

THE JOURNAL

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER
C. E. JACKSON, Publisher
Published every evening (except Sunday) and every Sunday morning at the Journal Building, Fifth and Yamhill streets, Portland, Or.

Entered at the post-office at Portland, Or., for transmission through the mails as second-class matter.
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.....\$ .75

FOREIGN ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE
Vieland-Benjamin Special Advertising Agency,
Broadway Building, 225 Fifth Avenue, New York 10007-08 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.....\$ .75

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

This Paper has proved by investigation that the circulation records are kept with care and the circulation started with such accuracy that advertisers may rely on any statement of same made by the publishers under the ownership and management in control September 4, 1908.

No man ever offended his own conscience but first or last it was revenged upon him for it.—South.

A GOOD EXAMPLE

M. R. C. A. BARRETT, a Republican representative from Umatilla county, replying to the nonsensical and unprincipled proddings of the Pendleton Tribune, said recently in effect that he would not only keep his pledge to the people in the matter of voting for senator, as a matter of course, but would have no hesitation or regret in doing so; that he would obey the people's will not at all grudgingly but cheerfully; and that he believed Governor Chamberlain would make a very good, efficient and satisfactory senator.

He has not Mr. Barrett's exact language before us, but he indicated that while he is a Republican and would personally prefer a Republican senator, the people's choice was readily and conscientiously his choice, and that, moreover, a man's politics was after all a matter of minor importance, the first consideration being the man's ability and devotion to the people's interests.

In these respects he considered the governor a fit man, whom he would vote for very willingly.

Here is an example worthy of respect, approval and imitation. It is true that the politics of the man counts no great figure in the case. A Democratic senator can serve the state in all essential matters, just about as effectively as a Republican. True, he will be a minority member of committees, but a man like Chamberlain will not allow that to handicap him much. He has the faculty of making friends and wielding influence, and his politics will not be considered nearly as much as the party organs would have people believe. If, as they assert, the Republican majority is really going to revise the tariff by reducing the duties heavily, there is not much dividing the parties anyway. The Republican majority in the senate is large, and an Oregon Republican's vote would really count for nothing. Chamberlain has declared for the "Roosevelt policies," and so will support Mr. Taft insofar as he will carry out those policies.

So what is all this partisan outcry about? It is mere "sound and fury, signifying nothing"—except that a lot of ex-bosses, ringsters and discredited politicians are determined to maintain or regain their occupation, their hold on affairs. Their motto just now is Rule or Ruin. And in order to cover up or divert attention from real matters of importance they declaim lustily about the importance of the party, of partisanship, of Republican "principles," and all sorts of delusive and irrelevant stuff. It is this partysm that is the real "bunko game," but the people will not be humbugged with it any longer.

Mr. Barrett is right, and his position is entirely creditable to him as a true representative of the people. They have instructed him, and he has pledged himself to the people to do a certain thing, he wishes it understood that he will do so willingly, cheerfully, heartily, as not a hard or unpleasant duty, but as one that he is glad to perform and that he fully believes it is right and best to perform. This is the right way to look at the matter; Mr. Barrett proves himself a fit and trustworthy representative.

It means something that Oregon granges are becoming aroused. It means something that Ramsey Park grange, the other day, passed resolutions and sent them to The Journal for publication. These resolutions denounced the prevalent effort to dislodge and defeat the Oregon primary law, and the processes of that law. Their adoption by an organization of farmers is significant. It is re-

fective of the universal wrath to be expected if the policy of personal program be carried out and popular rule be frustrated. It is typical of the reckoning that awaits those who insist that personal government shall be substituted for popular government. The bosses are few and the people are many. The grange resolutions are a challenge to the bosses from the people, and it is a challenge to the combat. It is a proposition about which there can be no misunderstanding. These granges intend to meet the personal program on their own ground, and to give them mortal battle in defense of the primary law.

The grange is a militant organization. It is a leader of rural thought. It is always on the side of civic righteousness, and always a factor for progress. It was said before the country life commission in one of the Portland hearings that wherever there is a grange best methods in agriculture prevail. It was said that where there are such organizations, concerted action by the farmers is easier, and in proof it was cited that in the Hood River district, where there is one of the best apple-growers' organizations in the world, there are five granges. It was stated by an agricultural college expert, who had traveled much through Oregon with farmers' institutes, that in grange neighborhoods social life was always advanced and agricultural methods superior. It is history that to the efforts of the National Grange is due the establishment of the rural free delivery.

