EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE JOURNAL

THE JOURNAL

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER.

C. S. JACKSON.....Publisher

Published every evening (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 839.

FOREIGN ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE

Freeland-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

Circulation Guarantee

This Certifies that the circulation of the

OREGON JOURNAL

Has been audited and is guaranteed by the Advertiser's Certified Circulation Blue Book

1908

Circulation Actuary 115 Dearborn St. Chicago

This Paper has proved by investigation that the circulation records are kept with care and the circulation stated with such accuracy that advertisers may rely on any statements of same made by the publishers under the ownership and management in control **September 9, 1908.**

No man can possibly improve in any company for which he has not respect enough to be under some degree of restraint.—Chesterfield.

THE REVERSE SIDE OF THE SHIELD

A GREAT deal is being said by the Republican organs about the "danger" of electing Bryan; that business interests would suffer, that people would feel timid, would lose confidence, would act with caution; would fear that somehow, in no clearly stated way, he might do something "radical," might try to make some "vagary" effective—and so on—columns upon columns of these dark hints and vaguely dire forebodings. This is campaign stuff, of course. Roosevelt has been considered astonishingly "radical," and yet most of these organs, at least out west, praise him unstintedly for being so.

But even if we were to concede that something of what they prophesy would come to pass, what is the prospect on the other side, in the other event? The campaign is now sufficiently advanced so that it can be positively stated that if Mr. Taft should be elected it will be with and largely through the allied, united support of nearly every trust, every law-defying corporation, every land-gobbling railroad, every monopoly, every great financier who expects and gets favors of the government, every "malefactor of great wealth," every possessor of a wrongly acquired "swollen fortune" and every predatory plutocrat in the country. There would be a few exceptions, perhaps, one out of a hundred of such people who poses as a Democrat and is ostensibly for Bryan, like Belmont; but practically all these combines, elements, forces and men who are making for a government of, by and for a privileged few instead of one of, by and for the people, are solidly ranged up in support of Taft. And observe that he has not yet uttered a word to displease them. Nor, it may be predicted, will he do a thing to offend them if elected.

In with Taft will go, or will remain, most of the tools of these interests in congress—we all know the list, or the prominent men in it, and with them Taft will cooperate. If he does not they will defy him, as they did Roosevelt. And since Roosevelt in large measure gave up to them and stands by them, what can be expected of Taft?

So it comes back pretty near to the question that Bryan declared was the paramount issue: "Shall the people rule?" They are told now, daily, in effect, that they not only cannot rule, but that if they try to come a little nearer ruling by electing a man who may be the choice of a majority, they will suffer for it; that there will be business depression and industrial paralysis and hard times. But if the trusts and high financiers and predatory plutocrats are permitted to rule another four years, there will be good times and prosperity will prevail. Even if we knew that this would be so, is the gain worth the price? If these predacious elements are so strong now that they can bring about a four years' depression as a punishment upon the people for voting as they please, how much stronger will they be four years hence—and eight years? How long will it take before the whole government will pass completely into the absolute undisputed possession of the Rockefellers, Morgans and Harrimans?

These constant threats should serve as warnings to the people of a different kind from that intended. They should warn the people that it is dangerous to yield to such threats, and that the more they yield the less power to run their government and put representative men in power they will possess. They are in the position of one who yields to blackmail; the more he gives up under threats the poorer and weaker he becomes.

THE NORMAL SCHOOL PROBLEM

EVIDENTLY the normal school question in Oregon has not been settled yet. The board of normal school regents is divided as to the number of schools yet to be maintained, after cutting out the one at Drain, leaving three. Two or three members of the board, a minority, will recommend the elimination of one or possibly two more schools, and this recommendation will doubtless find strong support among the people, if not in the legislature.

The board estimates that the cost of maintaining the three schools for the next two years, including new dormitories and equipment, will be $317,000. This estimate provides only for very low salaries for fully competent teachers—too low, in the estimation of many good judges. It may be expected that this cost will go on increasing biennially; such is the universal experience. The questions are: Are the schools worth the cost? Can equally good or better results be obtained at less cost?

