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-2244; East 839.

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

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 112 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 2, 1908.**

No man doth safely rule, but he that hath learned gladly to obey.—Thomas A. Kempis.

AN ANALOGOUS CASE

IN 1882 President Arthur, an expert politician of New York, attempted to boss the politics of that state, and forced the nomination by the Republicans of Secretary of the Treasury Folger for governor. The people resented this interference by a president, and Folger, though an able, worthy and popular man, was beaten by Grover Cleveland by over 190,000 majority. It was thus that the people of that state gave warning to presidents to keep their hands off state elections.

President Roosevelt's unprecedented and belligerent activity in behalf of Taft is not an exactly parallel case, but it is one closely analogous. He was not willing to leave the nomination to the Republican party, himself remaining neutral, or doing no more than to indicate his preference, and now his candidate, having been nominated at his command, as Folger was at Arthur's orders in 1882, he insists with almost the tone of a dictator that his nominee must be elected, whether a majority of the people want him or not.

New York is a doubtful state, partly on this account. Not only did the people of that state reject Folger in 1882, but a few years ago when Governor Odell made himself the boss, the absolute dictator of his party in the state, his reign did not last long; the rank and file turned against him. So they would have long ago repudiated Platt and Depew if senators had been elected directly by the people instead of by legislatures.

Of whom is Roosevelt president—only Republicans or the whole people? About half the people, probably more, do not desire Taft for president; what right then has the president, the servant, in a sense, as he claims, the ruler of all, to dictate to them how they shall vote? It will not be strange if many voters throughout the country should resent this dictation, even as the New Yorkers resented that of President Arthur.

WE MAY LEARN FROM CANADA.

THEY DO some things in Canada better than we do. One is the administration of justice in the courts, especially in criminal cases. Another is in the conservation of dominion resources. There railroads and other corporations have not been permitted to obtain possession of great areas of valuable timber lands and other public lands for little or nothing, nor of water power rights that will become very valuable.

And in the matter of elections they seem to act more sanely and sensibly than we do. It is only a little over a month since Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Canadian premier, dissolved the parliament and announced that new elections would be held on October 26, Monday. Within a week the new government, or the present one retained in office, will be established, and the whole business of the dominion election will thus have been transacted within six weeks, while we have been agonizing over our quadrennial election for months past.

In fact, the worry and strain of the contest began nearly a year ago. For months the country was stirred up over nominations and platforms. Four months ago nominations were made and over a week hence the election will take place. Then we will wait until March 4 before the new president is inaugurated, and for awhile after the country will be on the qui vive about the cabinet, and for many months thereafter political circles will be all stirred up over appointments to federal offices.

Meanwhile, next winter, and perhaps next spring if an extra session is called, congress will be playing politics and "monkeying" with a view to gain partisan advantage or to sustain or embarrass the president, not according as he is right or wrong, but according to his partisan views, and his attitude with reference to those of the majority in congress.

Much of all this quadrennial program is mere politics, is foolish and needless. We cannot and should not imitate the Canadians altogether, but we may well take a few pointers from them. We would do well to have our nominations on the one hand, and the inauguration on the other, closer to the elections. Then—though there is perhaps no use in making the suggestion—our public men should pay much less attention to party advantage and success and more to the service of the whole people.

A PLAIN REPUBLICAN CLAIM

VICE-PRESIDENT FAIRBANKS made a speech in New Jersey recently in which he very naively and candidly stated the Republican position. "Republican policies," he said, "brought prosperity to the country, and the abuse of this prosperity brought panic." This much we are used to, but Mr. Fairbanks went on to say:

"The Republican party accepts the responsibility for the creation of prosperous conditions; it cannot be charged with accountability for the abuse of prosperity."

This will be pleasing and encouraging to the organs. Having such high authority, they can declare more boldly and emphatically than ever that whatever of good has happened or been wrought in the country is due to the Republican party, but for whatever of evil the country has suffered under Republican administration that party is not responsible in the least.

