EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE JOURNAL

THE JOURNAL

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER.

C. S. JACKSON.....Publisher

Published every morning (except Sunday) and every Sunday morning at The Journal Building, Fifth and Yamhill streets, Portland, Or.

Entered at the postoffice at Portland, Or., for transmission through the mails as second-class matter.

TELEPHONES—MAIN 7173. HOME, A-6051. All departments reached by these numbers. Tell the operator the department you want. East Side office, B-2444; East 820.

FOREIGN ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE
Vreeland-Benjamin Special Advertising Agency. Brunswick Building, 225 Fifth avenue, New York; 1007-08 Boyce Building, Chicago.

Subscription Terms by mail or to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

DAILY.
One year.....$5.00 | One month.....$ .50

SUNDAY.
One year.....$2.50 | One month.....$ .25

DAILY AND SUNDAY.
One year.....$7.50 | One month.....$ .65

Man is made for action, not for idleness or pleasure. As plants and animals do the uses of their nature, so man must do his, for we are made for cooperation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and lower teeth.—Marcus Aurelius.

M'MAHON VS. THE GOVERNOR.

THE ACTION of L. H. McMahon, a Salem attorney, against the governor, is based upon the fact that as an ex-officio member of various boards created by the legislature he received fees as provided by statutes, in addition to his constitutional salary of $1,500 a year. Mr. McMahon's actions against former Secretaries of State Dunbar and Kincaid were based not only upon this same ground, but also upon the fact that they received large sums in the aggregate as fees for certain incidental services for which no statute provided any compensation for them. Much of the emoluments of former secretaries of state and state treasurers, prior to the going into effect of the flat salary law on January 1, 1907, were without any direct warrant of law. But the fees paid the governor, secretary of state and state treasurer as members of various boards were authorized by law. So there would seem to be a clear line of distinction between the two classes of fees. The governor is not charged with taking any fees except those authorized by law, while the other officers mentioned took fees not authorized by law. But McMahon bases his action against the governor upon the proposition that these statutes allowing these fees were unconstitutional, because the constitution fixes the salary of these state officers and says that they shall receive no other compensation, and provides further that they shall hold no other offices. The legislature, however, imposed new duties and work upon them, and paid them fees therefor, the constitutional salaries being very low. The governor's constitutional salary was $1,500 a year, and all these statutory fees increased this to $4,250 a year. The flat salary law abolished these fees and fixed a flat salary of $5,000, but McMahon contends that the flat salary law is also unconstitutional.

The supreme court judges would also be affected by a decision against the governor, for in consideration of their holding court twice a year in Pendleton their salary was raised from $2,000 to $4,500 a year, and the flat salary law does not include them.

McMahon, it is to be observed, has not brought any action against Geer or Lord, or Metschan, or ex-Treasurer Moore, or any other former officers who were beneficiaries of these fees, except Dunbar and Kincaid, whose cases are now before the supreme court for adjudication. As we have pointed out, the case against them differs greatly from that against the governor, and it is supposed that the latter action is brought now for the purpose of injuring or annoying him as the people's senator-elect and for no other reason.

A LIFE'S STRIKING OBJECT LESSON.

GROVER CLEVELAND'S life presents a striking object lesson to the American boy. It was from a very lofty height that the ex-president fell to the grave. All the honors that life could give had fallen to him. His last days were those of dignified repose, full of the confidence of his countrymen, a lofty figure in the republic, and the chief and beloved citizen in the university town of Princeton. Such activities as he had were as a trusted adviser in the councils of the great university, and as a stable and absolutely honest trustee in one of the great reformed life insurance companies.

Whatever may be the estimate of Cleveland's constructive statesmanship, he had to his credit in his retirement, the enduring monument of the Monroe doctrine, which with a courage that startled Christendom and brought the great British nation at the feet of America, he, more than any other man, wrote in ineffacable letters into the international law of the world. When Mr. Cleveland sent his famous note to Great Britain declaring our government proposed to assume the right and would, whether Great Britain be willing or unwilling, investigate and determine the Venezuelan boundaries, regardless of what the consequences might be, he awoke world reverberations that time will never still. It forced the acknowledgement by Great Britain of the Monroe doctrine as a fixed policy, and constituted an unparalleled triumph in American diplomatic achievement.