This estimated cost would not be alarming, should not be considered too great, if satisfactory results were being obtained. But regard for truth compels the admission that such is not the case. Of about 3,000 teachers required in the state, only about 300, one out of 10, are normal school graduates. So it is clear that the states is paying out a good deal of money, and unless a radical change is effected will pay out more and more biennially, for normal school teachers, and doesn't get them. The cost to the state is now about $250 per year per graduate, and then most of the graduates, either immediately or within a short time, turn their attention to more profitable or congenial employment, or—as most of them are girls—marry and so quit teaching. The state's investment is not, therefore, altogether a loss, for the education gained improves the citizenship of the beneficiaries, yet it remains true that the state is investing in something of which it gets but a small proportion of what it pays for.

The curious argument is made by one member of the board that because there are few normal school graduates among the teachers, at least three schools should be maintained. But one normal school has been established for over 20 years, and four were in operation for from 8 to 18 years—with the result stated. If this has been the record so far, how can better results be expected in the future?

It would be a very serious matter for the communities most interested to abolish two or all three of the present schools, and it should not be done except on careful consideration of the whole subject, from the sole point of view of the interest of all the people of the state, and this is scarcely to be expected in a legislature. The question will probably not be settled until some definite proposition is submitted to the people through the initiative. Under all the circumstances we would not be surprised if the people, if afforded an opportunity, would indorse the plan of Senator Smith of Marion county to abolish all the schools, and establish one at some new point, preferably near but not at Portland, for after all this is the only really central point for the whole state.

In a decision rendered Wednesday by Judge Smith McPherson, of the United States court in Iowa, he declared the Iowa liquor statute a quasi-criminal law and said that the federal court had no power to interfere with its enforcement by state courts. In view of some recent decisions by federal judges, this one is rather refreshing and encouraging.

MR. TAFT AND THE TARIFF

TO TARIFF revisionists Mr. Taft poses as a revisionist. Some remarks of his in the past serve as a foundation for this attitude. But he is careful never to specify how he would revise the tariff, nor to mention anything on which he would reduce the duty. On the contrary, he tells the beet sugar raisers that he would never consent to a reduction of the duty on beet sugar. (The sugar trust owns or controls all the beet sugar factories.) Mr. Taft would not reduce the duty on wool, though if effective for the intended purpose it taxes 1,000 men to benefit one. To the employes of a great manufacturing establishment in Milwaukee, one subsidiary to and a necessary patron of the steel trust, he said that he would not advocate a reduction of the duties on its products. Hence, it may be inferred, he would not disturb the duties that make the swollen fortunes of the steel trust.

So, wherever he goes, Mr. Taft appears to be for the present or higher duties on everything made by trusts and controlled by monopolies, though to the country in general he is vaguely posed as being some sort of a mild revisionist. Now with Mr. Taft as president, Sherman as vice-president, Cannon as speaker, and Aldrich, Elkins, Payne, Dalzell, and all the gang still in their places, what sort of tariff revision, if any, would we get? Manifestly, surely, one that would entirely suit the trusts, and rob the people worse than ever.

KERN—AND OTHERS

THE Spokane Spokesman-Review regards Mr. John W. Kern as a very bad man. He has been to some small extent a railroad attorney, and he has also been the attorney for the unsaintly Thomas Taggart. But if we plead guilty as to Mr. Kern, may we call the Spokane paper's attention to the gang on the other side? What of Sherman, standpatter, trust servitor, collector of campaign funds from the interests, all his public life playing politics for the purpose of plundering the people? What of Sheldon, member of 19 trusts and monopolistic corporations and stock-jobbing concerns? What of Cromwell, the general campaign attorney of the party, who buncoed the government, with its eyes wide open, out of $40,000,000? What of—O, most of the rest actively in the lead? It isn't quite fair or reasonable to make so much out of Mr. Kern's rather insignificant services as a railroad attorney and as attorney for Tom Taggart, a neighbor and lifelong acquaintance, while a private citizen, and never turn a glance on the sort of people that are managing the Taft campaign, or on Mr. Kern's opponent, who, not as a private citizen, but as a public official, has been serving the corporations and trusts and every sort of predatory interest all his life.

The president would doubtless like to break out again with reference to the report about his alleged bargain with Labor Leader Keefe, but he cannot have quite forgotten what happened to him the last time he took to letter writing for publication.