The party—nothing else—brought prosperity. Under that same party's rule a great panic came, but with that, or its causes, the party had nothing whatever to do. This is the way to talk; claim everything, and admit nothing. The party that produced the sunshine had nothing to do with bringing on the storm. All that is necessary to carry the country by this kind of argument is to make enough people believe it.

Awhile ago the president butted in to the state campaign in Connecticut, by writing a letter to Representative Lilley, Republican candidate for governor, fulsomely indorsing him and hoping for his election. The letter was of course intended for Lilley's use in the campaign, and was so used, but now the president, or some one on his behalf, says his letter, as published by Lilley, was "garbled," was not just what Roosevelt wrote. Perhaps the fact is that it does not read and sound quite so well in cold print as it seemed to hot off the impulsive presidential pen. Lilley, partly in consequence of this interference will probably be beaten. Even the Connecticut worm will turn when a president attempts to dictate who shall be elected governor.

In a murder trial in British Columbia a young girl had identified a certain negro as a murderer, she being the only eye-witness of the crime. But to test her, another and quite different negro was brought into court, and she identified him with equal positiveness as the murderer. No doubt many negroes have been lynched, and some legally executed, on no better identification than this.

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

WHITHER are we drifting? Is not the portent of passing events sufficient to give men pause? Was it not enough when the revelations by Hearst showed that Standard Oil had paid Senator Foraker $50,000 to kill in the United States senate, bills objectionable to that corporation. If one vote was purchasable, others are, and if Standard Oil spent $50,000 for one man, must it not, in order to make that money good, have spent other great sums to make death to objectionable legislation sure? What does it mean when a corporation that has earned nearly a billion dollars of profits in 10 years, is buying the congress of the United States?

What does it mean, when this corruption does not end with congress? What is the awful significance when new exposures show that the courts, the very heart of the republic, are tainted if not rotten from the corrupting hand of Standard Oil? A letter from John D. Archbold to the governor of Pennsylvania said:

"My Dear Governor: I am sure you will pardon seeming presumption on my part in writing you on a subject in which both personally and on behalf of my company I am greatly interested. It is to urge the appointment, if at all consistent, of Judge Morrison of McKeen to the supreme bench vice Mitchell, deceased. Judge Morrison's character for ability and integrity needs no word at my hands, but aside from these considerations, his familiarity with all that pertains to the great industries of oil and gas and the important relation they bear to the interests of the western part of the state, make him especially desirable as a member of the court from that section."

Judge Morrison was appointed, and in answer to a response to a similar letter, Judge Elkins was appointed to the judiciary by Governor Stone of Pennsylvania at the request of John D. Archbold, champion corrupter of the age. Fifteen thousand dollars, the tell-tale letters disclose was sent by Standard Oil to an Heslanized attorney-general of one of the greatest states in the union. Corrupting of congress, corrupting of the courts, corrupting of governors are momentous disclosures of the hour. There is no denial—it is all true, terribly, hideously true. Add to it, the contributions of $100,000 to the Roosevelt campaign fund of 1904, and add to it the dismal fact that there is a cry if a candidate opposed to Standard Oil is elected there will be hard times, and the question for men to consider frankly with themselves is, whither are we drifting? Are the people the republic, or is Standard Oil the republic? Do the people rule, or does Standard Oil rule? Is it true, or is it false, that in order to avert hard times the candidate to be elected November 3 must be acceptable to Standard Oil?

THE WORKINGMAN AND HIS COUNTRY

A PORTLAND workingman writes The Journal as follows:

Looking at the political situation from the viewpoint of a non-partisan, and having read the papers of the two leading political parties of the country, I am still somewhat at a loss where to place that decisive cross mark on the ballot on November 3.

If a capitalist I should be able to decide quickly, but having to work for a living the question arises with me whether I had better support the party claiming to be powerful enough to insure good and prosperous times, or if I had better support the party which claims particularly to back up the workingman's interest, and that the question of good and hard times cannot be regulated by a political party.

