

The Oregonian

Portland, Oregon.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter, June 15, 1881.

Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(By Mail.) Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$8.00; six months, \$5.00; three months, \$3.00.

(By Carrier.) Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$9.00; six months, \$6.00; three months, \$4.00.

How to Remit—Send postal note, check, or money order payable to the Oregonian Publishing Co., 110 Commercial street, Portland, Ore.

Postage Rates—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 15 to 20 pages, 1 1/2 cents; 21 to 24 pages, 2 cents; 25 to 30 pages, 2 1/2 cents; 31 to 36 pages, 3 cents; 37 to 42 pages, 3 1/2 cents; 43 to 48 pages, 4 cents; 49 to 54 pages, 4 1/2 cents; 55 to 60 pages, 5 cents.

Portland, Sunday, Sept. 13, 1908.

THE TEST OF "DOING THINGS."

It is fifty years since the Republican party came into prominence and power and declared its program.

Fault has been found with it, from the first till now, even by many of its own members.

But on the whole the Republican party has kept its promises.

Not long ago I bought on a pushcart two little books that contain all the platforms of the National parties since 1850.

The writer says that though a Democrat, he will vote for Taft, because the Republican party has done what it promised.

But the Republican party has done what it promised, because its policy on the whole has promoted the public welfare.

During all this period the Democratic party has come drifting and lagging along, occupying the former camps of the Republicans.

But the Democratic party hasn't even been a good critic.

It succeeded, however, sixteen years ago, in breaking up the continuance of Republican rule and in securing for its own hands.

It is controlled in all its action by the immovable conservatism of the South.

No house ever was more completely divided against itself.

It can do nothing, if it gets power, it will paralyze and paralyze the country.

It is the party merely of paralysis, opposition, obstruction, hindrance and decay.

It can't do things. The activities of the country, if it should come into power, would be deadened by its touch.

Among other reforms and much-needed innovations which may get round before the millennium, the "tipless" ocean steamer.

The history of parties, backed by their achievements, is something. It is much. It is guide for the present and assurance for the future.

THE TIP SYSTEM JARRIED.

Among other reforms and much-needed innovations which may get round before the millennium, the "tipless" ocean steamer.

The history of parties, backed by their achievements, is something. It is much. It is guide for the present and assurance for the future.

The affair created so much trouble on board that when the ship docked at Liverpool the bathroom steward, who started the trouble because he failed to get his portion of the 10-shilling tip, was promptly discharged and blacklisted.

He then brought suit for \$1500, and in the court was defeated, the defense being that it was contrary to the rules of the steamship company to solicit tips.

The case brought to light some interesting facts regarding the tipping system, which the big steamship lines publicly frown on and privately insist on.

The tipping evil would not be so obnoxious on ocean steamers were it not almost exclusively done by the stewards employed at a hegemony salary with the distinct understanding that if the salary is insufficient they are expected to graft what they need from passengers who have already paid liberally for the service.

Nor do the big steamship companies conceal all of

their petty grafts by making the poor stewards scapegoats for the practice. The "deck-chair graft," while it is only \$1, is collected exclusively for the company, although the passenger who has paid from \$100 to \$200 for his passage is also expected to contribute another dollar to the deck steward who collects the company's dollar.

These various grafts seem petty, but in the aggregate they reach such enormous sums that it will be very difficult to abolish the system.

On some of the well-patronized express steamers the conservative estimates place the value of the tips given employees as high as \$15,000 per trip.

In other words, the passengers contributed this sum for a service which was supposed to be included in the passage money, and all of which represented a saving in wages for the steamship owners.

The Cunard passenger who had the courage to resist the excessive extortion attempted to thereby brought about a courtroom exposure of the graft is entitled to the thanks of every ocean traveler who has suffered in silence from a similar hold-up.

COMPLAINTS OF THE PRIMARY LAW.

Here are some expressions from the press of Washington on the direct primary law:

Every candidate for nomination is forced to make his own campaign, to finance his own office, to pay his own expenses and run his own legs off trying to save the scene when he goes home and tells his own wife.

It is in favor of the direct primary law. It is in favor of the direct primary law. It is in favor of the direct primary law.

In some instances Democrats voted the Republican ticket, though without a legal or moral right to do so.

It is reasonable to assume that a considerable number of the more unscrupulous members of the party were induced to vote for nominees upon the Republican ticket—Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

Many Democrats were enabled to lend a "helping hand" to their Republican opponents by the old system of the "primary law."