IF LA GRANDE DEPOSITS HAD BEEN GUARANTEED

SCORES of bank depositors at La Grande regret that bank deposits are not guaranteed. The Farmers & Traders National bank there is closed, and the usual notice is on the door. As usual, the cash box is nearly empty, and the institution a hopeless wreck. In the hearts of those who placed their money there for safe keeping, there is the usual dismal anxiety, and in their minds, forebodings that their savings are hopelessly lost. It is the old story of incompetence, if nothing worse, a dismal tale from which there seems no escape, under existing laws. Apparently, as long as bankers bank, this reappearing shadow will continue to thrust itself over communities, carrying loss and distress, for bankers are only mortal, and have their weaknesses like other men. Incidentally, the manager of the fallen bank at La Grande was a vigorous opponent of the plan for guarantee of bank deposits, and gave it constant battle among his patrons. But his bank is a wreck, his depositors are defrauded, he is in the hands of the law, and his arguments against the guarantee plan a wasting memory. Such is the dismal sequel to many a financier's confident opinion on business ethics and the laws of finance.

Looking toward La Grande, contemplating the situation of depositors of the ill-fated Farmers & Traders National, it is passing strange that there should be insistence that deposits in banks should not be guaranteed. Nobody insists that there should not be guarantee against loss by fire. Nobody insists that a ship should be sent across the sea without guarantee against loss by marine accidents. To insist against either would be the strangest of strange contentions. It is a protective principle so confessed, that no man would have the hardihood to advise another not to insure his home against risk of fire loss. Yet it is no more important to have a guarantee against fire or marine loss than against loss by incompetency and dishonesty in banking, as the La Grande and many another bank collapse, so eloquently testify. The principle in each is protective, and is exactly the same. What is more, there is apparently as much need for one as for the other. This the La Grande depositors in their distress will freely admit, and from bitter memories of the past Portland Savings bank and Title Guarantee depositors will not dispute.

Bankers insist on being guaranteed against loss from dishonest or incompetent employes. Every great corporation and business establishment does the same. The banks take for themselves guarantees against loss from burglars. They require a stiff guarantee for money they lend. The nation requires a guarantee for its deposits in banks, so does the state, and so does the city. For everything and everybody there is a safe and snug guarantee, except the bank depositors who, Candidate Taft insists, ought not to have their deposits guaranteed.

It is a strangely anomalous contention that there should be protection for all else and all others, but none for the depositor. Candidate Taft may be able to explain why it should be thus, so may learned anti-guarantee editors, and so may the manager of the defunct Farmers & Traders at La Grande. But how about the depositors whose money is gone?

Small Change

Things that come cheap are sometimes pretty dear.

* *

The normal school question is not settled yet, by a long shot.

* *

Guggenheim's hired man is telling voters how to save the country.

* *

It is very curious what silly compositions will sometimes win prizes.

* *

The rain causes nearly everybody in the Oregon country to feel better.

* *

Multnomah county's assessed valuation is rapidly increasing; also the taxes.

* *

Aren't Anna and Helie behaving themselves just lovely? Not a word about them for weeks.

* *

The less number of women that can crowd in to hear a murder trial the better. The courtroom is quite large enough.

* *

C. N. McArthur seems to be chairman as well as secretary. This is well; there is therefore harmony between the two offices.

* *

At last the Republican campaign in Oregon seems to be fairly opened. That donation from national headquarters must have arrived.

* *

Representative W. R. Ellis is going to address the people of Rainier and Clatskanie. The punishment fits the crime; they voted for him.

* *

Senator Dolliver can't come to Salem to speak, after all. But perhaps Salem voters will know about as well how to vote as if he had come.

* *

Colonel Tucker's wife appears to be one of that sort of women whose mission on earth is to make it the opposite of paradise for the men they marry.

* *

Off and on, on and off again, every few days—the Abruzzi-Elkins engagement—and reported as though it was the most important matter on earth.

* *

If Mr. Taft would openly and vigorously denounce and renounce about 100 prominent Republican leaders and tools of the interests, he might check the rising tide in favor of Bryan.

* *

The police court Tuesday confiscated a gun with which one drunken man had nearly fatally whacked another. This is a good precedent that should be followed about 1,000 times—and then some.

* *

An aged husband of four wives pleaded in his defense that he had a poor memory and married again because he forgot he had been married before. This excuse was incredible, for no married man is allowed to forget that fact.

* *

Presidential Elector Butler was out telling the people of Sunnyside that all good things, including good times, were due to the Republican party. He did not fully explain whether last year's panic was due most to Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland or W. J. Bryan.