It is a serious question to decide. I see plainly that I must use my own judgment and choose the side that will support my interests to the greatest extent. Party No. 1 says: "Be for us and we will insure prosperous times; but if you oppose us we will manage the commercial interests of this country in such a manner that you will be unable to secure work and make a decent living."

Party No. 2 assures me that No. 1 has not the power to regulate the welfare or calamities of the people of these United States at will, and that if I will assist to place their candidates at the head of the government, laws will be made and the country governed in such a way that I particularly will be benefitted.

Summing it up I find then that in casting my vote with party No. 1 I supplicate, and in voting with No. 2 I demand. Which would be the proper course to take?

It is the estimate of the New York World that 1,400,000 men are now out of work in this country. An article in the Oregonian March 22, 1908, stated that a million men were then out of work, and during the April, May and June that followed the estimate ran up to 2,000,000 unemployed. During three months last year every bank in the country temporarily suspended, and if you had a deposit of any amount in them, you couldn't get it out. Instead of using money, the whole country did business chiefly on clearing house certificates, backed by products produced by the labor of workingmen.

In that crisis, was it on the capitalist, or upon you and the labor of men like you that the country depended for the means of exchange. Did not the things produced by labor in that hour of distress, supply life-blood to the business exchange and rescue the country from stagnation? Was it then that these capitalists, these trusts, or was it you workingmen who in the final crisis were the pillars of business and the bulwark against commercial paralysis? Is it John Rockefeller who clips coupons from his Standard Oil stock, from his railroad stock, from his bank stock, or is it you men who create the wealth, you men whose labor makes these coupons possible, who deliver the country in its need, who make its prosperity, and who from every viewpoint are the nation's bulwark?

Is it the wealth-eater like Rockefeller, or the wealth-maker like you and your fellow workingmen that is a first essential to the republic and to the prosperity, to the weal or woe of its millions.

Finally, is the boast of party Number 1, as you call it, that it is "necessary to prosperity" to be trusted? Did it make that boast good last year, when for three months every bank in the country would not pay off deposits? Has it made good that boast now with 1,400,000 workingmen out of employment, with 1,400,000 homes in poverty or on the swift road to poverty? To these 1,400,000 idle men in 1,400,000 homes where furniture is being pawned and sold for bread, has that prosperity boast been made good? Did that party not have the president, did it not have congress, did it not have all the machinery of government in its hands, and with all that, was not its prosperity boast, its vaunted full dinner pail, a hollow, empty and sounding mockery?

It is the sunshine, it is the soil, the rains, the seasons, the minerals in the earth and the labor of you workingmen, with just laws made by just men that makes prosperity. The trusts do not make it. They exploit your labor and make themselves.

Small Change

Smash the calamity howler.

* *

Let us have peace and prosperity.

* *

Only a week more of campaigning.

* *

Right after election, build good roads.

* *

The average straw vote is of little value.

* *

But why beat Uncle Joe and not the rest?

* *

Stand by the men who are building up Oregon.

* *

Hurrah for Japan; she's all right—at home.

* *

In a week the agony will be over—thanks be.

* *

New York, as usual, is the great final battle ground.

* *

That 19,200 may dwindle to 1,920, or even to 192.

* *

Oregon people should patronize Oregon industries.

* *

A vote for Debs or Hisgen is in effect a vote for Taft.

* *

Mr. Taft has nothing to say about the trusts these days.

* *

The straw vote will soon follow the straw hat into winter retirement.

* *

Just as good things are made in Oregon as anywhere; buy no others.

* *

The man who says there will be hard times if the people elect Bryan is as bad as an anarchist.

* *

Miss Elkins at least isn't butting into view as conspicuously as Anna Gould Castellane did.

* *

Think of a man losing an election bet and having to pay his monthly bills at the same time.

* *

Nobody will pay much attention to the Balkan imbroglio until the Abruzzi marriage question is settled.

* *

Anybody with a piece of paper and a pencil can carry enough states for either candidate to win in five minutes.

* *

The Kansas Watchman, a leading and influential negroes' paper, published at Topeka, Kan., is supporting Bryan vigorously.

