

Help! Help! I'm Falling!

Thus cried the hair. And a kind neighbor came to the rescue with a bottle of Ayer's Hair Vigor. The hair was saved! In gratitude, it grew long and heavy, and with all the deep, rich color of early life. Sold in all parts of the world for sixty years.

"About one year ago I lost nearly all of my hair following an attack of meningitis. I was advised by a friend to use Ayer's Hair Vigor, and after using a few bottles I began to grow a beautiful head of hair."—Mrs. W. J. B. W. Boston, Mass., Oct. 18, 1898.

Made by J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass. Also Solely by
SARAPALLA, PILLS, CHEERFUL PECTORAL.

Wanted! Tip It.
A Toronto man who visited England last summer appears to think that country the champion tip taker. He says: "Well, I had tipped every man from the swell gent who seemed to own the house of commons down to the hooligan who gunned the wrong labels on my luggage, and I went into the waiting room on the landing stage at Liverpool to wash my hands of everything English, and what do you think started me in the face when I did? A placard saying, 'Please tip the basin.' I'll be hanged if I did!"

Deafness Cannot Be Cured
by local applications, as they cannot reach the diseased portion of the ear. There is only one way to cure deafness, and that is by constitutional remedies. Deafness is caused by an inflammation of the mucous lining of the Eustachian tube. When this tube is inflamed you have a running or impaired hearing, and if it is entirely closed, deafness is the result. The inflammation can be taken out and this tube restored to its normal condition, hearing will be restored forever. Buy Deafness Cure at once. It is a small bottle, which is nothing but an inflamed condition of the mucous lining.

We will give one Hundred Dollars for any case of deafness (caused by catarrh) that cannot be cured by Hall's Catarrh Cure. Send for circulars, free.

J. J. CHENEY & CO., Toledo, O.
Sold by Druggists. 75c.
T. S. Hall's Family Pills for constipation.

Face.
"Well," said the customer, as he paid the barber and moved toward the door, "I feel like congratulating myself on getting safely out of a mighty bad scrape."
By placing himself promptly on the outside of the barber shop, he avoided getting himself into a mighty bad scrape.

Doesn't Always Follow.
Because some men get over a fence safely with a loaded gun it is not always safe to assume that they won't examine a mule's heels to settle a bet.—Washington Post.

THE DAIRY
destroys all the germs that cause the most common ailments of the stomach and bowels. It is a powerful purgative and cleanses the system. It is sold by all druggists.

Try them once and you will never want to do without them.

MAROLD BOMERS, 149 DeKalb Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

St. Helen's Hall, Portland, Or.
Resident and Day School for Girls.
Catalogue on Request.

Libby's Food Products

Libby's Cooked Corned Beef

There's a big difference between just corned beef—the kind sold in bulk—and Libby's Cooked Corned Beef. The difference is in the taste, quality of meat and natural flavor.

Every fiber of the meat of Libby's Cooked Corned Beef is evenly and mildly cured, cooked scientifically and carefully packed in Libby's Great White Kitchen.

It forms an appetizing dish, rich in food value and makes a summer meal that satisfies.

For Quick Serving:—Libby's Cooked Corned Beef, cut into thin slices. Arrange on a platter and garnish with Libby's Chow Chow. A tempting dish for luncheon, dinner, supper.

Write for free booklet—How to Cook Libby's Food Products.

Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago

RUEF OUT OF JAIL.

Ball Bonds for \$1,560,000 Approved by Court.

PRISONER SEVENTEEN MONTHS

Father and Sister Sign Obligations as Sureties, Holding Property of Ex-Boss in Trust.

San Francisco, July 7.—Abraham Ruef was released from the county jail last night on bonds aggregating \$1,560,000, the largest amount ever given in a criminal case in the state. This sum is the aggregate bail upon 78 indictments, returned by the Oliver grand jury, charging Ruef with bribing the former board of supervisors in connection with the granting of franchises to public service corporations, and upon which he was taken in custody by the prosecution as a sort of "prisoner of state," in charge of an elisor appointed by Judge Frank H. Dunne and a half a dozen private givers, at an expense of about \$1000 a month.

Since January 10, when the new administration went into office, Ruef has been languishing in the county jail.