It is in favor of the direct primary law. It is in favor of the direct primary law. It is in favor of the direct primary law.

These are representative newspapers of the State of Washington.

All have, we believe, been favorable to the primary law, but they see the grave defects of its operation.

For example, the spectacle of Democrats openly calling for Republican ballots and voting for Republican candidates whom they expected in the ensuing election to oppose was state-wide.

It is freely recognized that if this invasion of party rights, capture of party organization and control of party nominations by the opposing party is not checked and defeated the entire system must break down.

But what is to be done? How can members of a minority party be prevented from going boldly into the primary of the majority party and running its affairs?

Isn't this the very thing the primary law—any primary law—invites and permits? Isn't it the thing desired and demanded by the framers and promoters of primary law legislation?

Isn't freedom to act with any party and to act with any party at any time and to act with any party at any time and to act with any party at any time?

What is to be done about it? How can parties be maintained and party government under the primary law?

The next day will be a plebiscite of the whole voting population for the purpose of election without previous nomination or suggestion from any organized body of voters. Why not?

A LAWYER DISBARRED.

The singular fortunes of Francis B. Hart, of Minneapolis, deserve more attention from the readers of newspapers than they have thus far received.

Mr. Hart is a lawyer who had an insulting letter to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Minnesota.

It appears that he appealed three cases in succession to the Supreme Court, all of which were decided against him, and in the bitter disappointment, or the righteous wrath of his heart, it is hard to tell, he carried his burning thoughts into three or four letters, sending one to Governor Johnson, whom he besought to begin impeachment proceedings against the judges.

Another went to the St. Paul Dispatch, which printed it and gave it to the Associated Press, while a third went to the Chief Justice himself.

In all these letters both the ability and the integrity of the judges were scathingly impugned. Mr. Hart wrote with especial bitterness of the case of a poor widow whom the law had deprived of her share in her deceased husband's property.

In this case the Supreme Court ruled that the widow's rights in her husband's estate were governed, not by the law as it has been during his life, but as it happened to be at his death.

Thus the day before he died the Legislature might enact a statute confiscating the widow's interest, and the court would hold it valid on the ground that her right does not vest until her husband has drawn his last breath.

Were this rule to be applied to everybody alike, it would signify that any non-vested interest may be confiscated as the Legislature may please. But it does not apply to everybody alike.

There is as much difference between widows and all-rounders as there is between twiddle-dum and twiddle-dum. A railroad's right to its future earnings is not yet vested because no right can vest in a thing which does not exist.

Modesty forbade the Minnesota Supreme Judges to try the offending lawyer themselves, so they asked Governor Johnson to appoint a special bench to look into the matter, and this he did.

The decision, printed in the Northwestern Reporter, is as fair to the accused lawyer as language could possibly be.

The judges say that he had a perfect right to criticize any action of the court, after it was over and done with, as much as he wished.

It is not very proper conduct on the part of a lawyer to do so, they intimate, but it is perfectly allowable. The same privilege belongs to citizens and to newspapers.

A remark of Mr. Justice Brewer is quoted to the purport that court decisions when once completed are public property and that criticism of them tends to keep the courts sound.

Holmes is also quoted as being of the same opinion, and a long array of cases is set down to prove that courts have almost uniformly refrained from punishing people who ventured to comment upon their decisions.

So Mr. Hart could not be disciplined for criticizing the action of the court in his three unfortunate suits, and if he had not sent the letter to the Chief Justice, he would have come off with a whole skin.

But he did send it, and for that he was disbarred because his act was "disrespect to a judicial officer," and consequently a violation of his professional oath.

If every lawyer who violates his professional oath were to be disbarred, whether should we turn for legal counsel? Mr. Hart probably deserved his punishment.

Sending the letter to the Chief Justice looks like a piece of spite-work which could effect no good purpose.

What amazes one in a free country is that he could be tried, convicted and punished for this offense by a tribunal consisting of judges alone, with no appeal to a tribunal whose natural class feeling was strongly enlisted against him.

His disbarment amounts, of course, to a fine, since he loses his income for six months, and the singular point in the case, we reiterate, is the fact that such fines can be imposed for acts not committed in the presence of the court, or even while the case is pending.

The leading article in the Atlantic Monthly for September is good reading. It is one of those essays which make us think better of the human race.