It is such a record and such a reputation that gives portent to the grange resolutions. It is a rumbling from the foundations of the state. It is an evil omen for those who insist on substituting personal government for popular government.

THE RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

COINCIDENT with the meeting of the national congress today will occur the meeting of the Rivers and Harbors congress, a body that has no regular legal standing but that has exerted and will exert great influence upon the national congress and upon others in authority and public sentiment, in behalf of a larger, more rapid, steady and systematic movement for open rivers and improved harbors. Working along similar lines is the inland waterways organization, which will also be well represented at Washington this week, as well as many governors and other prominent men who, at the suggestion of President Roosevelt, constitute the organization for the conservation of the country's natural resources. Co-operating also with these are the forestry and irrigation services and interests, the National Irrigation society and the Transmississippi congress, and all these are supported by chambers of commerce and other like organizations throughout the country.

Owing largely no doubt to the efforts of the Rivers and Harbors congress and these other forces, it is hoped that there will be more liberal appropriations in a river and harbor bill this winter, perhaps as high as \$75,000,000, and there may be a step taken toward complying with the demand for a regular appropriation of \$50,000,000 a year for 10 years or more for the improvement of our rivers and harbors.

For the people of Oregon the efforts and influence of this Rivers and Harbors congress and kindred organizations have been and will be of immense importance and benefit. Judiciously used, the people of this country can afford to spend hundreds of millions on its waterways and harbors; they can make no better investment.

THE AVERAGE MAN

THOUGH eminently correct in many of his statements about the tariff, Mr. Carnegie is wrong in his remark that the tariff taxes the rich more than the poor. Exactly the opposite is true. Frederick A. Cleveland, technical director of the bureau of municipal research, has explained instructively that it is the average man who suffers most from indirect taxation, graft and bad government. If he has a family, the average man pays about \$240 a year on these accounts, according to this expert. This is a large amount to a man earning \$1000 or \$1200 a year, and many earn less. If the rich man pays more, say \$200, or \$500, or even \$1000 a year, the amount is comparatively nothing to him. The \$200 paid by the average man is, on the other hand, a very heavy burden, a burden that is oftentimes a chief-integrator in his life failure.

It is the consumer that is the victim from every standpoint. The landlord, the merchant, the butcher and baker have a recourse. Whatever indirect taxation, graft and bad government add to their life tax, they add to their own exactions. The landlord raises his rents and the merchant, butcher and baker their prices. As an effect, the average man, that unit typical of the millions whose salary is fixed, or whose income is fixed, or whose burden added to living presents hard realities, and until life becomes a struggle.

But the worst feature is that the system teaches beneficiaries of a tariff that it is good ethics for them to be placed by law in position to prey upon the earnings of other men. It teaches them that it is right for them to be placed in position to exact from others something for which no equivalent is rendered. It teaches them to expect the law to insure their business prosperity, and that the foil and earnings of other men must be taxed for this purpose. It teaches them a false doctrine, in short, that government should intervene to make their business pay, a proposition corruptive of effort, and damaging to citizenship. As Charles Francis Adams frankly puts it, "I am a tariff thief and have a license to steal. I stole under it yesterday, I am stealing under it today, and I propose to steal under it tomorrow. The government has forced me into this position and I both do, and shall take advantage of it." It is a generous program for the frank and wealthy Mr. Adams, but what of the average man, from whose income it takes \$200 a year? What of its effect upon the morals of the nation?

AS TO ASSURANCES

THE NEWS from Washington is that the Oregon delegation will make a special effort with reference to the Willamette project. The assurance sounds encouraging. Unfortunately, it is only an assurance. It has a familiar ring. It has been heard in campaign time, and heard at the beginning of other congressional sessions. In all other times, it has only been as sounding brass. It has been more sop, thrown to expectant and hopeful citizens. These citizens have been fed on it generously and with great regularity.

Maybe it was not the fault of the delegation. It is to be hoped that it was not. Yet, before us is the bitter memory that we have heard it all before, and that nothing ever came of it. We all heard, and believed. We listened, and were soothed into hopefulness, and we lay down and waited. But ever, the session of congress passed into history with only inaction, and for the fair assurances, there were substituted fair excuses. The program has become so familiar that the surmise is forced upon us, Are we a "processed" people? That we so surmise is not our fault. We have been patient. We have been meek. We still trust. We are still meek, but we want action. We applaud the delegation for its fair assurances, but we will applaud it more for a free river and an unrestrained commerce. This is the year for appropriation bills, and we offer to pay half the cost. How can there be failure?