* *

The Small Change man is in receipt of this communication from "Gussie": The following is suggested as a "yell" for the Political Purchasing Agent of the Standard Oil company of Wall Street college:

P. P. A., who are we?
Archbold, Archbold,
S. O. C.!!!

* *

Blaine was a popular idol, though as to political morals considered shady. Bryan is far superior to Blaine as an orator and a ready expounder of public questions, and he is admittedly of sound and strict morals and ethics. Blaine missed election to the presidency very narrowly, through Conkling and Burchard; Bryan—to be continued November 4.

Oregon Sidelights

A Scio party went coon hunting one night and got five.

* *

A building and loan association may be organized in Echo.

* *

An 80-acre tract near Clatskanie will be laid off in small tracts.

* *

It is believed that Tillamook "bootleggers" mix wood alcohol with their dope.

* *

The Madras Pioneer tells of a 5-year-old boy who while his dog held the attention of a coyote, killed him with a club.

* *

When a town the size of Sheridan can show a bank deposit of over $190,000 there must be wealth and something back of it to produce the wealth, says the Sun.

* *

Since the closing of the saloons in Grants Pass the work of the Salvation Army has been very light and their receipts from collections very light also, says the Outlook.

* *

Hay is plentiful, most of it is now in the stack, the surplus cattle have been marketed, and hence the ranchers are figuring on an easy time the coming winter, says the Prineville Review.

* *

Lewisville Correspondence of Silverton Appeal: The grain harvest in this locality was exceptionally good. In some places wheat yielded as high as 56 bushels per acre, and oats over 80 bushels per acre.

* *

Vesper Correspondence of Clatskanie Chief: There were some very careless hunters here this fall—shot six of A. Nelson's fine cows. I don't think the fellows had better show up around here again for a while.

* *

Every sawmill and lumber camp in the vicinity of Rainier is in full blast, lumber is constantly going up and orders are brisk. Boats are loading at the various docks, two freight trains pass through the city every day loaded with lumber and merchandise.

* *

Little Miss Margaret Garrison of Forest Grove, in addition to the prizes which she won at the state fair on her sewing, was awarded a sewing machine at the Washington county fair last week for the best exhibit of needle work of girls under 14 years.

* *

The number of strangers in the city these days, and many letters received by mail inquiring as to climatic conditions, price of city and farm property, and a hundred other questions, proves that Jefferson is beginning to attract attention from "outsiders," says the Review.

* *

A Clatskanie man went hunting and lost his dog. Sunday he went out to look for it, taking along a shotgun and a revolver, and found the dog guarding a treed cougar, which with several shots was killed. It measured 9 feet 8 inches in length and stood 2½ feet high.

* *

Cornelius Correspondence of Forest Grove News: Our new schoolhouse is fast nearing completion, and from the number of young married people who are securing homes in the new additions and adjacent to Cornelius, we realize that we will be compelled to duplicate the building in the near future.

* *

The increased movement in real estate transactions in this town and vicinity and the influx of new families is the beginning of a wholesome growth for Sheridan that will result in a development which many have labored long to procure, says the Sun. The revival of business activities throughout the country, even on the eve of a presidential election when stagnation in trade is the rule, is an encouraging sign for the future.

CAUSTIC COMMENT ON SON-IN-LAW LONGWORTH

Chicago, Oct. 15.—"Nick" Longworth has been importuned to keep off the stump in his own congressional district, and even refrain from making speeches for his own reelection to congress. His declaration at Rock Island, Ill., for eight years for Taft, then eight years for Roosevelt, aroused such a storm of protest from the Republican press that the managers took him from the stump and now have decided if possible to keep him from appearing again in the campaign. A few editorial expressions anent the episode follow:

* * *

From the Dayton, Ohio, News.

The most charitable thing that can be said about Longworth is that he is a joke. Most of his acquaintances consider him a calamity. Everybody knows that he is incurable. To send him about the country in an efort to induce the people to vote the Republican ticket was to class the people as fools. So long as he is allowed to live in Cincinnati he is harmless, but to send him outside of the city to make addresses—that is a crime against human intelligence.

There is not a young Republican in this city today but is more deserving of political favors than Longworth. There are not many but could make a better speech; certainly there are few more stupid, and not a large number but have a cleaner life back of them. And yet because of Longworth's money he was taken up by the committee and sent around over the country to tell intelligent men how they should vote. Is it any wonder that men turn from the safe and sane paths and grab a stick of dynamite when they see such things performed in the name of the republic?