* *

All the east and middle west have been suffering from one of the most prolonged drouths ever known. Moral: Come to Oregon.

* *

The Oregonian intimates that its 13,200 may drop to 10,000 or 5,000 or even 1,000, and that it will be glad to get even that much.

* *

Intimidation of workingmen with families, to coerce them into voting in the interest of the trusts and predatory combines, is meaner and more reprehensible than buying votes outright with cash.

* *

Perhaps Mr. Bryan remembers the words of the Bellman in the Hunting of the Snark:

* * * I have mentioned it twice:
That alone should encourage the crew.
Just the place for a snark—I have mentioned it thrice;
What I tell you three times is true.

Oregon Sidelights

Two cement warehouses will be built in Eugene.

* *

Some days ago snow was sixteen inches deep at Crater lake.

* *

A free employment bureau has been established at The Dalles.

* *

J. D. Carrol of Union is 90 years old, but is as spry as a man of 60.

* *

There are 121 pupils in the Hubbard school, and another teacher is needed.

* *

Within four days seventy-three carloads of cattle were shipped out of Dorris.

* *

Weston brick are used all the way from the Yakima valley to southern Idaho.

* *

A Eugene baby weighed 16 pounds at birth. What will Booster Hartog think of next?

* *

An Alsea man has killed twelve bears so far this year, and expects to get several more.

* *

More cement walks have been laid in The Dalles this year than ever before altogether.

* *

A man near Condon sold a quarter section of land for $6,000 that he bought seven years ago for $400.

* *

It is estimated that there were 40,000 gallons of huckleberries picked this season at Huckleberry mountain, near Crater lake park.

* *

Central Point people are eating strawberries quite regularly these October days, the gardens of A. C. Chittenden supplying a good output for the local market, says the Herald.

* *

The Swedish-Finn society of Astoria held a basket auction Saturday night for the purpose of raising money to assist a young man to return to his native home in Finland. He is sick with lung trouble, and his physician fears that he cannot live long. The sum of $106.50 was raised which will be turned over to him, a sum probably sufficient to carry him to Finland.

* *

Corvallis Times: Benton county may not raise the finest fruit grown on the globe but it does well enough to brag about—fully as well as nine out of 10 communities now spreading their literature broadcast over the land. Benton county fruit lacks the reputation of Hood River fruit, but the best from each section placed together would prove so markedly similar in size and color that the Hood River man couldn't pick his own fruit from the pile.

* *

The citizens of Scio are rapidly securing the reputation of people who do things, says the News. They own their own light plant and waterworks, and two weeks ago the proposition was made to build a condensery in Scio. The question was canvassed for a few days, when a dozen business men decided to build a condensery and the capital stock was subscribed. The News predicts that the condensing plant will prove insufficient to take care of the milk offered, and that within two years the plant will have to be greatly enlarged.

* *

Levi Welty writes to the Hubbard News: Last Monday morning a few of us who profess religion met on the street. Their conversation at first, I am glad to say, started on religious subjects. God's people love to talk of things in the Bible. But unfortunately the conversation ended in a heated argument. I wish to say to those who listened, that though I was not one of the main men in the controversy, I am ashamed that I took any part in it, and I hope and trust, the Lord helping me, that I may never again be guilty of taking part in a debate of religion or the Bible on the street of any town. There are many people who are not acquainted with the Bible or the Lord.

JAMES S. SHERMAN TACITLY ENDORSES SAVAGE DENUNCIATION OF UNION LABOR

While William H. Taft is traveling about Ohio and elsewhere making frantic appeals for the support of laboring men, his running mate on the Republican ticket, James S. Sherman, is giving his indorsement to the statement that "labor unions are composed largely of anarchists, socialists and demagogues." Mr. Sherman heard the organized wage-worker of the country thus denounced by a trust magnate who presided at a meeting where he spoke, and gave approval of the sentiment expressed. When Mr. Sherman appeared recently at Akron, Ohio, the meeting which he addressed was presided over by O. C. Barber, president of the Diamond Match company. Mr. Barber introduced Mr. Sherman to the audience. In doing so he made use of the following language, as stenographically reported.