Twenty sureties, including Ruef's father and sister, and himself, signed the bonds. It developed yesterday during the examination of his sureties before Superior Judge Frank J. Murphy, that Ruef owned real estate in this city which he recently transferred to his father and sister, upon which a real estate expert, on the witness stand, placed a value of \$1,095,556.

Ruef's annual income from this property was \$76,900. His father and sister went his bonds to the amount of \$690,000, while other sureties qualified for \$870,000. Of the latter, Joseph Hirsch and Leopold Hirsch signed bonds for \$20,000 each, Louis Friedman six bonds of \$20,000 each, and a surety company deposited a certified check for \$100,000, equivalent to \$200,000 in bonds.

Ruef's next trial has been set for July 15 on one of the indictments charging him with bribery in connection with the granting of a trolley franchise to the United Railroads. Although he has been in custody for 16 months, he has been tried but once, the jury disagreeing after being out 44 hours.

After leaving court Ruef went to the home of his parents to join them at dinner, and announced that later he would visit the county jail and bid farewell to the prisoners, and thank them for courtesies shown him.

BRYAN IS DICTATOR.

Has Complete Control of Convention in Denver.

Denver, Colo., July 6.—One great Bryan ratification leading to a wild burst of enthusiasm in celebration of the triumphant reappearance of the peerless one after a temporary eclipse; the demolition of the completeness of the new leader's power over all men and measures; amnesty and harmony for all who may be useful and who promise to be good; expulsion from the temple, excommunication and the scaffold for all who have committed lese majeste and who refuse to bow the knee in humble plea for pardon—such is the theme of the Democratic national convention, the first session of which is to begin at noon tomorrow.

Today the Bryan people have the bit in their teeth. They are running strong and free. They are feeling the exaltation of power. They bubble with joy over the triumph they have won over plutocracy. For the great majority of the conquered they have nothing but good-will, and the right hand of good-fellowship. But upon the heads of the few they are preparing the vengeance of Guffey, the plutocrat of Pennsylvania; McGraw and his side-partner from West Virginia; Tom Ryan, the head devil of the whole anti-Bryan conspiracy; Sheehan, the head devil of the anti-Bryan conspiracy in New Jersey; known as the wolf; and poor Governor Johnson, of Minnesota, whose crime it is that of being caught in bad company, are to be punished.

Harvest of Death.

Chicago, July 7.—This was the busiest day of the year for the coroner's office, and the patrol service of the police department. Seven sudden deaths, five suicides, two asphyxiations, three accidents, and one killing in the last 24 hours kept the men in both these departments on their feet. The excitement and nervous strain of the Fourth of July, combined with the heat, is given by the coroner's office as the explanation for the large number of suicides and sudden deaths.

Catch Black Hand Leader.

New York, July 7.—Lieutenant Petrosino and his Italian detectives yesterday were running down the loose ends of their case against a Sicilian, Giuseppe Affinto, who until recently, it is charged, was the moving spirit in many of the East Side bomb-throwings. Affinto was arrested on the specific charge that he threw a bomb in a tenement house in East Seventy-fourth street to intimidate a wealthy Italian in an attempt to blackmail him. This affidavit was sworn to by a man who the police say, saw the bomb thrown.

Death List Grows.

Chicago, July 7.—Ninety-four dead and 2920 injured are the totals of the Fourth of July casualties in the United States this year, so far as reported. In Chicago, in spite of all efforts for a sane celebration, the toll exacted was more disastrous than a year ago. The city's total of victims of last Saturday's tragedies is 10 dead and 182 injured—an increase of three fatalities and 52 persons injured over the 1907 figures. Lockjaw and blood poisoning will add more victims.

Horses Burned.

Portland, July 7.—Fifty horses perished in a fire of unknown origin, which started shortly after 2 o'clock this morning in the Dexter and Ankeny stable, corner Fifth and Ankeny streets. The loss to buildings and property is estimated at fully \$15,000.

Fourth Costs 38 Lives.

Crusade for Safe and Sans Celebration Comes to Naught.

Chicago, July 6.—Once more the annual barbaric orgy of death and mutilation, which masquerades under the guise of patriotic celebration of the nation's natal day, has passed, and the fearful cost has been counted in part.

In many homes there is mourning for children who have met untimely ends and adults whose lives have paid the penalty of wanton folly, while in darkened chambers and hospitals throughout the country lie thousands of maimed and suffering victims, some sightless and some disfigured for life, the work of the demon fireworks.

