

EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE JOURNAL

JOURNAL PUBLISHING CO.
O. S. JACKSON, PRG., J. CARROLL

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

Sunday, April 10, 1904.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT BINGER HERMANN.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY of the first congressional district is now confronted with a problem the solution of which involves the good name of the organization, as well as the honor of the state at large, without reference to party affiliations. The question at issue is whether or not Binger Hermann is to receive the Republican nomination for congress. Once since his retirement in disgrace from the head of the general land office he has received the indorsement of his district. It is believed that he was elected largely through a shabby trick which inadvertently placed him in apparently amicable relations with the president, assisted by the further fact that the circumstances in connection with his summary removal from the land office were neither known nor appreciated by his constituents.

All of these facts are now common property. No one can plead ignorance of the gravity of the charges that were made against Hermann, or the damning quality of the evidence which was adduced to prove the prostitution of his high office to the basest purposes. Here, therefore, is a man who has forfeited the respect and confidence of the president, and who will for that reason be totally without influence in the executive department during the whole term to which he may be elected. While his knowledge of land-office affairs and proceedings may be great, the record which he left behind will necessarily place those who succeeded him on their guard and force them to look with the gravest suspicion upon any cause which he may champion or any claim which he may undertake to push. His fellow-members of congress, whose stomachs may not be particularly weak, will yet be inclined to draw the line somewhere, and in such a palpable case as that of Hermann will draw it tight enough to be felt. No more deliberate snub was ever inflicted upon a congressman than that of Speaker Cannon when he excluded Hermann from all committee appointments. This is what might be called the selfish and business view of the case. But there is another and higher view, which affects the moral fiber and involves the self-respect of all the people of Oregon, but particularly the membership of the Republican party. By nominating Hermann they not only fly in the face of public morality and the national administration which dismissed him from office, but they condone his offenses and officially signify their approval of acts which in the judgment of one of the government inspectors should lead to his indictment and criminal prosecution. The Republicans of Kansas had a similar experience a few days ago in the case of Senator Burton. They elected him in the face of earnest protests and with the full knowledge of the weaknesses of his character and the shabbiness of his career. Burton has been convicted and sentenced for bribery, and whatever sympathy may be felt, the Republicans of Kansas have in it no share.

The Journal aims to be more fair than partisan. If it were moved by purely partisan motives it might wait until after the harm was done and Hermann safely nominated, and then open its batteries upon him. But having an infinitely higher regard for the good name of the state than it has for the welfare of either of the two great political parties, it enters its protest now, before the party is irrevocably committed, and in the name of common decency, in the name of public morals, in the name of good government and those primary virtues which every good citizen should hold dear, it enters its solemn protest against such a shameful perversion as would lead to the nomination for congress in

the first district in Oregon of such a man, with such a character and such a record as those which Binger Hermann so unfortunately possesses. It is true that the nomination of an ordinarily decent Republican in that district would be equivalent to an election, and this is one of the most potential reasons why some regard for public morals should be felt and recognized. It is the tendency of every party which feels itself securely lodged in power to become arbitrary in its methods, to disregard the public protests and to develop into an oligarchy which rules rough-shod over the rights of the people. But sooner or later there comes an awakening, and when it comes those who have defied the popular will are hurled from power and driven forth into disgrace. Surely the Republican machine in the first district is not so poor in membership that it is forced publicly to confess it can find no better man than Hermann to nominate. If it is, then it is high time for the people of the district, regardless of party, to rise in their wrath and strength and teach it a fundamental lesson in what constitutes public morality and common decency.

PRACTICAL SERMON ON DUTY.

WITH the advance of civilization in many directions, mankind's duties become more interwoven, many-sided, complex and multifarious. Especially is this true in a city where every adult person, with neighbors, friends or acquaintances, has not only the individual general duties devolving upon the rural citizen, but duties to his home city also. And these are various. They are not only to observe the ordinances; to vote intelligently and conscientiously, if a voter, and to pay taxes and otherwise encourage and aid movements and projects for municipal improvement, but individually to set a good example in the matter of improving one's premises and keeping them clean.