"In our plant at Barberton, 850 employes are today producing as many matches as 5,000 men did in 36 factories a score of years ago when the corporation was formed. * * * Each succeeding year in the history of the organization, more money has been made. Although the cost of raw material and labor has been increased, labor-saving devices and increased demands have made the earnings of the corporation greater * * * Today our Barberton plant produces 60 per cent more matches than all the factories combined at the time of the combination.

"One of the main reasons for the success of the Diamond Match company is that its directors have never tolerated union labor in its shop. They have always been open. We have had no one to dictate to us what wages we shall pay, what men we shall hire, and what hours our employes shall work. Labor unions today are composed largely of anarchists, socialists and demagogues. * * *

"It is not the monopolies that stand against the advancement of the country; they are the public benefactors. They are responsible for the advancement of wages. We hear much about the classes and the masses. The greatest number of organized laborers Samuel Gompers ever had under him was 2,000,000 men. This is a country of 80,000,000 of people. The union men are, therefore, the classes, and the remainder are the masses. And it is these classes that are the real tyrants of the country * * * They resort to violence to gain their end. And they cling to violent principles."

This was the speech of Mr. Barber, president of the match trust, in introducing the Republican candidate for vice-president. Mr. Sherman sat beside the trust magnate and listened attentively to his denunciation of organized labor and his laudation of combinations and the open shop. He heard union men characterized as anarchists, socialists and demagogues. He heard union men called tyrants, and monopolies termed benefactors. He sat by and gave his approval to these sentiments. When he arose to speak he uttered not a single word in protest against the slanderous statements of the mighty trust magnate. By his silence upon the subject he gave full approval to what Mr. Barber said. At the same time, Mr. Taft was traveling about the country appealing to union labor to support the Republican ticket.

Bank Guaranty Plan Emphatically Endorsed by Lyman J. Gage, Ex-Secretary of the Treasury

The proposition to guarantee bank deposits which is advocated in the Democratic platform is not without support from eminent Republican authority.

Reference to the hearings which were had in congress last winter before the house committee on banking and currency shows that the plan of guaranteeing bank deposits was cordially indorsed by so high a Republican financier as the Hon. Lyman J. Gage, ex-secretary of the treasury, and by Professor Joseph French Johnson, dean of the New York university school of commerce.

The committee had under consideration the Fowler currency bill, one provision of which was for a guaranty of bank deposits. Discussing the subject, Mr. Gage, according to the official report of the hearing, said: "The stumbling-block in the bill to most everybody, at first blush, is the guarantee of deposits. It stumbled me. I fell right down over that. I said, 'Never, never; no, that won't do.' But if I reflected on this, I studied this bill and I am persuaded that it is just, equitable, wise and right that the creditors of the banks which come under the provisions of this bill should have their deposits guaranteed to them, as will be the banks circulating notes held by the general public. There is no difference in principle."

At another hearing on the same bill Professor Johnson said: "At first I balked at the guaranteeing of deposits. That seemed to me too much like praying to the Lord that he would let us drink all the champagne we want and give some other fellow the headache. But when I considered the nature of the guarantee * * * I was won over to what seemed at first an unscientific and dangerous proposition. If one of the district committee provided for in this bill discovers that any bank is transgressing the laws of sound banking, the committee will have power to compel a conservative policy. The Canadian banks possess similar power at this time. * * * Canadian banks are tied together by a common guaranty fund for the protection of noteholders. * * * I regard it a most excellent feature of the Fowler bill that it will compel the bankers of the United States to keep a sharp eye upon one another. I do not believe the guaranteeing of bank deposits would result in bad banking, or that anybody would deposit in 'any old national bank.' People would select their banks as they do now * * * I am inclined to think there would be less unsound banking than there is now."

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

What the Banks Will Do.

