Sic, o sic:

> The Oregonian has awakened to the situation that the State Constitution means something, when it provides certain stated salaries for its executive and administrative officers. Any legislation making additional allowances is in violation of fundamental rights and ought not to be tolerated. The astonishing part of the whole business is, why has The Oregonian allowed its scruples to slumber thus long? For many years that paper was the representative of the party in power in the state and must have known such malfeasance was practiced contrary to law, and it is only now that it seems to have become anxious to square accounts with its political adversaries, both within and without the ranks of the G. O. P.

Yet there hasn't been a year for more than thirty years, and scarcely a month in all the months, of more than thirty years, in which The Oregonian has not cried out against this very thing. But The Oregonian never has been the "representative" of any "party in power," and it has usually found that it takes it from twenty to thirty years to enforce attention to anything of importance. For example, it had to fight the silver fallacy nearly thirty years. Then at last people began to take notice. Even the Christian gospel has made and is making mighty slow progress.

To be a good loser does not mean that one must always accept defeat cheerfully. If there has been a substantial variation from the rules of fair play the defeated party to a contest not only has the right but it is his duty to protest. But where the contest has been fairly conducted, as was the 400-meter foot race at London Thursday, the defeated competitors who raised a cry of "foul" show their entire lack of the elements of sportsmanship. Apparently the Englishmen thought it was not fair for Carpenter to run away from their sprinter, Halsewell. Unfortunately for the latter, Americans are not in the habit of waiting for other people. Carpenter was in the lead and was going his best. Halsewell couldn't get around him, not because the way was blocked but because he couldn't make his legs go fast enough. Judging by the events of Thursday's meet at London it is a foul for an American to outrun an Englishman. Sir Thomas Lipton, who has something of a reputation as a sportsman, entertains different views of what constitutes a foul. He doesn't like to lose, but he's a good loser just the same.

Portland is not the only place where an effort has been made to suppress the hoodlumism that finds expression in such amusement as throwing confetti. At Salem a man caused the arrest of a rowdy who threw a return ball and struck a young lady who was walking quietly along the street, and with whom he was not acquainted. Swearing out a warrant of arrest is the more lawful method of administering punishment, but in a crowd, where subsequent identification would be difficult, personal chastisement on the spot is a more effective remedy.

Mr. Bryan, remarks the Brooklyn Eagle, "describes the agriculturist as a victim of predatory wealth, and in the same breath declares that thousands of farmers could spare $100 apiece for his campaign funds." If the farmers respond, as Mr. Bryan seems to think they will, his Chairman, Norman Mack, will get a campaign fund that will beat anything Mark Hanna ever was able to raise.

Judge Grosscup says his "mind develops." That is the reason why he protects the iniquities of Standard Oil. Yet nobody has criticised corporation abuses more than he has. Yes, his "mind develops." He is going to quit the bench and take up the practice of a corporation lawyer. His mind develops.

Abraham Lincoln's address of acceptance contained 139 words, and his letter to the notification committee contained 134 words. Taft and Bryan will use from 3000 to 10,000 words. Is greatness measured by number of words?

Possibly the insurance company which is conducting a gambling game under the guise of insuring people against the election of Bryan may learn that a court can look behind formalities if it so desires.

Bryan is "talking into the phone" daily. Now if we had some of his speeches on free coinage of silver and government ownership of railroads, delivered in former years, wouldn't they sound well?

If Mr. Kern doesn't like the things that have been said about him he might find consolation in going back to the newspaper files and reading what was said about Henry Gassaway Davis.

Mr. Bryan has had his speeches canned in phonograph cylinders. It might be well to remember that canned goods sometimes poison the consumer.

Does the law governing publicity of "contributions" apply to the funds of certain classes of people "dig up" when told to do so by a political boss?

There will be no Pindar. So there will be no poet of the modern Olympian games. And what are Olympian games without a poet?

Judge Grosscup says he has no intention of retiring from the bench. Deep disappointment reigns.

IRRELEVANT

BY HARRY MURPHY.

It needs a mind intelligent
To see a motive never meant.

Who studies man in private were
Like a daylight astronomer.

With jeers they hung him to a pole,
And said we'll teach men self control.

* * *

Somebody's child is dying there,
Beside those wheels? Sad, I'm aware.
But yet it's work, you will allow,
That must be done; and, anyhow—
Don't think me hard—there's really such
A lot more one won't matter much.

* * *

It is beautiful to see reformers trying to elevate the moral and intellectual tone of society. It is rather discouraging, though, for the reformer when he finds that society doesn't want its moral and intellectual tone elevated. Yes, he might quite as well look for the stones to confound gravity and go soaring away into the ether.