To have done this, to have risen, step on step, to the presidency of the republic, to have lived as he lived in a lofty and conspicuous retirement in his last days, and to have had for his start to all this, a youth of poverty, self-denial, studying at night by a candle light in a grocery store, and supporting a widowed mother at 17, is a beacon-light of beautiful glow to every American boy. Like Lincoln splitting rails, like Garfield driving a canal boat, like Grant in the tannery and as a bankrupt merchant, Cleveland rose from the ranks of the great American commonalty, and it is inspiration to American youth to love our land, because it is free and wide open, and to aim high and strike hard.

MR. CLEWS ON RAILROAD RATES.

LAST WEEK'S circular issued by the veteran financier, Henry Clews, was of especial interest because of its comment on the proposed increase of railroad freight rates throughout the country. Mr. Clews is a very "safe and sane" banker, and perhaps has an exaggerated idea of the proper functions of Wall street, but he tells a good deal of instructive truth in the course of a year. He saw and announced last fall the real causes of the panic, the chief one being, he said, the absorption by stock gamblers of the available money supply.

In this recent letter he mentions approvingly the reduction of prices of its products by the United States Steel corporation, but says the reductions should have been greater. He says that values are still so high and unsettled that new business is restrained and that the big business concerns need to get down to "rock bottom prices." This leads him to the subject of railroad freight rates, upon which he says:

> Some of our railroad managers still seem determined to advance freight rates as soon as feasible. Here again is a singular lack of both business and political sagacity. Public hostility to corporations is now beginning to subside, and at last reason is resuming her wonted sway. An advance in freight rates, however, would surely revive the antagonism to railroads in a worse form than before, particularly in the interior. Further, higher freight rates would depress and not stimulate traffic. Moreover, as business recovers traffic will revive, and there will be less excuse for advancing rates. The railroads have already made heavy cuts in expenses, and when traffic revives the proposed advance in rates would give the railroads promise of big increase in net earnings. This would doubtless be very welcome to stockholders; but, as this gain would necessarily be forced out of the public pocket without giving any adequate equivalent in service, the wisdom of such a step is obviously questionable in view of the present attitude of public opinion toward corporations, and railroads in particular. It would produce the strongest argument in favor of government regulation of railroad rates that has yet been produced.

There seems no possible denial of these statements or answer to these arguments. They summarize the situation accurately and completely. The leading railroad men seem to have come to a similar conclusion, if a recent report be true that they had for the present abandoned their intention to increase rates. But this abandonment should not be merely temporary. As Mr. Clews points out, if the railroads will do their part, business will revive all along the line and they will have no reasonable excuse, even from their own point of view, for raising rates. Business in fact is reviving, but for the railroads to raise rates would check this revival. The country is in neither the condition nor the temper to stand the proposed raise, and it would surely give a great impetus to the government ownership movement.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY.

THE Oregonian gives Grover Cleveland credit, in view not only of his decided opinion and his position as president, but of his being a Democratic president and therefore able to influence a large number of Democratic congressmen, for saving the country from going over to the silver basis, and especially for the repeal of the Sherman silver purchasing clause, and then says: "Harrison could not have done what Cleveland did, because of the attitude of political parties at the time. Harrison could not have prevented loss of the gold standard, slump to silver and utter financial and industrial wreck threatened by the fatuous silver policy, to which both parties had contributed during nearly 20 years, but the Democratic more than the Republican."

The first portion of this statement may be correct, but the latter portion is historically untrue. "The fatuous silver policy" had been adopted and pursued by the Republican party, for that party had been in almost continuous and undisputed control of the government, except as to the executive department, from 1883 to 1887 ever since 1861. The author of the silver purchasing law was a noted and very able Republican. McKinley, up till a short time before his nomination for president, was a silver champion. It is true that a greater number of Democrats than of Republicans were in favor of bimetalism, but the Democrats were not responsible for the trouble, real or imagined, due to the effort to make silver standard money, for the Democrats had no power to do this. Hence the Democratic party, as such could not have contributed more to the threatened "wreck" than the Republican party, for it was not in power, and the Republican party was.