Portland, Oct. 24.—To the Editor of The Journal—Let us imagine that the Bryan deposit guarantee became a law. What then would happen? The great city banks of Portland would be guaranteeing the deposits of the bank of Bust & Skip. Surely, and what of it? What would the great city banks and the properly conducted other banks do to protect their interests? It is not at all all difficult to imagine that the presidents of the Portland national banks would talk the matter over. The conversation would run like this:

Mr. A.—Well, what are we to do about it? I'm hanged if I want to guarantee the deposits of the Title Grab & Bust and others like them.

Mr. B.—Nor me.

Mr. C.—Let's call a meeting of all the able bankers we know and talk it over.

Responsive to the pertinent suggestion of Mr. C., the first meeting of the Oregon Bankers' association would pass the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this association will admit to membership only those bankers who submit their books for the examination of this association, and only then when the examination shows them to be conducting business on sound banking principles.

"Resolved, That an examiner be appointed by the association to make periodical examination of all banks in membership or applying for membership."

Then, at a later meeting, it requires no great effort of the mind to conceive of the minutes of the association containing the following items:

"The National Grab & Bust bank was refused membership, and the reason of such refusal referred to the United States treasury department.

"The application of the Bank of Leave-a-Little-Only was refused, and the reason for such refusal ordered referred to the state board of bank examiners."

Does anyone suppose that the National Grab & Trust bank or the State Bank of Leave-a-Little-Only could do business without membership in the association? You wouldn't deposit in them, nor would I.

Does anyone suppose that these banks could retain their charters if the association's examination should show them to be unsound?

Does anyone suppose the examination would not be close and rigid? Self-interest would prompt an examination minute and detailed to the last degree. B.

Reform Measures in Danger.

Sumpter, Or., Oct. 23.—To the Editor of The Journal—There is a deep-laid and cunningly-devised scheme among the machine politicians of Oregon, to carry the state for Taft by frantically appealing to party loyalty of Republican voters, and after they have accomplished the endorsement of Taft at the polls, they intend to construe it as an endorsement of the old machine, and by that prestige so gained, and the powerful influence of the Portland Oregonian, this power will be exerted on the next legislature for the purpose of repealing and nullifying all the reform legislation now on our statute books in relation to the choice and election of our public officials.

The endorsement of Taft at the polls in November by the voters, means the destruction of all our primary election laws.

It means the choice and election of our United States senators by the corrupting influence of the trusts and predatory corporations, instead of by the people.

It means a holdup legislature in the interest of the machine element, and a return to the corrupt methods of a few years back.

The people of Oregon have gained a reputation abroad, of which they may well feel proud, in what has been accomplished in the shape of laws that have purified and supplanted the corrupt practices that prevailed a few years back, so that now our election laws as they stand have become a model that other states are gladly following, and Oregon has become the leader in advance reform legislation. Our reform election laws have attracted thousands to come here and bring with them millions of capital to invest among us, and the reform forces in the Republican party can well feel a pride in what they have accomplished along these lines.

Surely these reform forces will not allow themselves to be led by blind partisanship and pretended party loyalty by voting for Mr. Taft for the sole and only purpose of again enthroning the machine element in the affairs of our state, for I think they will do the only proper thing by casting their votes in favor of the presidential candidate who every American citizen can feel proud of, and that is William J. Bryan, the next president of these United States. GEO. E. ALLEN.

Relief in Bryan's Success.

Portland, Oct. 24.—To the Editor of The Journal—We, the common people, are occasionally allowed to gaze for a moment into the mysteries of lawmaking, as in the case of Hon. J. B. Foraker, and we are constantly ever and anon reminded that we should "obey the laws," many of them as unjust as can be imagined; for instance, the taxing of all the people to maintain colleges, while many thousands of those from whom the money is extorted could never expect any benefit. Their children are reared in a community where a few months' school only can be maintained, and are placed at a disadvantage, but it is the law. The tax-gatherer and the beneficiaries say, "Let the good work go on."

