

JUDGING from the responses we have received it is quite apparent there are many good men and women in Portland who believe there are two sides to the question of closing the Lewis and Clark fair on Sundays.

But they are deeply interested in the question of throwing open the fair on Sundays for the benefits which will come to so many people who otherwise will be unable to fully enjoy them.

In the judgment of The Journal a solemn obligation is placed upon us through the holding of the fair. We should not alone be concerned in making it a financial success, though that has its importance, but we should see to it that the chances to benefit by its holding are as widely diffused as it is possible to make them.

While most people may be able to spend a work day or two in the enjoyment of the fair and its attractions, nearly everybody, however circumstanced, could afford to spend there every Sunday afternoon while it lasts and get from these visits experiences which would make of them better citizens, which would raise their standards and make them more ambitious and hopeful for the future of their children.

It is for this reason and it is for people such as these that The Journal has spoken in its suggestion that there might be two sides to the question of closing the fair on Sundays, a course urged with such unanimity by the Ministerial alliance.

There are manifestly two sides to the question and we are firmly of the opinion that the amount of benefit that would come through opening the fair on Sundays would be infinitely greater than any evil that could possibly result.

This is a question which ultimately concerns many people and an answer to which may deeply influence the welfare and development of the community. It is a question which should not be hastily decided and which deserves to be fully discussed on its merits and carefully considered from the standpoint of those who would be most largely benefited by it.

each month a stipulated sum of money, satisfactory to the city administration, into the public treasury. For this he was supposed to secure the privilege, in conjunction with others who voted right, of openly maintaining gambling games. Not only this but it was understood that he and his fellows who were in on the original deal were to have a virtual monopoly of the business.

Having legitimized his business by placing it under the protection of the law, that is the law of the mayor, which overrides the law of the statute books, believing himself to be working under the fostering care of the city administration and the police department, having squared his accounts with newspapers and officials that otherwise might give him annoyance, he was certainly justified in believing that he would be allowed peacefully to pursue his calling and to enjoy undisturbed such of the profits of his business as the demands of the city administration and the influential grafters left to him.

It is now sadly apparent to the profession that while the mayor can override the laws and maintain open gambling in spite of them, he can only afford protection through the police and the police court, but he cannot close every avenue of possible danger. There is the sheriff's office and there, too, is the district attorney's office. The district attorney's office is now awake. Will it remain so? Perhaps not, but an avenue has been found to it. It is through the sympathetic heart of the district attorney.

But in any case the gambler is justified in feeling that he has been shabbily treated by a city administration to which he has paid his good money for protection and which protection was withheld from him in a critical moment when he was forced to give up 165 legitimately earned dollars, part of which in any event must have gone to the city in the shape of "fines."

HANNA AT THE HALF WAY HOUSE.

THERE WILL BE no quarrel with Senator Hanna's theory of applying the Civic Federation's motto, the Golden Rule, to the relations which exist between capital and labor. Neither will fault be found with the statement that there is no irrepressible conflict between the two.

But we are inclined to make quite a different application of the principle which he applies to Socialism alone. "Fairness," he says, "will never agree to the confiscation of the products of one man's toil in order to insure comfort to the idle and worthless." Fairness should never agree to the confiscation of the products of one man's toil to insure the comfort of any class, whether worthless or otherwise. It is this very spectacle in this country which has turned many worthy men to the study of socialism as the only way to escape the increasing burdens.

For ourselves we cannot reconcile Senator Hanna in his two attitudes, first as a "stand pater" in the tariff class and second, as an altruist in discussing the relations which should exist between capital and labor. The tariff confederately takes away from one class for the benefit of another. It means that the same goods are sold cheaper in foreign countries than here where they are produced.

We admire the spirit of altruism which leads Senator Hanna to devote time and energy in bringing about saner relations between capital and labor, but we cannot reconcile his enlightenment and breadth in one direction with the indefensible narrowness of his attitude toward the tariff which exploits the many for the benefit of the few.

A Plain Statement of What W. R. Hearst Stands for in American Politics.

From the Chicago Tribune. Washington, Jan. 18.—W. R. Hearst, owner of the New York American, the Chicago American, the San Francisco Examiner and the Los Angeles Examiner, and candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, today talked for two hours with a correspondent of the Chicago Tribune. He talked on general political questions, and especially on matters concerning himself and the impending Democratic nomination for the presidency.

The following interview can be regarded as the platform on which he will make his fight for the nomination, and, if nominated, his fight for the chief magistracy of the nation, and the Tribune herewith presents it as the views of a prominent citizen in the ensuing national political battle. "Mr. Hearst, what do you conceive to be the attitude of the more conservative class toward you? How would the average conservative citizen look upon your nomination for the presidency?" "The tariff depends upon what you mean by conservative," replied Mr. Hearst. "For myself, I should define conservatism as the preservation of those qualities, rights and principles of proved value to the American people."