In Chicago, as elsewhere, despite the brave struggle in behalf of a "safe and sane" Fourth, there was scant improvement over previous Fourth's, and the result of all the efforts toward reform can scarcely even be dignified by the appellation of near sane.

The death toll for this year's Fourth is 38, and the returns are still incomplete. At midnight reports of 28 deaths and casualties were still coming in, and the total of the injured had reached 1429.

In Chicago alone, where the crusade for a safe and sane Fourth was strongest this year, there are eight dead and 130 injured. The fire loss in the nation, so far as learned, is \$41,950. Of this Chicago will bear \$20,000.

Deadly tetanus last year claimed 73 victims after the noise and excitement of the Fourth had died away. Fifty-three cases were caused by blank cartridges, eight by giant crackers, six by toy cannons and four by firearms. In 1906 the number of cases that developed was 89, 54 of which were caused by blank cartridges. In 1905 it was 104, of which 65 came from blank cartridges. In 1904 there were 99 tetanus cases, 74 arising from blank cartridges, and in 1903 the number ran up to 392, of which all but 29 cases came from bulletless joy producers.

OAKLAND TRAINS COLLIDE.

Seven Killed and 30 Injured by Careless Engineer.

Oakland, Cal., July 6.—The narrow-gauge local, bound from the Alameda Mole into Oakland, crashed into the Santa Cruz train No. 57, bound for the Oakland Mole, at 7:10 last night at First and Webster streets, killing or injuring all of the passengers in the Santa Cruz train smoking car.

Seven were killed and over 30 injured. The collision was on the crossing of the narrow gauge and main lines, opposite the Webster street bridge. The engine of the Alameda train, which was running with tender ahead, cut into the Santa Cruz train smoking car, about 10 feet from the front.

The front end was smashed to splinters, the car being torn from the front trucks and the mass tossed to the main line track up against the signal tower in Webster street. The engine of the Santa Cruz train was derailed and the way up dead and screaming wounded was hurled on its side, with the Alameda local tender buried in the wreckage. The baggage coach of the Santa Cruz train, which was in front of the smoker, was derailed and the way upset. Both locomotives were derailed.

When the trains struck, the smoker was cut from the coach following, which continued on its course, crashing into the boiler of the Alameda local. Some windows were broken in this and the first Alameda coach, which was also derailed. Otherwise they were not damaged. The passengers in these were shaken up, but not injured.

Practically all those in the smoker were pinned in the wreck and their cries for help followed the terrific crash of the trains coming together. Some were able to dig themselves out of the wreck, but the majority had to be cut out. Several of the dead were badly crushed. The police and fire departments were called out, and were soon at work carrying wounded and dead from the wreck.

Laborers Murder Foreman.

Missoula, Mont., July 6.—Holmes Hayes, foreman at the St. Paul tunnel, at Taft, near this city, was shot to death at noon yesterday by five Montanegrins in retaliation for the death of a fellow-countryman last October. Hayes was attacked from ambush and fell at the first fire. The frenzied foreigners then literally hacked his body to pieces with knives and made their escape over the mountains into Idaho. A large posse of experienced rangers has started in pursuit.

Rebels Bombard City.

Buenos Ayres, July 6.—Telegraphic communication with Asuncion, the capital of Paraguay, where there is a revolution, is still interrupted, but word has been received from Asuncion at Corrientes that the artillery at the capital mutinied and bombarded the market place. Many women are said to have been killed in this fighting. The foreign representatives at Asuncion are urging the belligerents to abstain from bombarding the city. This news was brought to Corrientes by the captain of the steamship.

Mortar Explodes.

San Francisco, July 6.—Mrs. Annie Reigling and her 4-year-old son were killed instantly on the shore of Lake Merritt, in Oakland, by the explosion of a fireworks mortar. A piece of iron from the mortar struck Mrs. Reigling in the chest with such force that it tore her heart from her body. The piece of ordnance was being used in the public celebration. Thousands of persons had gathered around the lake to witness the fireworks.

President Celebrates.

Oyster Bay, July 6.—President Roosevelt celebrated the Fourth of July with his family and a few friends at Sagamore Hill. In the evening the president had a beautiful display of fireworks set off in front of the house. Seated on the veranda with the president and his family were a number of relatives and many friends and neighbors.