The man who owns old, dilapidated, noisome shacks in prominent sites, and refuses or neglects to destroy them because he can still obtain a goodly rental for them, or the man who owns a lot or block surrounded by or adjacent to dwelling-houses or abutting on much-traveled streets, and allows them to become overgrown with weeds and brush and covered with rubbish, fails in a plain civic duty. He is not a good citizen. If the case be aggravated, as in that of the disease-breeding shacks at the corner of First and Washington streets and others that might be mentioned, the owners being wealthy people, and growing wealthier daily through others' industry and enterprise, such owners may reasonably be classed as positive enemies of the city. The non-performance of their civic duty is an annoyance, an offense, an aggravation, an injury, to thousands of people who not only never did these owners any harm, but who have necessarily done them a great deal of good.

This consideration brings to view other species in the infinitely varied and multifarious schedule of mankind's duties. Right in connection with this matter of improvement of city property come in the duties of city authorities, of the police force, of landlords whose tenants will not clean up, of tenants whose landlords will not fix up, of civic improvement organizations, of every society or organization whose business or object it is to work for a greater and better city—even of preachers and teachers, and surely of editors; yes, and of fathers and mothers, who can teach their children lessons, both theoretical and practical, along this line.

Each season has its peculiar duties; this duty of clean-

ing up thoroughly, improving, beautifying, is peculiarly a spring duty. It is a duty that every property-owner and every tenant owes to society. To mention here no other reason—and there are other good ones—filth and all sorts of decaying matter are breeders of disease germs, especially as the wet and cool portion of our spring changes into the dry and warm portion, and more especially in such a spring as this, when this change will surely come more suddenly than usual. Everybody knows this; then do it. Faith without works is dead; it is he that doeth as well as thinketh that alone is entitled to credit on the great ledger of Duty.

Portland is a rapidly growing city. In the summer, in some respects, it is a very beautiful city. It is, thanks to Dame Nature, a healthful city. But it needs to be greatly improved, even more rapidly than it is being improved, along the line herein indicated.

Let us have such a spring cleaning as never before. Let every influential voice and accomplishing hand insist that everybody shall do his duty toward making Portland not only a big city, but a clean and beautiful city.

MAN, GOAD AND HORSE.

A MAN was tried a few days ago in the police court for prodding his horse with a goad, a sharpened stick, as an inducement to the animal's increased activity in a forward movement. The case was earnestly defended by a lawyer, who urged that the use of such an instrument was common in other states, and was not reprehensible and legally punishable cruelty to the animal. The court finally found the defendant guilty, but remitted the penalty.

Whether the goad used in this case, or in any case, is an illegal instrument of cruelty depends upon the hardness and sharpness of its point and the force with which it is applied. A driver might possibly use a goad, or something having the appearance of one, without being cruel. If a lazy horse had been severely punished once or twice, and then after that only lightly and gently prodded, on the theory that this gentle hint would be a reminder sufficient to induce a gait at once reasonable and desired, there would be no harm in it. But a goad in operation looks badly, and it is a fair presumption that the man using it is not a merciful man to his beast, and needs the correction provided for in our excellent law prohibiting cruelty to animals.

This is a good time and place to say that the Humane society of this and other cities has done a noble work—one evidencing, as few other movements have done, the progress of civilization. Not so very long ago there were no laws in this country protecting animals, even the faithful friends and servants of mankind, from cruel treatment at the hands of hard-hearted, tyrannical and vicious masters. Now such laws are found in probably all our states. And every year they are better observed and bring about better results. Boys are now taught more generally that it is vicious, wicked, unmanly and inhumane to inflict needless pain and terror upon other and lower animals.

But there is abundant opportunity for further improvement, advancement and instruction in this regard. Many men are unwittingly cruel to their animals, or inflict cruelty upon them to gratify a perverted taste, as in the matter of docking horses' tails and using too tight overdraw check-reins, both of which are causes of torture to the animals, besides rendering them less beautiful in the eyes of true lovers of nature's works. Some men will also keep an ani-

mal in a damp, cold, filthy shed, stall or pen for days or weeks, not considering that it is affected by such abuse in the same way, if in a somewhat different degree, as a human being would be.

Every strong user of a goad or a club to beat with, or who starves or mutilates an animal, or in any way inflicts misery upon it, is a proper object of the law's corrective penalty.

AN OBLIGATION UPON CITIZENS.