But what of the toiling masses, who have not the time, opportunity nor the ability, under existing conditions, to protect themselves. As well expect the trusts to advocate real relief from a monstrous duty as to think of those who, with unsolled hands, absorbed the public money, saying enough. Every year brings forth thousands more. As we are used to panics, would it not be well to elect Mr. Bryan president and check up our accounts and see whether we are not like some of the unprotected banks and determine about how much more the (m)asses can stand and still be reliable as a resource?

Taxation without representation has gone, along with "the greatest amount of good, to the greatest number of people." The answer to the question of whether the people at large or the trusts and combines have absorbed the most of the public domain and the supplies, such as coal oil, iron, steel, etc., during the Republican administration would be of interest at this time. INQUIRER.

No More "Moral Obligations."

From the New York World.

What would Quay or Brice, Whitney or Hanna have thought of a national committee that made public its campaign contributions either before or after election? The old regime has passed. There is a new order of things.

No Matthew Stanley Quay will again fry the fat out of the protected industries in order to control a presidential election by buying votes in blocks of five.

No Calvin S. Brice or William C. Whitney will again put the Democratic party up at auction in Wall street.

No Mark Hanna will again bleed the banks and corporations for a $5,000,000 corruption fund to "save the national honor."

No president of the United States will agin have occasion to appoint his chief corporation inquisitor chief collector of campaign tribute.

No president of the United States will again send an Edward H. Harriman away from the White House to raise a campaign fund of $260,000 that turns "50,000 votes in New York."

Quayism, Bricelsm, Whitneyism, Hannaism, Cortelyouism are all done for.

This Date in History.

1774—The first American congress, having finished its deliberations, adjourned.

1800—Count von Moltke, celebrated German soldier, born. Died April 24, 1891.

1803—John Penn, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence from North Carolina, died.

1807—Russia declared war against Great Britain.

1825—Final completion of the Erie canal celebrated at Albany.

1850—The Northwest passage discovered by Captain McClure of the Investigator.

1899—Boers bombarded Matcking.

1902—Elizabeth Cady Stanton, famous woman suffrage leader, died in New York city. Born in Johnstown, N. Y., November 12, 1815.

1908—President Roosevelt sent Secretary Metcalf to San Francisco to investigate the anti-Japanese sentiment on the Pacific coast.

The REALM FEMININE

Buy a Tag!

ALL friends of the Baby Home, as well as those new comers among us who are not acquainted with the representative men and women who stand behind it and its splendid history for 20 years, are expected to show their loyalty by purchasing one or more tags at 10 cents each on tag day, October 31.

An efficient corps of helpers, among whom are 200 Portland matrons, each with her younger assistants, will be stationed at all points where people congregate, to sell the tags—and there will be tags enough for all.

Nobody can refuse to buy at least one tag for so worthy a cause, and many will go about with from 20 to 100 tags pinned on their coats, to show their interest in the cause, and to help advertise the plan. A tag day was recently held in Seattle when thousands of dollars were raised for two. Los Angeles had a tag day and the sum raised was $6,000. Omaha had a tag day and raised $7,000. Memphis had a tag day and raised $15,000.

And this not by big individual gifts but by the hearty cooperation of the whole public. Cash girls, teamsters, street car men, school teachers, men, women and children all entered into the spirit of the day and bought tags to help the good cause.

Portland has been accused of a lack of civic pride. It has been a common reproach that we do not pull together, that we lack that hearty unity which makes for harmony in public matters. Now here is a good chance to disprove such an assertion. If the whole city enters into the spirit of the day, makes it a gala occasion and lets the whirlwind of giving sweep away sectarianism and selfishness, the result will be stupendous, and the charge of coldness will be effectively disposed of.

The Baby Home is not an encourager of irresponsible motherhood. Such a notion belongs to the dark ages. All intelligent people know that there are many cases in which only such an institution can be called upon. A father dies, for instance, and leaves a mother with a family of small children to support. In order to do her duty toward them, she must place the youngest where they will be properly cared for while she is at work. The Baby Home is the place. Here she may pay a small sum monthly for its support and know that her child is receiving far better care than she could give it, hampered as she is by her work.