Why not require a license for all sellers of milk in the city, so that the dairies everywhere, as well as the milk, could be inspected at any time? The market inspector thinks that this would be a solution of the pure milk problem, and that four inspectors could sufficiently cover the whole field. They should, however, be veterinarians and persons of undoubted ability and reliability. Portland would better spend a few thousand dollars a year than drink foul milk.

Two years ago the Chicago Tribune charged Mayor Dunne with appointing hoodlums as members of the school board. It now retracts that accusation, explaining that it was made in "the heat of a political campaign." This is possibly an occasion when a poor excuse is better than none and when an act of justice is better performed late than never.

Bishop Hughes' Birthday.

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes of the Methodist Episcopal church was born at Mountsville, Va., December 7, 1866, of an old Virginia family. He studied at the University of West Virginia and Ohio Wesleyan university, graduating from the last named institution in 1889. Going to Boston, he entered the Boston University Theological school, where he graduated in 1892 and was ordained to the Methodist Episcopal ministry in the same year. His first parish was at Newton Center, Mass., whence he removed to Malden, Mass., where he remained until 1903. In that year he was called to the presidency of De Pauw university at Greencastle, Ind. He continued as head of the university until his election to the bishopric by the general conference in Baltimore last May. During the years he was with De Pauw university Dr. Hughes rendered efficient service to the cause of education. He is at present one of the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation.

This Date in History.

1804—Noah Haynes Swaine, Lincoln's first appointment to the United States supreme court, born in Virginia. Died in New York City, June 8, 1884.

1816—Elizabeth Hussey Whittier, poet and sister of John Greenleaf Whittier, born in Haverhill, Mass. Died in Amesbury, Mass., September 3, 1884.

1829—Suttee, the Hindu rite of burning a widow on the funeral pyre of her husband, abolished.

1846—Santa Ana proclaimed president of Mexico.

1862—Battle of Prairie Grove, Ark.

1902—Ex-Speaker Thomas B. Reed died. Born October 18, 1839.

According to Location.

From the Louisville Courier-Journal. "I don't know much about buying meat," admitted the young husband. "How do the prices run?"

"According to location," explained the dealer. "Then gimme a two pound roast, best you have in the orchestra circle."

The Administration Changes.

From the Pittsburg Post. "You don't seem to be keeping up your tennis."

"Well, I don't know so much about tennis," remarked the Washington official. "I don't know if it's as good a game as golf."

Letters from the People

Letters to The Journal should be written on the paper only, and should be accompanied by the name and address of the writer. The name will not be used if the writer so desires. Letters should be returned when not used should include postage.

Corrections are notified that letters exceeding 300 words in length may, at the discretion of the editor, be cut down to that limit.

Fulton Should Keep Out of Race.

La Grande, Or., Dec. 4.—To the Editor of The Journal—I hold no brief for Governor Chamberlain and he does not include the amnesty his "Benjamin" and I have never been the recipient of favors from him. Nor am I a believer in Statement No. 1. In fact, I am as much opposed to that document as the Oregonian is. A long time ago it was said by their own newspaper, "The Journal," and Statement No. 1 should be judged by its fruits. The only fruit that it has borne so far that has ripened is Senator Jonathan Bourne. I do not believe that the count at any time, have been elected as "Statement No. 1." But the point that I want to make is this: Senator Fulton and his friends are the chief advocates of the defeat of Chamberlain and the defeat of Chamberlain is the purpose of Statement No. 1. It is certain that in this part of Oregon hundreds of berries from Fulton, before the June election and after he was beaten at the primary, predicted that Chamberlain would beat the vote of the people. Fulton added that he would not be elected United States senator. Many of them voted openly for Chamberlain (I have been told) for the purpose of defeating the senatorial race, which was beaten once before, and that Fulton would have another chance of election, if Chamberlain were defeated. I have no doubt that Chamberlain's defeat was caused by Fulton's scheme of voting for Chamberlain. It seems that the same men who voted for Chamberlain to defeat Fulton, want men, who pledged themselves by signing Statement No. 1, that they would vote for the person receiving the highest number of votes at the June election, to violate their pledges and to vote for Fulton who was repudiated by the voters at the Republican primaries. It seems to me that these men are stopped by their own consciences by the repudiation of Statement No. 1 and the election of their favorite. If Fulton would eliminate himself from the electoral race, he would be a true patriot. There would be some reason in the attitude of those now opposing Statement No. 1. Fulton has been repudiated by his own party and he should recognize that fact and keep out of the race.