The author, John Martin, is a New York publicist, not especially familiar to the general reader, but well known to the students of the "Social Reconstruction."

In Mr. Martin's opinion there has been a great change in the views of our leading thinkers and public men upon social questions within the last twenty-five years.

The old doctrine that things would come out all right if they were diligently left alone has been pretty well discarded, he believes, and everybody seems to have united either consciously or unconsciously in an effort for betterment.

He reminds us of the popular social philosophy of Herbert Spencer in the early days of the United States, and sets us wondering why it was that this most anarchistic of thinkers should have harmonized so well with our American predilections.

When we first began to read Herbert Spencer in this country, we were at a loss to know what he was, and had to read a law unto himself.

On the frontiers there was no organization except the vigilance committees. Even in the heart of the land, organization was loose.

There was a call for individual, isolated activity everywhere and so far as the individual was concerned, he was a law unto himself.

Of course, the individual was not so anarchistic as he is now, but he was more or less thoroughlygoing eupeptic diet. In one particular, at least, his pages remind us of innumerable reports which the reader devours in his greedy imagination without the slightest apprehension of dyspepsia afterward.

This pleasure of eating imaginary repasts, by the way, is one in which the laboring man may revel day and night if he desires, and since it is a pleasure which he cannot be deprived of, it is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

He served his dismembered remains on two slices of toast, thus creating the visual image of two eggs, and the man was content. The truth seems to be that this most ingenious wife fed her husband on illusions, and put the proceeds thereof in the savings bank.

We cannot, for our lives, see why other women should not do the same thing. Why should anybody remain poor when it is so easy to become rich by dining on fattened-out imitation porterhouse steak?

It is a delight to see that the author of this epoch-making book has a good word to say for the despised Atkinson oven.

This is the invention by which the late Edward Atkinson, of Boston, gained the deserved honor of "Shinbone Atkinson."

He invented it to make the workmen's wages go farther. By using it they could cook without much fuel and could transform shinbones and scraps into viands more delicious than terrapin.

They rewarded their benefactor with the customary compliments. "Why should we try to save our wages slaves?" they rallied, "when the only result of it would be that our masters would cut down our wages? Since they will only pay us enough to keep us from starving, anyway, go to, let us continue to pine away on rib roast!"

So they would not abide the Atkinson oven, though they were literally "in the pocket" for the poor fellow who made it.

How much makes a "little" is a matter of opinion. There is a story in the papers of an Englishman who was left \$480,000 a year and found it not enough to keep him out of debt.

Many laboring men would think \$1000 a year unlimited riches. So that living on a little is pretty indefinite in meaning as well as means.

Our author has not an economic word, but not so great a one as Thackeray. He showed how to live on "Nothing a Year" and enjoy all the luxuries of polite society.

The diligent reader is invited to compare the little book we are remarking upon with the wonderful chapter in Vanity Fair and decide which is the more helpful to the indigent masses.

SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION.

The leading article in the Atlantic Monthly for September is good reading. It is one of those essays which make us think better of the human race.

The author, John Martin, is a New York publicist, not especially familiar to the general reader, but well known to the students of the "Social Reconstruction."

In Mr. Martin's opinion there has been a great change in the views of our leading thinkers and public men upon social questions within the last twenty-five years.

The old doctrine that things would come out all right if they were diligently left alone has been pretty well discarded, he believes, and everybody seems to have united either consciously or unconsciously in an effort for betterment.

He reminds us of the popular social philosophy of Herbert Spencer in the early days of the United States, and sets us wondering why it was that this most anarchistic of thinkers should have harmonized so well with our American predilections.

When we first began to read Herbert Spencer in this country, we were at a loss to know what he was, and had to read a law unto himself.

On the frontiers there was no organization except the vigilance committees. Even in the heart of the land, organization was loose.

There was a call for individual, isolated activity everywhere and so far as the individual was concerned, he was a law unto himself.

Of course, the individual was not so anarchistic as he is now, but he was more or less thoroughlygoing eupeptic diet. In one particular, at least, his pages remind us of innumerable reports which the reader devours in his greedy imagination without the slightest apprehension of dyspepsia afterward.

This pleasure of eating imaginary repasts, by the way, is one in which the laboring man may revel day and night if he desires, and since it is a pleasure which he cannot be deprived of, it is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy. It is a pleasure which he should be allowed to enjoy.

pitals for the sick, and so on endlessly. What principle underlies all this effort for reconstruction and betterment? Our author believes that it is the struggle to apply rational intelligence to the institutions of society.