* * *

From the Springfield, Mo., Leader.

Nicholas Longworth struck Taft a harder blow than any he has yet received from the White House when the official son-in-law of the administration proposed that the Republican candidate for the presidency should be a chairwarmer and stool pigeon for "Dad" during the next eight years. Has the presidency of this mighty American republic sunk to such base uses? Have we fallen upon such evil days that an appointed president shall sit in the seat once occupied by Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln, and have no other or higher function than to keep it warm for a Theodore Roosevelt? Under such circumstances the comparatively harmless Taft would become "a lieutenant of Satan sitting in the chair of pestilence."

After 1925 is the nation to be blessed with a succession of Roosevelts, or may we hope for a Longworth in time as a variation? It is a fortunate thing that Son-in-Law Nicholas has prematurely revealed the plot of the Roosevelt dynasty, in which William Howard Taft is expected to play a part more important than honorable.

* * *

From the Brooklyn, N. Y., Citizen.

From Rock Island comes a reiteration of the original story in the shape of affidavits made by two persons who heard the congressman's speech, and who declare that he made the statements attributed to him. The real significance that lies in the incident is not whether Mr. Longworth was in earnest or merely joking, as his apologists now say, but in the manner in which it was taken up by Taft's newspaper supporters in the east. These, without exception, groaned audibly over the prospect of eight years more of "Terrible Teddy." The worst thing they have against Taft is his readiness to kowtow to the president. They have been trying to educate their readers to believe that Taft will reverse Roosevelt's policies if elected the same as Roosevelt reversed McKinley, but the candidate is constantly belying their statements by his adoration of the "Bogie Man."

* * *

From the Richmond, Va., Leader.

Mr. Longworth is reported as saying in a public speech that after four years with Taft as president Mr. Roosevelt should be elected for another term. This coming from the president's own family, will be taken by many people to express his real purposes. We can not imagine anything more likely to turn the American people against Taft than the suggestion that he is a mere stop gap intended to evade the third term precedent and to make opportunity for four years more of Theodore. On general principles, we believe it is safe to predict, even now, that if Mr. Taft is elected and Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate for another term in 1912 the Democrats will win in a walk with any kind of nominee. The thing would be too much like a royal succession or a constitutional monarchy to be accepted by this country.

* * *

From the Spartansburg, S. C., Herald.

Does Nicholas mean to suggest himself for the presidency, by declaring that "modesty forbids" his pursuing the matter further? It is scarcely possible for any other construction to be put upon his words. His program, or the program of the Roosevelt machine, is, according to the view of it that is to be emphasized by the Democrats, eight years of Taft, then eight years more of Roosevelt, then eight years of Sherman—and after that "modesty forbids" Mr. Longworth to go further in revealing the plans of the family.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

Did the Wires Get Crossed.

Toledo, Or., Oct. 13.—To the Editor of The Journal—It seems to be a very true saying that "great minds run in the same channel." Only a short time ago the very able editor of the Oregonian jumped onto the tariff plank of the Republican national platform and very properly castigated it, but did so under the mistaken idea that he was "hitting up" the Democratic platform. In a very recent issue the editor of the Omaha Bee, the leading Republican paper of Nebraska, made the same grievous error. The printed extract and editorial are as follows:

"In all tariff legislation the true principle is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with reasonable profit to American industries."

Concerning the above plank of the Republican platform, Mr. Rosewater has the following truthful sentiment to offer:

"Nothing prettier in the catch-all line has been offered in this campaign. The most hide bound standpatter in the country can accept that as satisfactory and the rankest free trader can find delight in it. The declaration means simply nothing. An attempt to legislate along that line would simply open the way to interminable wrangling as to what constitutes a 'reasonable profit' for hair-splitting on wages in one industry, price of raw material in another, rebates and drawbacks in a third and so on through the list of thousands of articles that are now on the tariff lists.

"Under such a proposition an attempt at tariff revision, at Bryan's direction, would serve only to halt industrial and commercial progress and keep business unsettled during his term of office."

The queer part of the above editorial is that it is almost the same words the Oregonian used. Can it be possible that both of these were "inspired" and the wires got crossed?