It sounds a little strange to hear men who voted for Chamberlain in June now opposing his election. They voted for him and they should not come into town to oppose him on account of his politics. The Fulton men are caught in a trap of their own constructing and their wall at the result creates no sympathy. It seems to me that some of them have any reasonable show of doing so, Chamberlain is to eliminate Fulton from the contest. Many Republicans would prefer the election of a Democrat to his being elected. While many people do not like Chamberlain, they do not dare to credit for slaying Fulton. INDEPENDENT.

Portland, Dec. 5.—To the Editor of The Journal—I am awfully worried about the discussion that is now arising regarding the disarming of the law-abiding gentlemen of the city. Why, if you are in favor of it, why not let it end in some sort of an agitation and the citizens may seize their natural rights in spite of the police. The police were quietly pulling all the good citizens and were making some of them into their own good shape, thus making more money for the county of Multnomah in a day than the holdup gang and its associates in a month. This was good work and it was my intention to go out in a sandbag in the short time and take a few of the suckers whom the police have rendered as harmless as a rabbit. But now you are agitating this thing and I am afraid the people will "catch on," and not stand for the disarming under the constitution of the United States as interpreted in Portland police courts. That will militate against the rapidly growing industry of the year, and the law will be established in Portland. If the people kick on disarmament and commence carrying guns for us, where will we be? Why, it will destroy the whole business in the spring, as I had anticipated.

I do not see what complaint the people can urge against the yegg fraternity. They are a little low and a little noisier with a gasp, but for some citizens are a little slow in giving up. But we don't get much money after all. We take a few dollars that go home. But the yeggs, who are a man in, make him go out and get \$50; they whang him into the lockup, they drag him before his honor and give him a roomful of rubbernecks that give him a good grip, for being a criminal gunkeeper. He gets out in a kind of a show. If he don't rustle up a \$50 bill he goes over and pounds rock 90 days and comes out a branded man for life. Now the yegg boys do not treat the citizen as they do. If a gent has only four bits on him, we just politely bat him one over the head for being so negligent in money matters as to carry such small sums of nights, and send him to the pen. We do not brand him as a criminal, for we know he never did a thing in his life and never intends to. We do not make him send home for the full \$50. The fact is, the people have no right to complain of the treatment of the yeggs in the hands of our best classes of yeggs. Far worse abuses should be attended to first, not the least of which is the agitating of the citizen against the law-abiding gentlemen of the city. Why, if carried to its legitimate conclusion the agitation against the yeggs would end in a jury convicting some insane man some time somewhere, or somewhere else. Goodness, can't some of these agitators be stopped? HANS U. P. JOHNSTON.

Logan Refutes Hitchens' Statements.

Portland, Dec. 7.—To the Editor of The Journal—With reference to the letter printed in Saturday's issue of The Journal over the name of J. H. Hitchens, I desire to make the following corrections. I never said (although it was advertently misquoted to such effect) that I had secured the appointment of the late Ralph Fisher as referee, or in any way connected with the disbarment proceedings against Hitchens. What I did say was that Mr. Fisher, who was the regularly appointed referee,

Letters from the People

Letters to The Journal should be written on the paper only, and should be accompanied by the name and address of the writer. The name will not be used if the writer so desires. Letters should be returned when not used should include postage.

Corrections are notified that letters exceeding 300 words in length may, at the discretion of the editor, be cut down to that limit.

Fulton Should Keep Out of Race.