NOW THAT the appropriation bill has been passed by congress and we know precisely what we have at our disposal for the fair which will be held next year, the work on the exposition will doubtless be pushed systematically, and the fall should show every building under roof. But if heavy obligations rest upon those in charge of the exposition, some obligations which should be recognized rest upon the people of Portland in their private and corporate capacities. Most of those people who will come here from a distance will be attracted by the fair, and if it were not for that magnet their trip might be indefinitely postponed. But all who will come will want incidentally to see the city and country, which to many of them is still a terra incognita. To many of these Portland is simply a name. They have no adequate conception of the wealth, importance and beauty of the city, and the impressions which they gain of them will be deep and lasting as well as far-reaching. Now, it may be possible that in their judgment the exposition is a great success, gauged from every reasonable point of view, while at the same time Portland itself may not appear to be quite so worthy of consideration.

It will be one of those occasions when the city should literally put its best foot forward. Each resident should take a personal pride in doing everything within his means and reach to beautify the city. With the advantages which nature has blessed us so abundantly, the whole residence section of the city can be made a perfect bower of beauty. There are many beautiful homes here, and to the credit of the owners it must be said that the surroundings are usually in keeping with them. But, on the other hand, there are hundreds of other homes—much more modest in appearance, it is true—whose surroundings are utterly dilapidated, due entirely to the carelessness and the lack of public spirit of the owners and renters. For the sake of a few dollars spent for sprinkling the lawns, very many pretty cottages are set in the midst of the most demoralizing surroundings. No patriotic Portlander should permit such a condition of affairs to exist. He should feel that he owes at least that much to his own self-respect and as a contribution to the public welfare to keep his grounds in condition and help to spread forth the impression that of all the beautiful cities on the coast there is none quite so beautiful as Portland.

The streets and sidewalks should be placed in good condition. If such work as has been done is not as good as it might be, then the best way should be found, and, once found, the work should be prosecuted with vigor. We cannot help sharing Auditor Devlin's feelings in regard to at least one well-paved and well-kept thoroughfare leading to the fair grounds. This is a matter which should be seriously taken hold of by the residents themselves, with a view of bringing about this desirable result.

Portland should not only determine to have a great fair—indeed, we believe that is already assured; but its citizens should do everything in their power to raise the standard of beauty and attractiveness so that every visitor will be delighted, not only with the fair, but with the city as well.

A CORRESPONDENT'S DILEMMA.

By Rev. Thomas B. Gregory

THE following letter would seem to call for an answer:

"New York, March 24, 1904.—
I work down town and have three classes of friends:
"First—Men who seem to be right in every particular—honest, truthful, will do any one a favor; but they never go to church.
"Second—Men who are exactly like the above, except they never go to church and use profane language.
"Third—Men who have recently come from the country. Before coming here they always went to church regularly every Sunday; now they never go. They smoke a little, drink a little, and are just bad enough not to be classed good.

"Can you state through The Journal what verses in the Bible could be used to wake up these men? What parts of the Bible are good to read to a man who is good in every way except religious?"

"The country is full of such men. Everywhere I go I meet them. They are good, honest, true; but the minute you begin to talk religion they wave you away. CORRESPONDENT."

Consciously or unconsciously, "Correspondent" has opened up a pretty wide field for thought; but down at the bottom truth is simple, and I will endeavor to the best of my ability to help him out of his difficulty.

Let us begin at the beginning and proceed slowly and carefully, and I must not forget to add, reverently,

The first class of young men referred to are admittedly "right in every particular, honest, truthful," and always disposed to help others, and the only thing that can be said against them—from the viewpoint of "Correspondent"—is the fact that they do not go to church.

"Correspondent" asks for a verse of Scripture that will apply to these young men, and I give it to him: "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read."—Luke iv:16.

The point of this Scripture is that, perfect as Jesus was, he nevertheless felt the necessity of the spiritual uplift that is born of worship.

The young men in question may be very noble, but certainly they are no nobler than the Master was, and if he felt the need of the Sabbath service, surely they cannot well afford to ignore it.

It is true that the church is a means rather than an end—the means of a noble manhood and womanhood; but even the grandest character is not beyond the necessity of keeping in touch with the infinite.

Against those of the second class there is something to be said. Profane swearing is not one of the major vices, but still it is a vice. It may not be so disgusting to hear an honest man swear as it is to hear a hypocrite pray; but it remains perfectly true that the

honest man is none the better for his profanity.

Swearing is unrefined, ungentlemanly, vulgar and degrading, and those who are given to the habit might very profitably be referred to the words, "Swear not at all."—Matthew v:34.