J. F. STEWART.

Warmly Resents Sladden's Charge.

Sellwood, Or., Oct. 16.—To the Editor of The Journal—One Thomas Sladden, alleged by himself to be a leader of the Socialist party in this state, has been granted space in The Journal to say that I am not a Socialist and do not represent the party. I want to say in reply, if you will permit space, that I founded the Socialist party in this state, have always been and am now a member of the party. Sladden, nor any one else has any right to question my position nor my loyalty to the party. In fact, I doubt Sladden's being even a clerk legally in the employ of the party. The trouble with this fellow Sladden, Mr. Editor, is that he is eaten up with envy and inordinate vanity. He imagines he is a great writer on economics, poses as a proletariat and friend of the "wurkin' class" at $30 or $40 per month. He imagines he is necessary to the Socialist movement and other things of that nature. He soon will be, if he isn't already, a fit subject for Dr. Henry Waldo Coe or Dr. Williamson. His spite and resentment at me is on account of my leading him by 200 votes in the last June election. He can't get over it—and after my acceptance of Mr. Stone's invitation to represent Debs and the Socialists at the White Temple, the poor fellow couldn't contain his animosity any longer, it had to have vent. Of course, Mr. Editor, if the Socialist voter prefers me to Sladden I can't see why I should be blamed for it. If I am more popular in Portland than the Davis street economic philosopher, why not blame the public who prefer voting for me than Sladden? I don't want to be a candidate. I have always tried to evade it, but when duty calls, why, as a good Socialist, I respond.

Not only is J. D. Stevens a Socialist now, but has been since he founded the party, and it is my intention to remain in the party, representing it when and wherever I can. I have done it in the past and will do it in the future, and this Davis street nonentity will in no way prevent me.

J. D. STEVENS.

Beveridge's Talk Dissected.

Astoria, Or., Oct. 13.—To the Editor of The Journal—It seems to me that Senator Beveridge's appeal to the voters why they should not support Bryan in his declaration that the leaders of his (Bryan's) own party now in the senate would not support him in his policy of controlling the trusts, is fully as bad a blunder as was that of the Omaha Bee and the Oregonian when they ripped up a portion of the Republican tariff plank, mistaking it for that of the Democratic.

Why does Beveridge confine his belief in the non-support of Bryan to the United States senate? Why does he not also go to the lower house of congress on this trust-busting proposition? Does he wish the people to understand by leaving them out that the people who elected them are in sympathy with Bryan, and that they must necessarily stand with the people? Yes, that is just what he means, and he acknowledges at the same time that the trusts are a part of the constituency of the United States senate. He believes the leaders of the Democratic party in the senate are controlled by the trusts and corporations, and are no better in that respect than the leaders of the Republican party.

Well, he may be right. But he hasn't told the people how dearly the Republican senators loved Roosevelt's trust-busting and reform policies, and how well they stood by him in the past, when the interests of the trusts were at stake. Now, Taft, if elected, is supposed to continue Roosevelt's reform policies; why not take a vote of the Republican senators at the same time as that of the Democrats, and find out the Republican-Roosevelt reform converts, too? This acknowledgment by Beveridge of the source of the United States senate's control is a sufficient recommendation for the election of that body direct by the people—just what Bryan stands for and Taft does not. In analyzing Beveridge's understanding of the United States senate, when he fails to take in the lower house of congress for the Democratic non-support of Bryan, is simply this: The leading, at least, United States senators owe their election to the corporations and trusts. The lower house members owe their election to the people. Mr. Beveridge's argument, like the Omaha Bee of October 2 and the Oregonian of September 14, is an unintentional boost for Bryan and the Democratic platform.

F. ALLEN.

Down the Boss.

Bonneaville, Or., Oct. 15.—To the Editor of The Journal.—In this morning's Oregonian is an editorial declaring that Taft was to be preferred to Bryan for president because one of the president's duties is to make treaties with foreign powers. So! Mr. Taft is to imitate the big boss and make the treaties—yet, even Roosevelt does it by deputy, and there are as able men and thorough gentlemen in the Democrat party as in the Republican. Perhaps he meant that Bryan would go back to the old way and only make treaties "by and with the consent of the senate" as the constitution requires, instead of setting himself above the laws as Teddy the terror does and making secret agreements (note the German agreement) without allowing congress or the people to know the particulars. If that is his idea he is probably correct. I believe Bryan will revere his oath of office, and having sworn to uphold the constitution and enforce the laws will do his level best to keep his oath. Sure am I that if a Democratic president dared to threaten a Democratic congress to veto a law if they passed it and if they passed it over his veto, to refuse to enforce it, that they would call his bluff at once by passing the bill he objected to; and if he really did refuse to enforce it, they would impeach and turn him out of office, as they would have a right to do.