La Grande, Or., Dec. 4.—To the Editor of The Journal—I hold no brief for Governor Chamberlain and he does not include the amnesty his "Benjamin" and I have never been the recipient of favors from him. Nor am I a believer in Statement No. 1. In fact, I am as much opposed to that document as the Oregonian is. A long time ago it was said by their own newspaper, "The Journal," and Statement No. 1 should be judged by its fruits. The only fruit that it has borne so far that has ripened is Senator Jonathan Bourne. I do not believe that the count at any time, have been elected as "Statement No. 1." But the point that I want to make is this: Senator Fulton and his friends are the chief advocates of the defeat of Chamberlain and the defeat of Chamberlain is the purpose of Statement No. 1. It is certain that in this part of Oregon hundreds of berries from Fulton, before the June election and after he was beaten at the primary, predicted that Chamberlain would beat the vote of the people. Fulton added that he would not be elected United States senator. Many of them voted openly for Chamberlain (I have been told) for the purpose of defeating the senatorial race, which was beaten once before, and that Fulton would have another chance of election, if Chamberlain were defeated. I have no doubt that Chamberlain's defeat was caused by Fulton's scheme of voting for Chamberlain. It seems that the same men who voted for Chamberlain to defeat Fulton, want men, who pledged themselves by signing Statement No. 1, that they would vote for the person receiving the highest number of votes at the June election, to violate their pledges and to vote for Fulton who was repudiated by the voters at the Republican primaries. It seems to me that these men are stopped by their own consciences by the repudiation of Statement No. 1 and the election of their favorite. If Fulton would eliminate himself from the electoral race, he would be a true patriot. There would be some reason in the attitude of those now opposing Statement No. 1. Fulton has been repudiated by his own party and he should recognize that fact and keep out of the race.

It sounds a little strange to hear men who voted for Chamberlain in June now opposing his election. They voted for him and they should not come into town to oppose him on account of his politics. The Fulton men are caught in a trap of their own constructing and their wall at the result creates no sympathy. It seems to me that some of them have any reasonable show of doing so, Chamberlain is to eliminate Fulton from the contest. Many Republicans would prefer the election of a Democrat to his being elected. While many people do not like Chamberlain, they do not dare to credit for slaying Fulton. INDEPENDENT.

Portland, Dec. 5.—To the Editor of The Journal—I am awfully worried about the discussion that is now arising regarding the disarming of the law-abiding gentlemen of the city. Why, if you are in favor of it, why not let it end in some sort of an agitation and the citizens may seize their natural rights in spite of the police. The police were quietly pulling all the good citizens and were making some of them into their own good shape, thus making more money for the county of Multnomah in a day than the holdup gang and its associates in a month. This was good work and it was my intention to go out in a sandbag in the short time and take a few of the suckers whom the police have rendered as harmless as a rabbit. But now you are agitating this thing and I am afraid the people will "catch on," and not stand for the disarming under the constitution of the United States as interpreted in Portland police courts. That will militate against the rapidly growing industry of the year, and the law will be established in Portland. If the people kick on disarmament and commence carrying guns for us, where will we be? Why, it will destroy the whole business in the spring, as I had anticipated.

I do not see what complaint the people can urge against the yegg fraternity. They are a little low and a little noisier with a gasp, but for some citizens are a little slow in giving up. But we don't get much money after all. We take a few dollars that go home. But the yeggs, who are a man in, make him go out and get \$50; they whang him into the lockup, they drag him before his honor and give him a roomful of rubbernecks that give him a good grip, for being a criminal gunkeeper. He gets out in a kind of a show. If he don't rustle up a \$50 bill he goes over and pounds rock 90 days and comes out a branded man for life. Now the yegg boys do not treat the citizen as they do. If a gent has only four bits on him, we just politely bat him one over the head for being so negligent in money matters as to carry such small sums of nights, and send him to the pen. We do not brand him as a criminal, for we know he never did a thing in his life and never intends to. We do not make him send home for the full \$50. The fact is, the people have no right to complain of the treatment of the yeggs in the hands of our best classes of yeggs. Far worse abuses should be attended to first, not the least of which is the agitating of the citizen against the law-abiding gentlemen of the city. Why, if carried to its legitimate conclusion the agitation against the yeggs would end in a jury convicting some insane man some time somewhere, or somewhere else. Goodness, can't some of these agitators be stopped? HANS U. P. JOHNSTON.

Logan Refutes Hitchens' Statements.

Portland, Dec. 7.—To the Editor of The Journal—With reference to the letter printed in Saturday's issue of The Journal over the name of J. H. Hitchens, I desire to make the following corrections. I never said (although it was advertently misquoted to such effect) that I had secured the appointment of the late Ralph Fisher as referee, or in any way connected with the disbarment proceedings against Hitchens. What I did say was that Mr. Fisher, who was the regularly appointed referee,

COMMENT AND NEWS IN BRIEF

SMALL CHANGE

Fruit.
More fruit.
Better fruit.
Fruit is the best.

Fruit state in the union.
This fact is worth millions.
Being only 28 years old, Finch, if convicted, may not die of old age.