He thinks Americans are trying to organize the whole society as thoroughly and efficiently as they have organized business. The movement is not religious. He does not see any effort to buy an entrance to Heaven in Mr. Rockefeller's donations to education.

On the contrary, they are National, or they are international, and are optimistic. They are based on the belief that human nature can be improved by making its environment better.

In short, Mr. Martin is of the opinion that the leaders of thought and action in America are engaged in a united effort "to produce a higher civilization" and believes that they will succeed.

The scholars of the university seem to have developed higher and higher types of life, and there is no reason to think that the process has reached its climax or will reach it for centuries to come.

SOLOMON'S WIVES.

There seems to be some reason to fear that the Jewish Tribune, an especially esteemed contemporary, has not entirely mastered the distinction between morality and legality.

This lacuna in our pious contemporary's knowledge is the more to be wondered at when one remembers that the Tribune has pointed it out long ago in his "Pilgrim's Progress," a work of edification which we cannot suppose the Tribune has neglected to read.

The particular epistemological error of the Tribune's to which we refer may be found in an editorial utterance of September 11. Objection is taken to the Oregonian's views as to why David was not permitted to build the Temple, the International Lessons, which this Tribune adhering to the party, but it is chiefly our animadversion upon David's ten concubines, and more especially Solomon's thousand, which disturbs the Tribune.

In its opinion these multiplied matrimonial delights were not immoral when they were experienced. The Tribune means to say that polygamy is morally wrong, but the fact of the matter is that morality itself is changeable.

Thus speaks the Tribune. What it means is that men's views of morality are changeable. Otherwise our contemporary would be found in the ranks of the abhorred pragmatists, who hold that all truth, including not only morality, but religion itself, is changeable.

Men's aggregated opinions upon Nature at any moment are summed up in the word "science," and as these views change science changes with them, but Nature does not correspondingly alter. Likewise the prevalent opinions which are held at any time upon right and wrong conduct are summed up in the word "legality," either ecclesiastical or civil, and legality which it grows. But morality is a very different thing.

Briefly, the word sums up that course of conduct which is, upon the whole, best adapted to the universe we live in, and it is no more mutable than the laws of the universe are. Our knowledge of those laws develops from age to age, and legality advances accordingly. But morality is fixed, and undergoes no such development.

What is immoral now was, therefore, immoral two thousand years ago, though people then living did not know it any more than they knew the world was round. And just as it was scientific at that time to say that the earth was flat, so it was legal to have a thousand wives; but just as it was true to say that the earth was flat any more than it is true now, so also it was not moral to have a thousand wives, or even ten.

REDUCING THE TARIFF.

The New York Evening Post hopes that nobody will be beguiled into voting for Mr. Taft because he has promised to call an extra session of Congress to revise the tariff.

The building of the tariff comes up in Congress will be so beset by the protected interests that no reductions will be possible, while many duties are likely to be raised and the robbery made worse than ever.

The only rational conclusion from this is that the tariff can never be lowered by either party, and the best thing to do with it is to let it alone.

The protected interests are less likely to hover around a Democratic Congress than one that is Republican.

In the editorial we are speaking of in the Post describes how the tariff-billed plutocrats perverted the Wilson bill and made it a high-tariff measure, to the disgust of Cleveland, who would not sign it.

What would hinder them from repeating the performance if we had another Democratic Congress?

People who expect to get some little relief from tariff extortion by putting the Democrats in office are doomed to dismal disappointment.

Mr. Bryan is probably firm, but he would find himself powerless to fulfill them. His fellow-party men are so soaked in hypocrisy and the essence of broken promises that they would betray him by force of habit even if they had no other inducement.

The voter who hopes for the betterment of conditions from a Democratic party should pay more attention to the plain facts of current history.

Mr. Bryan's party is gone to seed. It has lost the virility of manhood. Even if it wished to accomplish reforms, it lacks the energy. It wanders up and down the land like a decrepit old rake who promises to be vigorous because he is precisely his pledge to be vigorous and is precisely his pledge to improve the condition of labor.

Both are made to fool the simple and both will be forgotten as soon as they have served their purpose, if they ever do. It is possible that the Republicans will not lower the tariff, but it is certain that the Democrats would not.