"I think that the fundamental American ideas which have developed this country, making the national wealth and greatness while fostering the individual happiness and prosperity of its citizens should be preserved."

"Too often, unfortunately, those that call themselves the conservative element are endeavoring to introduce radical departures from these old conservative principles. I do not think my views are in conflict with those of any citizen, however conservative, if his conservatism takes the form of an earnest desire to preserve and perpetuate the original American form of government and the liberty, equality, independence and opportunity guaranteed under it."

"But I am in conflict with those so-called conservatives that are reverting to the ideas of former centuries and of other nations, seeking to exploit the masses of the people. These are not conservatives. Such men are reactionary; they are not conservative. I do not consider the steel trust conservative, for instance."

"The effort of a certain limited, law-defying class in America today to establish industrial feudalism on the lines of the old military feudalism, and for the same purpose—the exploitation and control of the many by the few. This effort to destroy the liberty and individual independence of the people through the use of industrial combinations is not conservative along American lines."

"I do not consider conservative the modern establishment of a system of unearned, piratical finance, on the lines of the so-called trusts, which is the cause of the country's present economic depression. I do not call conservative that system which diverts the people's savings from such really conservative investments as the savings bank and the legitimate business enterprise to the pockets of speculators and swindlers."

"I think that those friendly to the shipyard trust, or planning such trusts in the future, would look upon me as a dangerous person. I hope that at least I am not consciously sought their approval."

"I am not opposed to legitimate organization and combination; for the great work of the nation must be conducted along the lines of extensive combination. Statistics show that the industrial strength and efficiency by uniting many states in one grand union—for the benefit and protection of all (not for the benefit of a few) and safeguarding with special care the interests of the weak."

"Today I talked to an old gentleman recently arrived from Atlanta. He said that when he first made that journey from Atlanta to New York, 50 years ago, he changed cars 14 times, reached his baggage at the end of the journey, and only reached New York after a week of traveling."

"Obviously a combination of railroad enabling a citizen to travel that distance in one day without changing cars and at a benefit to the entire population as well as a source of great and legitimate profit to the few whose executive ability and foresight bring about the combination."

"In other words, I am in favor of organization and combination whenever the people are allowed to participate fully in the economies and advantages which result from the combination. I am opposed to the combinations that establish virtual monopolies in the means of living, the people partners in the improved industrial conditions, infatuate their stock, increase the cost of the product, reduce wages through a monopoly of the employing power, interfere with the creation and distribution of wealth."

Letters From the People

Burns and Goldsmith. Portland, Or., Jan. 22.—To the Editor of The Journal: Referring to an editorial in this morning's Oregonian under the heading of "Burns," I would point out that I consider it misleading in several points. I am well acquainted with the writings and memoirs of Burns. Burns was not in a financial position to be a drunkard, or libertine. He was of a genial temperament, and when he met with congenial companions there is no doubt he occasionally gave way to excess. At the same time there is no doubt many who condemn Burns as a drunkard and think more in the month than Burns did in it. As to Burns' amoral allowance should be made for poetic license, and also for the fact that the poet—above all men—is keenly alive to the beautiful. The assertion that there was no love between Burns and his wife, Jean Armour, has been at least once with recorded facts. I think Burns' "Cotter's Saturday Night" quite equal to the poems recited by the Oregonian; and it gives one a much better insight into the real nature of the man, as his own father was his model from which he drew.

I respectfully protest at the indignities which the Oregonian heaps on the name of the immortal Oliver Goldsmith. How unjust and unnecessary! Any one who has read Goldsmith's life knows how contrary it is to facts. Goldsmith was the son of an Irish clergyman and his father was his model for the "Vicar of Wakefield." His worst fault was that he was poor, and had no idea of economy. His writings are by no means at variance with the man himself, but rather pertinent illustrations of the man. Goldsmith was short, stout, and badly marked with smallpox. A gathering of society ladies was one day discussing "Who is the homeliest man we know?" One lady remarked: "If you had asked me that six months ago I should have replied without hesitation, Oliver Goldsmith, but since I have known you converse I never think how plain he is." Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. OBSERVER.

Open to Sundays. Portland, Jan. 21.—To the Editor of The Journal: I was delighted to read your article in favor of keeping open the Lewis and Clark fair on Sundays. I am myself a church supporter and church member, and as a resident of the city have been looking forward with much pleasure to the time I could spend at the fair in extending my knowledge, not only in my own trade, but branches that I would like to know something about. This privilege I would like to extend to my children. If the fair is kept closed on Sundays I am afraid I will not be able to make the most of it—nor nearly so much as I had hoped to.