Almost any imaginable little excuse serves now as a cause for a divorce.

It's been wintry weather for Oregon lately, but eastern visitors don't regard it so.
Isn't butter full of microbes, too? Perhaps it would be well for poor people to think so.

Thirty nurses have been engaged for the young emperor of China. Poor, miserable little kid.

Perhaps correspondence with congressmen and senators would be more profitable if rendered Standard Oil's business hazardous.

There is apparently no end or limit to excuses for and defenses of murderers. It is quite time for courts to sit down on most of them.

The superintendent of the Seattle schools wants to teach girls how to get out of a jam, and no one would doubt volunteer as teachers.

It looks now like a bumper crop next year in the inland empire. Of course several things may happen before next harvest, but the prospect now is away above average.

A King county judge holds that "cuss" words used by a husband are not a cause of divorce under the Washington law. Then the wife should be allowed to "cuss" back.

Dr. Pearson denies that he is near broke, and says he has some \$2,000,000 to give away. Even if he had no money, he would have what is better, a multitude of friends.

From printer to lawyer, from lawyer to criminal; such is the downward step of J. A. Finch. Is the way the Eugene register puts it, which is not exactly complimentary to lawyers.

If the country commission can get the pretty and intelligent country girls out of their homes, and no come into town to become stenographers, teachers and saleswomen, it will do much to make the life more attractive to young men.

From an address before the Saturn club, Buffalo, N. Y., February 22, 1897.

One of the best of those paintings which have made the name of Edouard Detaille famous is called "The Salute to the Wounded." In the painting one sees a country road in France, along which a French soldier is being carried by a Prussian prisoner under an escort of French curriers. A French officer of high rank and his staff are seated upon their horses by the roadside and are in the act of saluting their wounded comrade, who is passing before them. The picture always has had an attraction for me, because it shows that strong patriotic feeling which led the French painters at the time of the Franco-Prussian war to find even in the incidents of a struggle fraught with so much shame and disaster for their day, opportunities to paint nothing that did not put in evidence the best qualities of their national character.

Here in the United States there is no lack of admiration for courageous self-sacrifice which the French painter has put so faithfully into his picture; but I sometimes feel that we fall to find in the devotion, the self-denial and the sacrifice of those who have given themselves to make a better world for our country, all the inspiration that should be derived from them, or that would be got out of them by the men of France had those qualities been displayed by the countrymen.

I fear we undervalue the devotion to country which comes from a contemplation of what has been done and suffered in her name. I feel that we teach those who are to make or mar the future of this nation, that much of what has been done elsewhere, and that much of what has been done here. Courage is the characteristic of no one land or time. The world's history is full of it, and the lessons it teaches, American citizens should not forget. These acts of devotion and of heroic personal sacrifice with which our history is filled are worthy of earnest study, of continued contemplation and of perpetual admiration.

"Let him who will, sing deeds done well across the sea. Here, lovely land, men bravely live and die for thee."

The particular example I desire to speak of is that splendid quality of courage which deters everything not for self or country, but for an enemy. It is of that kind which is called into existence not by dreams of glory, or by love of land, but by the highest human courage, the desire to mitigate suffering in those who are against us.

cutting officer, desired for convenience that I assist as referee in all the local disbarment proceedings then at issue. I protested because of press of business, and had in mind the appointment of Honorable C. M. Idleman as referee in the Finch case. Mr. Fisher needed no special appointment nor my assistance, for the very good reason that he was the special prosecutor of the Bar association.

Concerning the often and freely expressed opinion by Mr. Fisher that Hitchens was connected with the anonymous communications, I desire to add that Mr. Fisher never expressed this belief to ally year and to show his contempt for the writer. Hitchens had attained an infamous celebrity long before Francis J. Henry procured his indictment for attempting to traduce his good name. Mr. Fisher was aware of this and knew, moreover, that he had nothing to fear in the way of bodily harm, from a cowardly creature who had been publicly whipped a score of times by citizens of both sexes, for unspeakable insults to unprotected women.

JOHN F. LOGAN.

Not the Bar's Fault.

Bay City, Or., Dec. 2.—To the Editor of The Journal—Tillamook county people are much pleased to hear of the new boat which is being put on the Portland and Tillamook run. And it is believed this boat will go when the weather and bar are favorable—that it won't wait for the sun to shine. Again, Captain Bob Jones has had a vacation this year

THE REALM FEMININE

A Man's Problem.
YOUNG man, think well before you buy that Christmas present for the "only one." That is, unless you are perfectly willing to lose your job.