Coming now to the third class mentioned by "Correspondent," we find that we have a real case against them.

They are not downright bad. They are not criminals. They are, as "Correspondent" puts it, "just bad enough not to be called good," which is only another way of saying that they are pretty nice young gentlemen—not perfect, of course, but a long, long way from being real bad.

But when a young man begins to drink, there is no telling where he may

bring up. The young men in this class, so "Correspondent" says, "drink a little." That sounds very innocent. And it is innocent—if it stops right there. But thousands of the wisest and best-hearted men in the world know, to their shame and sorrow, that there is no assurance that it will stop there.

It is to be hoped that by the help of the Scripture here given "Correspondent" may succeed in "waking up" the profane swearers to a sense of decency, in arousing within the minds of those who "drink a little" a realization of the danger of their seemingly innocent habit, and in convincing the excellent young men who "never go to church" that they would be none the less excellent if they should go occasionally "into the house of the Lord."

LOCAL OPTION BY STATE LAWS

Graham Taylor in Chicago News.

On the liquor question, as in everything else in America, we must reckon on the people having their own way sooner or later. That is the rule under which we have been playing the great game of our national life ever since we began it with the declaration of independence. The only restriction upon the freest choice of the people is imposed by our state and national constitutions and our city charters. These provide only for delay enough to assure deliberation in making changes which might otherwise be so sudden and sweeping as to defeat the people's sober second thought and thus make everything insecure. But there is provision in every one of them to amend or annul and to make new rules when we are sure we do not like the old ones. The majority of our people sooner or later are bound to have their way if they really want it enough to work and wait for it.

We might as well admit this unalterable fact and shape our policy and action accordingly. Moreover, we may as well do so good-naturally. There is no good reason for whimpering if the majority differ from us and want to have their way. There are, of course, a few fundamental minority rights, which the law safeguards from the unjust aggressions of the majority. But in all other things we entered the game under the majority rule and took the personal and property risk of the play turning against us. Now, neither the liquor traders nor the temperance agitators, much less other folk, never said, "We won't play." Many of them are evidently getting tired, though, and want some way to find out whether they have not enough votes to make new rules. Where enough people have the will to do this, their will is bound to be done, at least to test its strength with those who differ from them.

Either side which refuses or even objects to playing under the local option rule thereby gives away its lack of confidence in its own cause or its strength to make it win. Sooner or later the people will have their way about liquor selling. If there are enough of them who want less or none of it, they have every right to have it as they want it. If the liquor sellers or drinkers want more license or liberty to do as they please, they only have to make good the claim to a majority vote at the polls. So there is no use whining about the loss of personal liberty. Let each respond good-naturally to the call for the "tug of war" and pull the other over to his side of the deciding line if he can. The side that falls must simply own up that it was weaker and the other stronger, and must go on playing under the other's rule until it is strong enough to change.

While there is a very small proportion of people in any community who are or can afford to be indifferent to this issue on its merits, other local interests should make many citizens of Chicago have a decided preference between the two ways in which it is proposed to give the right of local option to all our people. There is a well defined and far advanced movement throughout Illinois to enact a state local option law, which would give each voting precinct the liberty to retain or banish the liquor-licensed saloon. There is another attempt to secure by petition and referendum elections a city ordinance providing for local option by wards. The only alternative to these local option measures is to let the present policy alone, except as it can be more strictly enforced. With it there is increasing dissatisfaction, how inadequate legal restriction of the saloon or the slack enforcement of the existing law regulating them. Before very long Chicago is bound

to face a choice between these two measures for local option. They should, therefore, be widely and frankly discussed. Should either of these ways be chosen? The principle of local option seems desirable for these reasons: It lands and leaves the issue where it belongs under free government—with the people themselves; it brings the issue home to each locality in such a way as to educate the intelligence, conscience and self-control of every man, woman and child; it also lodges with the people who vote for it the responsibility for the effects of a saloon. There is a question as to how large or small the voting constituency should be to which the option for the locality should be left. If it is too small the real sentiment of the people most involved or interested may not be able to fairly represent itself. If it is too large any