Nor was the Democratic party or Grover Cleveland at all responsible for the hard times that came soon after his second election. The country was on the brink of the panic in the latter part of Harrison's term, and would have toppled over just the same if he had been reelected. And he would have done just what Cleveland did; in fact, the plates for a bond issue had already been made during Harrison's administration.

We are not saying that the Democrats if in power would have done any better; for the purpose of this criticism it may be assumed that they would if possible have done worse; but the historic fact is that insofar as either party was responsible for what happened prior to 1893, and largely also for what happened in the succeeding years as unavoidable consequences, it was the Republican party that was responsible. The editorial historians, if not the platform eulogists, of that party ought not to appropriate for it everything during its career that was good and pleasing, and charge everything bad and disastrous to the Democratic party, when it was almost or entirely out of power.

A FEW PLAIN WORDS ABOUT MR. L. M. DAVIS.

OUT of nearly a score of men who come forward as candidates for the legislature on a certain ticket, it is not surprising that at least one of them should turn out to be a moral weakling, a flopper, a man who on some paltry excuse or another would try to sneak out of the performance of his duty and the keeping of his promises to the people who, reposing too much trust in him, elected him. Such an untrustworthy and disingenuous person is one L. M. Davis, according to the wearisome, trivial and contemptible excuses he is trying to make in advance for not keeping a positive, specific, absolute unequivocal pledge he made to the people of this county last spring, in consequence of which, mistakenly relying upon his honesty and truthfulness, they accepted him as a Statement No. 1 candidate for the legislature, and later electing him along with honest and honorable men, to that office. There might well have been suspicions of this man, on account of his former efforts to break into office, or to help some other candidate by running independent, on terms never made public, but people could not reasonably suppose that even so doubtful a political character would deliberately break the particular, positive, sole pledge upon which he gained the nomination and election. Such absolute political perfidy, such extreme baseness in betrayal of a trust, could not be foreseen.

It may be that Davis will keep his pledge yet, but he is evidently trying with verbose sophistry and flimsy excuses to pave the way for breaking it. All his excuses make clearer the political dishonesty which prompts them. Every one can see that they are a mere sham, a false pretense, a species of political pettifoggery that ought to bring a blush of shame on the cheek of a Pittsburg police court lawyer.

He, Davis, wants to know the exact nature of Chamberlain's politics before he votes for him; he, Davis, won't vote for a Democrat; he, Davis, is going to be very careful now to satisfy his conscience, in order to do which he may have to become a liar and a traitor to the whole people of Oregon, who decided this question on June 1, and will have to perpetrate an act of perfidy and treachery that has no parallel in our history.

There is not an honest, sincere word or thought in the whole long rigmarole of excuses, and everybody knows it. The people of Oregon know Chamberlain's politics, and principles, and sentiments, and record, and it makes no difference whether Davis knows them or not. He pledged himself to vote for the man whom the people chose, the one receiving the highest vote for senator at a popular election. Davis knew then that Chamberlain was a candidate and was likely to be chosen by the people. Davis doesn't care a fig for Chamberlain's politics or principles; he is trying to play the traitor to the people in consideration of—something. This can always be positively predicated in such a case, and of such a man. His gabble about whether Chamberlain is a Roosevelt Republican or a Roosevelt Democrat only insults the people who read it by assuming that they can be deceived by such "open, gross and palpable" hypocrisy.

All that Davis has to do in this matter is to keep his word to the people who elected him, solely in consequence of his subscribing unequivocally to Statement No. 1. Not to do so will render him a traitor to a specific trust and to the whole people, and a man indelibly disgraced for life throughout the whole state. There is no occasion to speak equivocally or softly about this matter. Davis is bunglingly and contemptibly trying to frame up an excuse for sneaking out of a sworn duty, for playing the traitor and committing an act of "perfidy and dishonor," and he cannot do this without the truth being told about it and about him by The Journal.

If he refuses to keep his word at Salem next winter—nay, if he does not most positively renew his pledge—the recall should be put into operation against him on the sixth day of the session. There is no danger that it would not carry, for even if a majority of the people would not choose Chamberlain again—and we think that they would—a majority of them have no use in public life for a man who hypocritically breaks his positive word and basely betrays a sacred trust.