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley, for a negative result, cannot help but retard settlement and discourage capital.

The purchase of a water right in Oregon means the purchase of a lawsuit. No litigation over water rights in this state has ever settled an issue so that it cannot again be raised. The decrees are binding upon only the parties to the litigation. These decrees often serve to cumber title to the unused waters, as the state, interested in preserving the unappropriated waters for future uses, has not been represented in court at trials of these cases.

Conserving Our Waters.

In the arid portion of this state the area of irrigable land far exceeds the regular water supply. The summer flow of these streams can be increased many fold by the storage of water in the mountains, and using the natural channel to convey such water to the place of intended use. This class of development, which is encouraged and protected in Wyoming, Idaho and other states, is absolutely impossible in Oregon, except under the most favorable conditions. Capital will not invest in such storage works until the state provides the necessary administrative machinery for protecting stored water as it passes down the stream past numerous ditch diversions to the place of intended use.

No State Protection.

It is not a crime in Oregon to steal water. In fact, the law encourages it. As stated above, any person can acquire a water right by posting a notice or digging a ditch and diverting water regardless as to the area of crops destroyed at the lower end of the valley by such wrongful diversion. Without the necessary administrative machinery, and a reliable record of vested rights to the use of water, it would be impossible to enforce any criminal law covering water, even if enacted.

Theft of water in an arid region is as serious a crime as destroying the crop of another, since it amounts to the same thing. In the end, yet this state maintains no department having control of diversions from public streams. There is no department to write to ascertain if the water rights claimed for constructed works are as represented, or whether any unappropriated water remains in a certain stream. Even if unappropriated water exists, there is no method provided by law for securing the same, and no title to this water from the public, to whom it belongs.

It requires constant litigation on the part of early appropriators to secure their rights. Where the price of justice exceeds the value of the water right the place must be abandoned.

(CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.)

STATE CONTROL OF WATER.

ord is, therefore, of no value to the public.

Resulting Litigation.

The conditions in California are identical with those in Oregon. The Commonwealth club has labored for years to secure the enactment of modern water laws, and in the proceedings of this club we find the statement that the bar of California was delighted to find in their primitive water laws such a fruitful source of income, and did nothing to remedy conditions. "The statute in question has been the foundation of some of the large fortunes of California, but these fortunes are held exclusively by the attorneys of record of the misguided individuals who availed themselves of the privilege granted by these statutes."

A case is reported where ditch "A" sued ditch "B" and upon the sworn evidence introduced obtained a decree giving it a priority of twenty cubic feet of water per second. Ditch "B" sued ditch "C" with the same result, and ditch "C" thereafter sued ditch "A" with the same result, and there were still 25 ditches diverting water from the same stream whose rights were not defined.

Along the Walla Walla river in Oregon, litigation to secure a proper division of the stream has been in progress for about 30 years, without settling the issue. This experience is typical of many other communities and should serve to demonstrate the failure of the present system of distributing water by the courts, through injunction proceedings.

There are approximately 200 ditches diverting water from this stream in a distance of 10 miles, for the irrigation of some 5,000 acres. Nearly 500 persons or corporations have been made parties to the lawsuit, and lawyers retained to protect the various rights. When the decree is rendered, the relative rights of the various ditches will be known, but how will the water be apportioned among the pioneer irrigator knows that the court cannot deny him his usual water supply, and though his right has been determined for perhaps the second or third time, the question is still, how to get this water at the time when needed. How will he determine which of the many ditches above is diverting water without right, in order to bring an injunction suit against it?

The decree is binding only on the parties to the suit. New appropriations can and will be made, thus forcing new litigation. The same conditions which brought on the present suit still exist; and this decree, without additional legislation, will be of no more value in settling conditions than former decrees.

The supreme court, by consistent decrees, has enacted practically all the water law of this state. To expect the court to provide in their decrees the complicated administrative machinery to make water decrees effective looks like a complete shifting of the burden from the legislature to the courts. This, in the opinion of leading water right lawyers, is not possible. One of the leading attorneys in the Walla Walla river case estimates that the present suit will ultimately cost between \$20,000 and \$25,000. This enormous drain upon the agricultural resources of this small valley