change may be impossible. There is, too, the danger of gerrymandering, or "chiseling" the boundaries at every legally recurring redistricting. Against the city ordinance granting local option by wards these serious objections are to be urged: It would not be at all likely to pass the council; if it did, it would be almost sure to change the character of the next council to be elected and thus prepare the way for its own repeal, for the nominating power is still controlled at the saloons, even in wards where a saloon canvass can no longer win an election. Moreover, such other imperative issues as the traction and other public franchises, the building ordinance, sanitary inspection, school appropriations, etc., would be hopelessly involved. The immense gain in the ability and character of the city council won by the independent vote

through the Municipal Voters' league and other agencies would surely be imperiled and possibly lost. Local option, established by state law, has these advantages over the proposed city ordinance for ward option: 1. It gives the same free choice to the people of each locality. It operates not only in Chicago but all over the state in country or city. 2. It would rally to the support of the local option movement a possible majority of voters favoring it who bulk more largely in the smaller towns or cities than in Chicago, and who would, therefore, be more likely to give it to Chicago than Chicago could get it for herself. 3. It takes the initial effort out of city politics, where it would be sure to make the ward vote more corrupt, for the time being, at least. 4. It introduces to the legislative districts throughout the entire state a

morale which would be sure to re-natalize the interest and activity of earnest people who are now negligently ignorant and indifferent to state affairs. What, therefore, might be the destruction of better city politics if confined to Chicago may be the salvation of state politics if extended to legislative elections. With such odds between the means of promoting the same end, loyalty to a common purpose, as well as to all the interests of the whole community, should rally the friends of local option to enact a state law and not a city ordinance.

DINKLSPEIEL'S EPPY GRAMS

(By George V. Hobart.)

Married men make der best inventors because a poor eggcuse is better den none.
A soft answer turneth away der gas und leads to a proposaling.
Most peoples haf to get it in der neck before dey get religion.
Der chent mit der rag-time mind always pretensions to like classical music.
Votefer a man wishes to be he vill be, unless he gets a transfer.
Der automobile owner is always a man dot can put his shoulder to der wheel.
Vimmen chump at conclusions der vay dey chump at a mouse—backwards.

Everydyng comes to him dot waits in der middle of der street.
Der man dot kicks because he has too much work should remember der fellow dot is too hungry to kick because he has no work.
Patience vas a virtus always found in bill collectors.
Der brainy politician is der vun dot knows how to use der brains of his friends.
Opportunity often veers boxing-gloves ven it knocks at our door.
It vas a long lane dot don't turnish someding to be run oter by a autobustum.
D. DINKLSPEIEL.
(Copyright 1904 A. G. S. Co.)

SENTECE HERMONS.
From the Chicago Tribune.
Mercy is never mushy.
Regret cannot uproot wrong.
Labor is the salt of our lives.
Doubts make a poor refuge for duty.
It takes more than a fence to make a garden.
A shallow man usually has his soul in his skin.
There is no clear thinking apart from clean living.
Man's noblest right is that of giving up his rights.
Rest is religion's opportunity for re-investigation.
Present character is a prophecy of future condition.
Nothing blinds the soul quicker than winking at sin.
He who loses no love for others loses all life for himself.
Respectability may be quite different from righteousness.
The worst blasphemy is that of profession without practice.
Platiitudes against sin are as harmful as applause for sin.
In the divine scales a dime often weighs more than a dollar.

SENTECE HERMONS.
No man has any spiritual blessing that he can keep to himself.
No condemnation of wrong is so effective as the commendation of right.
The friends we can never lose are the ones we say we have lost in death.
A man is worth what he takes out of the world, not what he leaves in it.
God cannot blot out our past, but He can prevent its blight on the future.

SENTECE HERMONS.
From the Baker City Democrat.
Hon. Malcolm A. Moody, ex-congressman from the Second district in Oregon, candidate for reelection to succeed J. N. Williamson, who supplanted him two years ago in the Republican camp, is said, by tricks of the trade, is the choice of 95 per cent of the Republicans in Baker county who will have anything to say in the county and state convention forthcoming.
Mr. Moody spent yesterday in Baker City, visiting with his friends, and when asked by a newspaper man for an interview said that he was only here socially and had nothing to say of importance for publication. "I am in the hands of my friends."
A careful investigation among leading Republicans reveals the fact that a very large majority, probably 95 per cent, of the Republicans in Baker county, will vote to put Mr. Moody back in congress. A leading attorney yesterday afternoon said, and he expressed the opinion of most of the people: "Moody is the only man we ever had in congress who ever did anything for Baker."