A "BUNKO" GAME AND A "BUNKO" ARTIST.

WITH a brutality that has been characteristic of it during the editorship of Mr. Scott, the Oregonian makes what is nothing more nor less than a savage attack on Representative Eaton of Lane for his manly announcement that he will abide by his Statement No. 1 pledge, and vote in the legislature for the people's choice for United States senator. What else would it have Mr. Eaton do? Has it become the privilege of man because forsooth he is a legislator to lose sight of honor and be free to violate every obligation, whether that obligation be to man, family, country, or God? Because legislatures have been a place of debauchery and demoralization, should there be no effort for their regeneration? The Oregonian has frequently said that legislators would not carry out their Statement No. 1 pledges and that they could not be expected to do so. What is the moral standard of the teacher that preaches such a philosophy? Is it a standard that is wholesome in its effects upon the citizenship, or is it otherwise?

The Oregonian laments that the Republicans of Oregon refuse longer to follow its lead. Advocating infamy, preaching and teaching dishonesty, advising honest men to forsake a solemn covenant with the people, abusing righteousness, doing its utmost to destroy higher civic standards, slandering just men for just public acts, and its editor actually participating in doubtful if not disreputable legislative transactions, how can it expect all the thousands of honest and truth-loving men in its party to follow its lead?

The paper iterates and reiterates that the system by which Mr. Chamberlain was chosen by the people for senator was a "great bunko game," ignoring the fact that nearly 57,000 votes with only 16,000 against adopted the method and did it in revolution against a "great bunko game" that had been biennially played on them, to their great cost in increased taxes and otherwise at Salem. It ignores the fact that in the voting for compulsory Statement No. 1 at the recent election more than 69,000 voters pronounced for the system. It all means that the greatest "bunko game" that has ever been attempted against the people of Oregon is this Oregonian newspaper with Editor Scott as chief "bunko artist," working as he is now for a return to the old system of legislative holdups, senatorial deadlocks, and 40 days of political hell at Salem, and all for what?

Does anybody know, can anybody divine, is there a seer who can indicate why Mr. Scott wants 90 legislators and a bunch of bosses, rather than 100,000 Oregon voters to select Oregon's senator?

A Republican Statement No. 1 member of the next legislature wants Governor Chamberlain to say whether, if he should be elected senator, he "will line up with Roosevelt principles and the Republican party." The Journal does not assume to answer for Governor Chamberlain, but on its own account suggests that this member asks an inconsistent, impossible question. "Lining up" with "Roosevelt principles" or policies might be a very different thing from lining up with the Republican party. That party stands opposed to most of the "Roosevelt principles."

"Prince" Helie de Sagan and the ex-wife of his cousin Boni de Castellane are having a hard time getting married, or else by pretending to find great difficulty in doing so are succeeding in keeping their names continuously in the newspapers, which is perhaps a prime object with them, or at least with the pseudo prince. The world is bored and much of it disgusted with the antics of these fools, who furnish an exception to the rule that "all the world loves a lover."

A five-column, double-leaded editorial, including a Taft sunrise cartoon, in the New York World, is headed: "President Taft—Roosevelt's Reign of Terror Over." So in the World's opinion the "Roosevelt policies" are to be dropped next spring. This is why the World will zealously support Taft instead of Bryan, for Bryan would continue "the Reign of Terror"—from a Wall street point of view.

There is widespread criticism which to The Journal seems well founded, of the law requiring the voters of the whole state to vote on the formation of a new county. This is for the most part a matter of local interest, and ought to be settled under some general statute, by the people directly concerned.

Chairman "Fingey" Connors thinks Taft a very weak candidate, and that almost any Democrat except Bryan could beat him. But "Fingey's" opinion isn't worth much; he only knows what Boss Murphy tells him, and most of that isn't so.

CHAMBERLAIN OF OREGON

From the New York Evening Post.