* * *

Of the various cants that of "friendship" is one of the most common and disagreeable. Not one person in ten thousand who so glibly, in letters and otherwise, protests friendship knows the meaning of the term. A capacity for it is as rare as a great talent for music. Rochefoucauld spoke by the card when he said: "In the distress of our best friends we always find something that does not displease us." Of course this is not real friendship, but it is what is current as such.

The persistent characteristics of the average man are selfishness and a kind of aspiring which on its reverse side is envy. He has other qualities more evident; they are merely superficial; still not so superficial as not to deceive the weak—those, for example, who, reading this, call me an ill-natured pessimist.

There isn't one man in ten thousand who doesn't regard his friend's success as a personal affront, a reflection on his own want of success. On the same principle, "benefit a man, he'll hate you for it." The beneficiary feels that magnanimity or nobility in another but emphasizes his own meanness. Hence there can be no friendship unless both parties to it are equally of high mind.

Attack one Cant and a whole host of Cants will rush to the defense of their fond brother; so what is here written will be denied, especially by the priests of "Optimism"; that is to say by those weak-minded worthies who cannot comprehend the facts, or by those too cowardly to face them, or by those who for private advantage pervert them; those "cheerful idots," in short, who prose about "brighter sides," "jolly old world after all," etc. Only over the dead bodies of these is there progress.

* * *

The worst vices and crimes flourish among the very rich and the very poor; two classes which owe their existence to the folly of that class which is neither.

* * *

Is the world growing better or merely older? Is the boy better than the man? Has our progress after all been but the exchange of turbulent youth for prudent and avaricious age? Bloody, purposeless wars, gladiators and torture chambers are gone—we have factories and mines where two and a half million little children, pale and ragged waifs, are at work.

* * *

If ever there was a poet of the common man, Whitman is he. And yet it is the uncommon man, comparatively, that understands Whitman. The million whose minds run in conventional channels will find his manner insuperable. Of course this isn't Whitman's fault; his poetry would have been impossible in any other way. Whitman is a great poet. It is just that he should share first place in American literature with Poe. Future generations may even hold him to be one of the supreme poets of all time.

Those who cannot comprehend Whitman may console themselves with the thought that they did their best with an imperfect mental equipment.

* * *

Haughty and humble alike scorn the "mob"—the ever named but never identified; for no one has thus far been discovered who belongs to it—by self-admission. And yet from the mob, from its lowest levels, its most ragged ranks, all the great reforms of the world have emanated. The Christian religion was first adopted by Roman slaves; Luther's reformation found its support among cobblers and tinkers; the French revolution, that effacer of feudalism, originated among the outcasts and spawn of Paris. Our own war for independence was achieved by the humblest of the colonists. The well-to-do and cultivated were nearly all Tories. The popular songs of the time narrate that the nice sensibilities of these conservative gentlemen were shocked by the barefoot rebels, who frequently had but one shirt. This, for instance, current in 1778:

> They renounce allegiance and take up their arms,
> Assemble together like hornets in swarms,
> So dirty their backs, and so wretched their show,
> That carrion-crow follow wherever they go.
> With loud peals of laughter, your sides, sir would crack,
> To see General Convict and Colonel Shoeblack.

Reforms proceeding from the lowliest gradually permeate to the higher until at length when they have survived their usefulness, have become a bar to further progress, they reach that rarefied region where dwell the privileged and the proud—that highest class of all who are the especial care of the Almighty. These sanctified beings then rise to announce awfully that unless this "venerable and time-honored institution that our fathers died for" is preserved, 2000 years of advancement will be as naught. Civilization will crumble to its ultimate stone, the universe will revert to night and chaos.

* * *

An unpleasant egotist in a small way is he who emphasizes, or otherwise scribbles, comments in public library books. It is, in fact, the extreme of impudent presumption, this setting up as critic and censor for the readers who must follow him.

* * *

Here is a course of reading recommended to ignorant "business men": "Critique of Pure Reason," "First Principles," "Sartor Resartus," "Walden," and the first part of "Progress and Poverty," called the "Problem"; the second part called "The Remedy," which deals with single tax, may be omitted. And, gentlemen, if you are at all susceptible of instruction you will rise from the perusal of these works chastened and humbled.

* * *

Ibsen is read by the morally disquieted, those who think in terms of sensualism.

* * *

When a nation comes to govern itself by the maxims of the dead, disregarding in so doing a century or two of subsequent experience, it is stable and intelligent.

* * *

Swift and Fielding were not coarse in the same respect as are many recent writers; the former assailed vice, the latter fondle it.

* * *

With the foolish loud talk goes for unanswerable argument. Herbert Spencer's great reputation among the unthinking is owing to his tone of sweeping infallibility.

* * *

The right generalization of political parties in the imaginative and the non-