Or it is perhaps a mother who dies, leaving a father with a family of dependent children. Warm as his heart may be, and willing as may be his hands, he cannot give the baby the care that a good and sensible woman could. Here again the Baby Home comes to the rescue.

And sometimes accident or illness deprives the baby of both parents. Then again the Baby Home is called upon. If there is no money to pay for the child's support, it is given tender care, just the same. No little one is turned away.

And, of course, there are some poor little people born into a cold world who find no home awaiting them, neither father's protection, nor mother's love. What an irony that the poor, little, helpless thing should also be burdened with a stigma of sin. To every generous heart these helpless little people appeal strongly.

And yet some of our great men have been waifs. When we applaud the name of Henry M. Stanley, the African explorer, do we remember that he was a forlorn little waif, nameless and neglected, whom a good man gave a home and a name? It is no experiment in this city to care for such little helpless people through charity. The Baby Home has been in existence for 20 years and during that time it has seen its work grow and its purposes demonstrated as its wards have grown up to be useful and honorable citizens.

We can easily remember when the tract in which the Baby Home is located was away out in the country. That the city would overtake it and surround it with modern beautiful homes did not then seem probable. This has come about, however; the streets have been graded, cement sidewalks laid and the city has grown up around the institution. And all of this is right and desirable, of course—only it costs much money. Over $3,000 is taxed up against the home for street improvements. And this the friends of the Baby Home who know its history and feel its worth are asked to assist in paying on tag day.

It can be done, but only by the cooperation and hearty good will of everybody. And so be prepared to buy tags; as many tags as you can, but at least one tag, which will cost 10 cents, for the good of the cause and to demonstrate the larger spirit of civic unity which belongs to a larger Portland.

The Daily Menu.

BREAKFAST.

Cereal with cream. Hot fried apples.
Sausage. Whole wheat gems.
Coffee.

LUNCHEON.

Sweetbreads with mushrooms.
Celery salad. Boston brown bread.
Cranberry sauce. Gingersnaps.
Tea.

DINNER.

Lemon and egg soup.
Broiled flank steak.
Creamed cauliflower.
Baked stuffed tomatoes.
Lettuce with French dressing.
Cheese wafers. Pumpkin pie.
Coffee.

Popular puffs—One cake yeast, quarter cup lukewarm water, half cup lukewarm milk, one pint sifted flour, whites three eggs, half cup butter, one tablespoon granulated sugar, quarter teaspoon salt. Sift flour and salt into bowl, add to it the yeast that has previously been dissolved in the lukewarm water, then add the milk to make a soft batter. Set aside to use. When light, which will be in about one hour, add to it the whites of eggs beaten to a stiff froth and the sugar and butter thoroughly creamed. Beat thoroughly and pour into well-buttered patty pans. Let rise again for 10 minutes and bake in a hot oven for 20 minutes. This makes one dozen most excellent puffs. Takes about two hours in all.

Edward Harrigan's Birthday.

Edward Harrigan, the veteran actor and playwright, was born in New York city, October 26, 1845, and received his education in the public schools in that city. Early in life he adopted a stage career and before he was 25 years old he had won considerable fame as a variety actor. For a number of years in his early career he was a favorite performer at the New York playhouse managed by the late "Tony" Pastor. After leaving Pastor's Mr. Harrigan toured the country for several seasons and then he entered upon his career as an actor-manager in the metropolis. For nearly 15 years he remained in New York, during which time he managed several theatres and appeared in a number of plays that met with great public favor. In 1890 Mr. Harrigan retired from the stage, but in 1905 he was again induced to appear in "Old Lavender," and since then he has been seen in several other productions. He is the author of a number of plays which were very successful 15 or 20 years ago.

Honest and Able.

From the Pendleton East Oregonian (Ind. Rep.).

If Judge Lowell said last night that William J. Bryan is dishonest and without any fixed principles upon any subject, he made a statement unworthy himself. The big men of the Republican party now know and they openly state that Bryan is thoroughly honest and that he is a man of matchless personal ability. If he were not such, he could not have the splendid following that is his, and he would not be making a third race for the presidency.