Politicians in every state of the union with one exception rubbed their eyes in astonishment a week ago last Tuesday when they read that under the direct primary law Oregon had chosen a Democratic United States senator. Oregon, which four years ago gave President Roosevelt a plurality of 42,988! Oregon, which on the very day that it decided to send George Earle Chamberlain, Democrat, to the senate, chose two Republican representatives to accompany him, and elected a Republican to succeed him as governor!

The one exception was Oregon herself. There, the politicians know George Chamberlain, and they know that so long as he is given opportunity to appeal directly to the people, he is likely to win on every occasion when he is a candidate. His whole record from the day four years after his arrival in Oregon from Mississippi, when he was elected to the legislature, is a chapter of success at the polls. That chapter began to be written 25 years ago. It tells how, after his term in the legislature, he was elected prosecuting attorney for the Third judicial district; how, having been appointed attorney-general by Governor Pennoyer, he was promptly confirmed in this office by the people when he sought their votes a year later; how, having moved into the city of Portland from the small town of Albany, where he had first settled, he found no difficulty in securing election as prosecuting attorney of the Fourth judicial district; how the votes of the people made him governor when every other office to be filled at the same time was captured by the Republicans with pluralities ranging from 25,000 to 30,000; finally, how, being fortunate in that the state of his adoption has the direct primary law, the electorate has expressed its demand that he be elected United States senator by a legislature which has no desire to send him to Washington.

Just Plain "George."

To half of the state at least he is just plain "George." Undoubtedly he is what is colloquially termed a "mixer," and a remarkably successful mixer, because he mixes with men naturally and because he really likes to mix. But one must be something more than a mere mixer to accomplish what George E. Chamberlain has accomplished. To the credit of the voters of Oregon be it said that many among his supporters incline to the belief that sometimes the governor mixes a trifle too much; but they recognize that he is absolutely honest and that, as they trust him, so he trusts them. For be it borne in mind that they have the initiative and referendum in Oregon.

Here is the main secret of this uniform success at the polls—the unflinching honesty of the man in the administration of the affairs of every office that he has filled. Which goes to show that while Oregon may have had its Mitchell, Mitchell was not Oregon.

As a campaigner, Governor Chamberlain is remarkable. At first estimate he has few natural aids to success. He can scarcely be called a good speaker, not to so much as suggest him for classification among the orators. He just "talks to the boys," plain, homely talks, about matters that concern every citizen and that every citizen can grasp and understand. Quite frequently he addresses his auditors as "boys," very often he points his argument with an illustration from the home, the farm, or the factory. These are not dragged into the speech after careful rehearsal; they occur naturally because he knows—and his hearers know that he knows.

He works hard during a campaign, appearing to suffer little fatigue, and always seeking opportunities to supplement his addresses by personal appeals to individuals.

Of medium build, there is nothing in his appearance to immediately attract. In fact, he is almost the opposite to what might be called a striking figure, as he has a distinctly receding chin.

Compared With Johnson.

It is only natural, perhaps, that frequent comparisons should be made of George E. Chamberlain with John Johnson, the Democratic governor of Republican Minnesota. In some respects their careers have been distinctly similar; in many regards the success of both has been due to the same main causes. But there are points of difference. Chamberlain is probably the more adroit politician; he has a keener sense of political values and political opportunities as such. Seemingly ingenuous to a degree, he is really as calculating as any politician in the west. He is the Democratic party in Oregon, and none knows this fact so well as the governor of that state. Moreover, or perhaps because of this very condition, notwithstanding his reputation as a "mixer," the Oregonian has fewer friends than the governor of Minnesota. Many think they are his intimate friends, and "George" is not likely to dispel the idea, but, as a matter of fact, he has no confidant.

Some idea of the methods which he employs as a politician may be gained by considering the fact that he continually and almost continuously refers to himself as a "Roosevelt Democrat." That label will have secured for him a seat in the senate if the legislature obeys the expressed mandate of the people, and it may not be without its uses when the legislature meets if strict party men are seeking further excuse for sending an opponent to Washington.

Oregon is a Roosevelt worshipper to the point of idolatry. It forgives much to Senator Bourne (and it has much to forgive), because he shouts "third term" in season and out, and offers to pay $1,000 to any one who will furnish him with a good reason for the noise he is making. George E. Chamberlain knows Oregon as "Dan" Finn knows the Battery. Wherefore he capitalizes the popularity of Theodore Roosevelt for the benefit of George E. Chamberlain.