I hope, for the sake of the working public, and in this class I include everyone who works for wages, no matter in what branch of industry he may be employed, that the fair will be thrown open on Sundays, particularly in the afternoons, so that everybody will get the fullest possible benefit out of what I cannot help but regard as the opportunity of a lifetime for those who live here. H. L. F.

Favors Opening the Fair Sundays. Portland, Jan. 21.—To the Editor of The Journal: As a workman of this city I wish to return you my hearty thanks for your editorial on keeping open the Lewis and Clark fair on Sundays. I believe there are hundreds, if not thousands, in this city who feel the same about the fair as every man, no matter how humble his occupation, has a certain amount of ambition for his children. What he failed to do he hopes his children may be able to accomplish. Most of them have favored the fair for selfish reasons, because it would add to the amount of money in circulation. But there are many, too, who look forward to it for the great advantages it would bring to the very doors of their children. Here, for a small admission fee, could be seen the very finest things in all the world, things they could never see at any other place. The children would be home from school, the father would be home from work, and the mother would have some of her very few care-free moments. Then, without loss of time or money, outside the home, they could all see, enjoy and profit.

It is all right enough for those who can afford to travel to favor Sunday closing, but in doing so they are doing a positive crime to their poorer fellow citizens who must take things as they come, and take advantage of opportunities when they arise, otherwise they may lose them forever. For the benefit of such as these, and the list includes nearly every one who works for wages, the fair should be kept open on Sundays, and you can believe me that the good which will come from it will offset a thousand fold all the evils which will be predicted for it. JAMES H. SMITH.

The Magdalenes. Portland, Jan. 20.—To the Editor of The Journal: Spokane ministers that are driving immigrants from their homes should drive out their main associates, too; those that live from their ill-gotten earnings. They are as great a menace to the city's safety, morals, and good as the women, and should be dealt with just as harshly as the misguided, abandoned, Magdalenes. "Abandon ye all hope that enter here; may well be written above their doors. Who from the world of respectability ever puts forth a kindly hand, or says, 'Come back, my sister, from the depth which thou art in?' I will be your friend, and help make possible for you to return to the path of right." The Booths invade our prisons to pray for, encourage, and console our convicts and criminals, to make them feel that some one has their interest and that they are not forgotten, and are striving to better their conditions. Much has been done, is being done to reform our drinking men, but nothing for erring women. They are the unclean, the despised, the leprous of the earth.

Man's curse, at least, if not God's, is upon them. They are worse than the treacherous black man, or the heathen for whom the missionary crosses the seas; to save his soul to God. They are the soulless lost to earth, until for heaven? Ah, that is not for you or me to say. VOICE OF A WOMAN. Objects to the Midway. Portland, Jan. 21.—To the Editor of The Journal: While I do not entirely disagree with your article on keeping open the Lewis and Clark fair Sundays,

there are features of it with which I cannot agree. Among the attractions, so called, of the fair, there will be a Midway Pleasure of somewhat the same character as that which the Chicago exposition made notorious. If this sort of thing is deemed desirable and necessary, surely you would not favor its opening on Sundays to add to the desecration of a day little enough regarded in Portland, with its pawing saloons and flouting theatres doing so much to lessen public respect for God's day?

There are some things which seem to be beyond our control the moment we delegate our authority to our public servants, but if opening the fair on Sundays meant the opening of the Midway I am sure the people would rise en masse and enter such a protest that none would dare to fly in the face of it. T. G. B.

St. Matthew 15:1-39. Christ reproveh the scribes and Pharisees for transgressing God's commandments through their own traditions: Teacheth how that which goeth into the mouth doth not defile a man. He healeth the daughter of the woman of Canaan, and other great multitudes; and with seven loaves and a few little fishes feedeth four thousand men, beside women and children.

Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying: Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and he that curseth father or mother, let him die the death.

But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; And honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. And in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

And he called the multitude, and said unto them, Hear, and understand: Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; But that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. Then came his disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone; they are blind leaders of the blind. And ye shall fall into the ditch. Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable. And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding? Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man.

Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour. And Jesus departed from thence, and came into the sea of Galilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there. And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them. Inasmuch as the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see; and they glorified the God of Israel. Then Jesus called his disciples unto him, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way. And his disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude? And Jesus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few little fishes. And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass. And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake them, and gave to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken meat that was left, and filled twelve baskets. And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children. And he sent away the multitude, and took ship, and came into the coasts of Magdala.