A young clerk in a department store last Christmas spent \$25 for an umbrella to give the girl he went to see every other evening. He was discharged a few days later.

"I considered that we didn't want a clerk who was drawing \$18 a week but spent \$25 for a present for his sweetheart," said the manager of the store. "It might be all right if he spent his money on a suit, but he was discharged a few days later."

Was not the employer right? Can a firm afford to take the chance of continuing to employ across the clerks a young man who shows so little sense of balance and proportion. And if a man is so reckless in his estimation of the worth of his own money, it is a strong probability that he will be equally lacking in respect to his employer's sensible property.

It is a large and important question, how much a young man should spend in giving a present to the girl of his choice. On the one hand, he should be generous. On the other hand there exists a probability that if he spends his money lavishly, she will cease to respect his judgment as a business man, and that she will get an impression of a man lacking in discretion. And she will not be relied upon in the long run, for the long run which counts. Many young men who are generous in the acquaintance of sensible young women, they never come seriously into consideration or really enter into their lives. They make good partners at the dance, or for an afternoon's picnic, but when it comes to serious service to pass an evening well—but they will do for a theatre party, or even pass for a horse back ride—but they will not be seriously considered by sensible, well-poised young women as suitable parties to a matrimonial alliance.

"Oh, matrimony!" exclaims some impatient one. "Can't a young man show a girl some courteous attention without its being considered a proposal of marriage?"

Undoubtedly. But we were talking about giving presents. Now no sensible girl will give a present to a young man which he can ill afford to give, which would cause her embarrassment and which would, to say the least, be a matter of which she would regret a passing acquaintance between them.

The three "his" remain, as heretofore, the most important factors in the gift given by a man friend—books, bouquets and bonbons.

If the young people are engaged to be married, more elaborate and expensive presents are permissible, of course. In that event, anything which is not an essential utility is expected, (only excepting gloves) may be given, providing always that it falls well within the limit of the young man's income.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the man who is engaged to a girl hopes to marry her. That his prime ambition is to get on his feet, and to accumulate enough money to build her a home and equip it; that he would count it a privilege to be able to give her a present, and show himself able to conserve his income for the new duties and responsibilities of a married man.

And how can a girl help it if a man wants to give her presents? Well, that calls for a little more of just common sense. If she does not care for the man surely she doesn't want his presents. If she does care for him, she expects to marry him she should be able to speak frankly with him about his income, and to give him just what she can afford to give. He would be offended at such plain speaking, and she would not be thoroughly appreciated. When a young man is worthy and healthily minded young woman if he failed to understand her point of view, she would be disappointed. He might be forgiven to youthful enthusiasm and the occasional spasm of generosity in the line of gifts.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the man who is engaged to a girl hopes to marry her. That his prime ambition is to get on his feet, and to accumulate enough money to build her a home and equip it; that he would count it a privilege to be able to give her a present, and show himself able to conserve his income for the new duties and responsibilities of a married man.

And how can a girl help it if a man wants to give her presents? Well, that calls for a little more of just common sense. If she does not care for the man surely she doesn't want his presents. If she does care for him, she expects to marry him she should be able to speak frankly with him about his income, and to give him just what she can afford to give. He would be offended at such plain speaking, and she would not be thoroughly appreciated. When a young man is worthy and healthily minded young woman if he failed to understand her point of view, she would be disappointed. He might be forgiven to youthful enthusiasm and the occasional spasm of generosity in the line of gifts.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the man who is engaged to a girl hopes to marry her. That his prime ambition is to get on his feet, and to accumulate enough money to build her a home and equip it; that he would count it a privilege to be able to give her a present, and show himself able to conserve his income for the new duties and responsibilities of a married man.

And how can a girl help it if a man wants to give her presents? Well, that calls for a little more of just common sense. If she does not care for the man surely she doesn't want his presents. If she does care for him, she expects to marry him she should be able to speak frankly with him about his income, and to give him just what she can afford to give. He would be offended at such plain speaking, and she would not be thoroughly appreciated. When a young man is worthy and healthily minded young woman if he failed to understand her point of view, she would be disappointed. He might be forgiven to youthful enthusiasm and the occasional spasm of generosity in the line of gifts.

It is only reasonable to suppose that the man who is engaged to a girl hopes to marry her. That his prime ambition is to get on his feet, and to