The mines of the Oro Fino district of Idaho, the objective point of a great rush of gold seekers in 1861, are, after years of inactivity, again being vigorously worked.

The placer mines were practically exhausted in a few years and the towns of Florence, Oro Fino and Elk City were depopulated after the manner of mushroom mining towns when their source of supply ceases.

The quartz mines are, however, of relatively recent development. Capital has gone in and is turning them to rich account. Some of

the large fortunes of this city had their base in the placer mines of the Oro Fino district—or rather in the excavation created by the discovery of gold made by the farmers in the Spring of 1861.

Transportation business on the Upper Columbia opened with a boom that year and in carrying miners and their supplies to the head of navigation the stockholders of the old O. S. N. Co. reaped a golden harvest.

That was nearly half a century ago, in the early stress of the Civil War, and the account of the revival of mining interest in that region recalls an interesting chapter in the early commercial and industrial history of the state.

The rank and file of the eager army of gold hunters returned from Oro Fino in the Fall of that historic year disappointed. But the men who were engaged in the task of transporting gold hunters and their equipment and supplies to the Dalles and beyond as far as steam navigation extended at that time, laid the foundations upon which the superstructure of many large fortunes was built, some of which still endure.

If the sons of pioneers had defended their orchards against codlin moths and anthracnose as well as their straw-defended them against "savagae foes," the sons would not now be assailing high heaven with shrieks of wrath against Mr. Lowndsale.

See Mr. Richardson's letter, printed today. The question of destroying diseased fruit trees is exactly the same as that of killing tuberculous cows or glandered horses. We suppose many a cow which has been slain for tuberculosis was dearly beloved.

There are a number of glandered horses may have been entwined by the heart strings of a whole family; but for all that its death was necessary to the public good and it had to die.

The mossback farmers talk a great deal about their love for their old orchards. If they are so very fond of the trees, one would suppose they would take care of them.

If the trees were properly cared for, they would not be in the least danger from Mr. Lowndsale's ax. The love of these farmers for their orchards is about on a par with that of a son who thinks everything of his sick father, but is too stingy to send for the doctor.

Schools will open throughout this district, and in some of the rural districts of Multnomah County, tomorrow morning. Teachers have gathered from the corners of the earth, refreshed by a vacation of nearly three months, and ready to take up the work assigned for the year by the City Superintendent and his associates.

The rally of pupils promises to be large for the opening, though the lists will not be full until hop-picking and fruit-gathering are over.

The school board has made earnest effort to furnish sufficient accommodations for all. The increase of attendance upon the public schools is an index of the growth of the city in the home side of its development and is the surest indication of substantial prosperity.

Hence, overflowing schoolhouses are regarded with satisfaction. Albeit the taxpayer looks somewhat apprehensive toward the next levy for the maintenance and betterment of the public schools.

Three men of Portland, indignantly denying that Gompers is trying to deliver the union labor vote of the country to Bryan, have themselves undertaken to deliver the union labor vote of Oregon to him.

The names signed on this manifesto are C. M. Ryan, W. H. Fitzgerald and J. D. M. Crockwell. Just watch and wait and see what numbers of union labor voters of Oregon they will not deliver to Bryan.

A manifesto like this is a piece of impudence; and it violates, moreover, a fundamental principle of unionism. But what else can a member of labor union do but obey the order and vote for Bryan? Is he to be expelled from the union?

They say now that defeated candidates for Senator in the primaries, in the State of Washington "will not be bound" by the primary vote.

There is nothing in principle of this sort to bind anybody, and allegiance is cast to the winds, and the primary is a confusion of parties, participated in by men whose great objection to Bryan is that he would destroy the principle of unionism.

But what else can a member of labor union do but obey the order and vote for Bryan? Is he to be expelled from the union?

They say now that defeated candidates for Senator in the primaries, in the State of Washington "will not be bound" by the primary vote.

There is nothing in principle of this sort to bind anybody, and allegiance is cast to the winds, and the primary is a confusion of parties, participated in by men whose great objection to Bryan is that he would destroy the principle of unionism.

But what else can a member of labor union do but obey the order and vote for Bryan? Is he to be expelled from the union?

They say now that defeated candidates for Senator in the primaries, in the State of Washington "will not be bound" by the primary vote.

There is nothing in principle of this sort to bind anybody, and allegiance is cast to the winds, and the primary is a confusion of parties, participated in by men whose great objection to Bryan is that he would destroy the principle of unionism.