With regard to the great questions of statesmanship which deserve the study of those to whom opportunity has been given to influence, if not to direct, the opinion of large communities, it must be confessed that Governor Chamberlain has given no indication of willingness to lead. His followers have been taught to be "regular," as he is "regular." There is none of Johnson's outspoken desire for tariff reform as an issue worthy the Democratic party. Evidently this issue would not be regarded as being opportune in Oregon just now; more votes can be obtained by a "Roosevelt Democrat." A fervent follower of Bryan, Mr. Chamberlain may have decided opinions concerning the currency questions, but it is likely that he would have supported free coppper with the same enthusiasm that he once displayed for free silver if the majority of his party had made this an issue—and if it had been "good politics" in Oregon.

The Politician in Office.

All of which may cause wonder at the usefulness of the man in responsible office. Does this desire for success not lead to manipulation of the strings of office for personal or party ends? Let it be said at once that it does not. George E. Chamberlain has represented the people and not the party in his every act as executive. There are those who say that in this he has continued to play politics. Perhaps, but if this be true, pity is that there are not more of such politicians in the United States. Careful as a campaigner, he appears to be absolutely careless of party popularity in his decisions as governor.

Only, he seeks at every opportunity to know the will of the people. Rarely, but occasionally, he really leads them, but always he consults them. He has vitalized the referendum in Oregon, steadily vetoing everything in the form of legislation that inhibited reference. It is impossible to receive the gubernatorial assent to any new enactment "to take effect immediately," if there is any question in regard to the desire of the electorate for the new law.

Humanitarian movements of all kinds, especially those planned on scientific lines and indorsed by experience and experiment, have found in him a warm and consistent supporter. His actions in regard to child labor have been not merely sympathetic, but also sane. Penal reform has always interested him, and he has not only shown a keen interest in all legislation on this subject, but has carried his interest to the point of making frequent visits to the Salem penitentiary, where he knows half of the convicts by name, all about the causes of each one's imprisonment, and the plans made by many for a new start in the world later on.

It has been saiad that George E. Chamberlain is the Democratic party of Oregon. It is doubtful whether it might not be said with equal truth (especially in view of the election two weeks ago) that he typifies Oregon herself. Certainly he will represent Oregon as emphatically as Mitchell misrepresented the state at Washington. Shrewd, persistent, ambitious, to a certain extent provincial in ideals, but honest toward his neighbors—so he is estimated by the voters who have chosen him as senator, and so they are content that he should be.

Men, Not Parties.

Party labels don't count for much in Oregon these days. The railroad interests, which so long dictated the politics there, placed the useful men before the party, and the people, determined to fight for their prerogatives, early learned that they too needed useful men. They decided that they needed "George," and "George" has never disappointed them. They needed help from Washington to oust Mitchell and Fulton, and when Heney began his work they thought that behind Heney they saw Roosevelt. They had lived under tyranny, for neither railroad dictators nor timber thieves were easy bosses. They ruled with raw methods, and when the revolt came the thought of the big stick as an ally evoked an enthusiasm which has not yet subsided.

Republicans in the legislature, if they keep the pledges made to abide by the popular vote on the senatorship, must choose a Democrat. But in this matter Oregon sees less that is strange than does the outside world. She remembers that when time after time Mitchell, Republican, was sent to the senate, he was assisted on every occasion by Democratic votes in the legislature. Only on such occasions such votes were cast not by order of constituents, but in the face of their opposition.

Already there is talk of rebellion on the part of the legislature which is strongly Republican. It is doubtful whether the rebellion will materialize. In Oregon men know one another fairly well, and generally manage to make themselves understood. The city of Portland wanted a good mayor, so it chose one in the person of Dr. Harry Lane, a Democrat. Finding him to be all that had been expected, and something more, for his messages have been models of common sense couched in the breeziest of western terms, it promptly reelected him. Now, the whole state, through the voice of the majority, wants a Democratic United States senator, and it will have him, if it has to change the constitution. The members of the legislature know this, and not many will be willing to seek reelection with a record of having attempted to balk the will of the people of Oregon, not to speak of having violated an individual pledge. Oregon has little use for a bad loser.