Congress is supreme, not the president. A little knowledge of the constitution would be good for Roosevelt and all his admirers. The emperor of Germany would not dare act as Roosevelt has in interfering with the legislative and judicial departments. Henry Watterson is right. The great issue before the people is whether they will continue to change their rulers at will or submit to be bossed by one man and a very ordinary man at that. Hundreds of legally elected delegates were kicked out of the Chicago convention and their places taken by creatures of Roosevelt, and I believe every patriotic Republican should vote this year for Bryan and down the big boss. Thousands of Democrats rallied to the support of the Union in 1861 now let the Republicans prove equally patriotic.

MRS. PATRICIA ROBISON.

Cannon's Sun Slowly Setting.

From Collier's Weekly.

When Mr. Cannon accused Mr. Bryan of being worth a million, he may not have expected Mr. Bryan's retort. At any rate, Mr. Cannon has not explained how much he has or where he got it. He is not dishonest—his morality is simply out of date. He is too great an obstacle to be endured. It is very possible that, on account of the probability that Danville will reelect him, the Democrats may win the house. The Republicans in the Fifty-ninth congress had a majority of 114. The election two years ago cut that majority exactly in half, down to 57, the defeated including such old Republican wheel horses as Babcock of Wisconsin, McCleary of Minnesota, Lacey of Iowa, and Wadsworth of New York. In the coming election a change of 29 districts from Republican to Democratic would give the house to the Democrats—and would effect the certain overthrow of Cannon. Already some men have been eliminated by being beaten for renomination, because of their subservience to the machine; such as Jenkins in Wisconsin. There are at least 34 districts where the change of less than a thousand votes—in some cases less than 100—would turn the district from Republican to Democratic, would elect a congressman whose vote would be for another speaker than Cannon. Some Republican congressmen who hold their seats by small majorities are better men than the Democrats who have been nominated against them, and ought to be reelected. But there are a good many more than 34 districts where the Republican is a satellite of the Cannon machine and where the Democratic candidate is an honest man, with the one towering virtue that he would not vote for Cannon.

One of Foraker's Tricks

The following story is told by the Louisville Post (Rep.). It should be added to the concluding paragraph, however, that, knowing all about Foraker, Taft did make up with him and sought his support only a few days before the Hearst exposure:

When a candidate for governor against James E. Campbell, Mr. Foraker sprang a sensation at the close of his campaign, which he believed to be decisive.

It was far less serious than the accusation of Mr. Hearst against Mr. Foraker, for it related to but one transaction.

The document he read undertook to show that Campbell, as a member of congress, had favored a bill requiring the purchase of certain patented articles in which he was intrested.

The paper involved Republicans as well as Democrats, but with that sense of fairness characteristic of Senator Foraker he suppressed the names of the Republicans and read only the names of Campbell and his Democratic associates.

At once the document was denounced as a forgery. An examination revealed the names of Congressman Butterworth and Senator Sherman, and they made a like indignant denial.

The paper was shown to be a clumsy forgery, which would have deceived no man who did not want to be deceived. Sherman and Butterworth were especially offended that a Republican candidate for governor would use a document impeaching their integrity before giving them an opportunity to be heard.

The move failed. Men in each party denounced Foraker, and Campbell was elected by a decisive majority.

No wonder Mr. Taft said he would make no compromise with Foraker, even for a nomination.

Claptrap and Buncombe.

From the Medford Tribune.

What an utter contempt for public intelligence a campaign speaker develops! The blackest of lies are blandly uttered as precious pearls of truth and the virtues and benefits of the world are unblushingly held forth the creation of a political party, an organization of office seekers and holders, financed by business grafters.

Judge Taft tells Kansans that in 1896 corn was 18 cents a bushel and now it is 44 cents, a difference, he claims, due solely to Republican administration. The veriest claptrap. He might as well say that because apples were $4 last year and $1.50 this year Republicans were also to blame. Prices for such commodities are fixed by the laws of supply and demand, by crop conditions and economic factors.

Senator Beveridge tells Medford that the tariff is making this country prosperous and making the fruit-grower rich. All of which is buncombe, and no one knows it better than the Indiana politician. The tariff does not help the farmer or the fruitgrower in a single instance, though it forces him to pay higher prices for everything he consumes or uses than the foreign farmer or fruitgrower, with whom he must compete in the world's markets, pays for the same article made by the same people.

The sole beneficiaries of the tariff are the "infant industries," now grown into trusts and monopolies through special beneficiary legislation called the tariff, which forces the American public to pay exorbitant rates to the end that a few multi-millionaires may be created for lives of idleness. The same monopolies undersell foreigners in the world's markets, but, being protected at home, rob the people.

The Difference in Cows.

From the Fossil Journal.

Harry Reed's Jersey cow, a valuable animal, died Sunday from floating as the result of eating more alfalfa hay than was good for her. Not long ago Mr. Reed lost a fine Jersey heifer, and the Journal Jersey also succumbed to an altogether too generous dose of mill feed and wheat, so it will be seen that the Jersey rate of mortality has been far above the average lately. As showing that the Jersey is not as tough an animal as the kind we raise here on our bunchgrass hills, we cite the case of the common red scrub cow that is now being milked by the Journal family. This old heifer found her way from the barn lot into the garden one evening about a week ago, and 12 hours afterwards was found there serenely chewing her cud, with a smile of sweet content on her sonsy face and about 500 pounds of roasting ears, carrots, cabbage, onions and wet clover reposing harmlessly in her capacious interior. Her sides stuck out to such an amazing extent that she was about a foot taller when lying down than when standing up, the only other noticeable result of her all-night picnic being an increased yield of variegated flavored milk.

Where the Apple Came From.

E. P. Powell in The Outing Magazine.

There are two varieties of apples found wild in Europe, but the region adjacent to the Caspian sea seems to have been the origin of the apple as known in the east. Charred pieces of apples are found in the heaps of refuse left by the Lake Dwellers, who occupied portions of Europe before any of the present races. These people lived on platforms, laid over piles driven into the water—probably to protect themselves from animals, in an era before metal weapons were known. These specimens of apples are generally carbonized by heat, but they show perfectly the internal structure of the fruit.

There are five types of native American apples, all of them crabs. John Smith wrote from Virginia that he had found "some new crabapples, but they were small and bitter." New Englanders made the same report. The Soulard has the reputation of being the largest and best of these natives. Sports of this variety, like the Matthews, are improved in size and quality. Selections might probably be made from western thickets, of even better sorts than are now known. I believe the blood of the wild crab is in some of our best orchard apples.

Thomas F. Ryan's Birthday.

Thomas F. Ryan, financier and street railway magnate, was born in Nelson county, Va., on October 17, 1851, and there received a limited education. In 1868 he went to Baltimore to seek his fortune and obtained a position in a dry goods commission house. After a short time he found a position in a bank and after two years he went to New York, where he formed a partnership with a stock broker. He prospered so well that in 1874 he was able to buy a seat on the stock exchange. In 1886 Mr. Ryan, together with William C. Whitney, began the undertaking of purchasing and consolidating the various surface street railway lines of New York and since then he has been conspicuous as a developer of street railway and lighting systems and as a promoter of steam railroads and various industrial enterprises. He was the original promoter of the Metropolitan street railway and organized the Consolidated Traction company of New Jersey. He was a prominent member of the syndicate which organized the Chicago Union Traction company. Mr. Ryan is also extensively interested in the Seaboard & Roanoke railroad and various other southern railroads. He was married in 1873 and has five sons.

This Date in History.

1781—Richard M. Johnson, ninth vice-president of the United States, was born in Bryant's Station, Ky. Died in Frankfort, Ky., November 19, 1850.

1849—Frederic Francois Chopin, the composer, died. Born March 1, 1809.

1854—The bombardment of Sevastopol began.

1860—The prince of Wales visited Boston.

1866—The Oregon legislature withdrew its assent to the fourteenth constitutional amendment.

1893—Marshal MacMahon, ex-president of the French republic, died. Born July 13, 1808.

1896—The dispute over the Catholic schools in Manitoba was settled by compromise.

1906—The W. C. T. U.'s world congress assembled in Boston.