A Poem for Today

Contentment.

By Sir Henry Wotton.

(Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) was one of the best known diplomats of the court of James I of England. His life and character are treated by Izaak Walton in his Lives. Following an interesting foreign and diplomatic career, checkered in a manner characteristic of that period, he was appointed provost at Eton, where he was able to indulge in his literary avocation. Some of his maxims and his short poems are all that remain of his labors.)

How happy is he born and taught
That serveth not another's will;
Whose armor is his honest thought
And simple truth his utmost skill!

Whose passions not his masters are,
Whose soul is still prepared for death;
Not tied unto the world with care
Of public fame or private breath;

Who envies none that chance doth raise,
Or vice; who never understood
How deepest wounds are given by praise,
Nor rules of state, but rules of good;

Who hath his life from rumors freed,
Whose conscience is his strong retreat;
Whose state can neither flatterers feed
Nor ruin make accusers great;

Who God doth late and early pray
More of his grace than gifts to lend,
And entertains the harmless day
With a religious book or friend.

This man is freed from servile bands
Of hope to rise or fear to fall;
Lord of himself, though not of lands,
And, having nothing, yet hath all.

A Matter of Honor.

From the Grants Pass Outlook.

Senator Fulton has added nothing to his popularity with the rank and file in Oregon by his utterance with regard to the honoring of Statement No. 1. His statement, in effect, that a legislative candidate is no more bound to adhere to the dictum of the federal constitution than to abide by his pledge to his constituents is virtual encouragement of deceit and disloyalty. The wisdom or folly of taking this pledge is a question upon which candidates may honestly differ, but having made this pledge with the people, knowing that there was a possibility if not a probability that the choice of the majority might be a Democrat, it is a matter of ethics and of honor for the candidate to abide by the result, however unwelcome it may be. We cannot conceive how a legislator can settle with his own conscience, to say nothing of his constituency, if he undertakes to dodge this obligation.

This Date In History.

1712—Jean Jacques Rousseau, French writer and publicist, born. Died July 8, 1778.

1836—James Madison, fourth president of the United States, died at Montpelier, Va. Born in Port Conway, Va., March 16, 1751.

1838—Queen Victoria crowned.

1844—John Boyle O'Reilly, Irish patriot, born in County Meath. Died in Hull, Mass., August 10, 1890.

1855—Railroad from Panama to Aspinwall opened.

1860—Steamship Great Eastern first arrived at New York.

1898—Wisconsin celebrated her semi-centennial as a state.

1904—Steamer Norge lost off the Scottish coast and 646 persons perished.

Higher Than Eiffel.

M. Tournay, a Belgian engineer, has been commissioned by the committee for the international exhibition at Brussels in 1910 to erect a tower at Ixelles which will be much higher than the Eiffel tower. The cost is estimated at $240,000.

The White Peril.

From the Taiyo, Tokio.

The "white peril" is as threatening to the east as the "yellow danger" is to the west. China and Japan should agree to stop the Europeans and the Americans from cornering the whole of the industrial and commercial markets in the far east.

A Sermon for Today

Religion and Morality.

By Henry F. Cope.

"Faith apart from works is dead."—James, ii., 26.

YOU will often hear some one say: "I am not a religious man at all. I am just a plain moral man, trying to do what is right with all others." There is some implied distinction between religion and morality which makes the average person feel that while there can be no doubt as to the value of the latter to the world, the former is a separate matter and of doubtful usefulness.

It is safe to say that every person is either more religious or less religious than he imagines himself to be. He who disclaims any religion, insisting the only thing he is concerned about is his duty to his fellow man and the good of society as a whole, may be cherishing profoundly religious ideals and following them in a deeply religious spirit.

On the other hand, those who seek to discredit what they call "empty morality," who tell us there is no good in any man except the good that is formally, supernaturally conferred in the name of religion, have only so much religion as they may by force or by accident express in the morality they affect to despise. A man's religious professions are no guide to his moral character, but his moral practice is a safe guide to his religious sincerity.

Is there any difference between the realities of religion and morality? Can one be religious without moral living? Can one be moral without the religious spirit? What is religion but the inspiration of morality and morality but the vitalizing expression of religion?

Morality is the art of the right conduct of life, especially in relation to one's fellow beings. The moral man sees before him standards and ideals of living, personal and social; his sense of duty is the obligation to do certain things and to avoid others because these are for the good or the ill of that ideal of personal rightness and social good which he cherishes.

Religion is the life of ideals, the life of goodness and truth and service because these seem to be the supremely desirable aims in life. It is the life that cherishes the great thoughts of the past, the high vision of character and civilization that men have dreamed, the spiritual heritage of the ages; it is the life that counts all things but dross that it may win character and social completeness.

When the man who avows the moral aim says that he has no use for religion, he is probably thinking of its forms and its furniture. He seeks the right life and he cannot see that songs and ceremonies, from which time and changing conditions often have taken all deep significance, have any value or helpfulness to him.

Often the difficulty comes, however, because we who seek the moral ends, the high aims of character and service, fail to see how deep is our need of the inspiration and light that religion can give. No man can live for great purposes unless he cherishes high ideals, unless he comes to some sense of the world of spiritual values.

In the fight for the full and free life we need to know that we do not fight alone, that we are but part of a great and glorious army that has been struggling up through all the ages past. We need to catch the vision of the glorious army of martyrs and to feel the glow of strength that comes from touch with the great souls of every age.

We may read any kind of meaning we will into the words by which we attempt to describe the infinite being. God may be a definite person or only an influence or an ideal. But our morality needs the dynamic of that ideal, the sense of the great spirit of truth that works through us all to the realization of our best thoughts and hopes for all.

Let a man honestly follow his moral ideals; let him pay the price they will demand of him; let him invest himself in their achievement, and he will not need to worry about religion; he will come to a sense of the spiritual values of his service; he will find himself a part of the great company of those who have lived for the kingdom of the good; he will know the power that works in us for the right.

Sentence Sermons

By Henry F. Cope.

Fidelity is the best evidence of faith.

* *

To cease to dream is to begin to die.

* *

The best exposition of truth is its exhibition.

* *

Sublime victories are first won in commonplace days.

* *

The worst thing about any evil deed is its fruitfulness.

* *

Conscience is the answer of my life to the light I have.

* *

The only way to use a great opportunity is to serve it.

* *

The life has left any truth when it needs laws to defend it.

* *

The rule of gold makes the golden rule seem sadly unreal.

* *

The pessimist kills all hope because happiness irritates him.

* *

Living a double life is killing each half of life with the other.

* *

The curriculum of character may often involve painful circumstances.

* *

He is never worth thinking much about who thinks most of himself.

* *

The eye single to the main chance always misses the great opportunity.

* *

The best way to cure the fear of man is to lose the love of mammon.

* *

There is only one way to the hearts of men, it is the way of your own heart.

* *

He who expands his house needs to have a care not to contract his heart.

* *

A resolution to go to heaven will not help you much if you get on the wrong train.

* *

Some men carry Bibles under their arms to balance the heavy purses laid on their heart.

* *

It's a difficult thing to lift up the man who is down while you're trying to win a smile from the man who put him there.

* *

Many a man who prides himself on being a law abiding person would be surprised to see himself in the light of the law of love.

Princess Henry of Pless' Birthday.

Princess Henry of Pless, who is often spoken of as one of the most beautiful women of England, was born June 28, 1873. Before her marriage she was Miss Daisy Cornwallis-West, the daughter of William Cornwallis-West. Her husband is a captain in the Prussian cavalry and formerly was secretary to the German embassy in London. Both move in the highest circles of English society and are favorites of royalty. Their marriage took place in 1891, and was one of the notable events of the London season. Several years ago the prince and princess visited New York, the former as the representative of the German emperor at the inauguration of the New York chamber of commerce. Princess Henry of Pless' youngest sister, Miss Sheila Cornwallis-West, married the Duke of Westminster, and her brother, George Cornwallis-West, is the husband of Lady Randolph Churchill. The father of Princess Henry is a grandson of the second Earl of Delawarr and her mother is a granddaughter of the Marquis of Headfort.