

The Bend Bulletin

BEND, OREGON

GEORGE PALMER PUTNAM
Publisher
ROBERT W. SAWYER
Editor-Manager
FRED A. WOELFLEN
Associate Editor

An independent newspaper standing for the square deal, clean business, clean politics and the best interests of Bend and Central Oregon.

One Year \$1.50
Six Months75
Three Months50

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1917

STAND BY THE PRESIDENT.

There is growing discontent at the conduct and misconduct of war-time affairs at Washington.

The army, the navy and the men who are bearing the brunt of the responsibilities of action seem to be acquitting themselves with credit. But at Washington, where the main spring of our war efficiency lies, and where the war, to a great degree, will be lost or won so far as we are concerned, there is haggling, delay and puerile wordiness.

The shame of it is becoming increasingly apparent to the country at large. Soon the people, who pay the cost of this war for world freedom and who bear its burdens and its sorrows, will let it be known in certain tones that they have had enough of narrow-gauge political pulling and hauling at the capital. They will rise up and drive the little obstructionists, the contemptible Kaiser-pawns and the self-conceited partisans from their posts of misapplied authority.

And in their stead will be placed men of real patriotism, bigness and ability.

If the middle at Washington serves no better purpose, it will at least show who in Congress, and who elsewhere in official position, is truly worthy. There will be a grand thinning out of the unfit, during the war, and afterward.

The ship building row, with its interminable quibbling and delay was a world disgrace. The everlasting jealous debating and revising of the food bill is as bad.

God knows we have need of action. And the experience of our Allies during the three years of war shows conclusively the rightness of centralized power, and the futility of divided responsibility.

With all our democracy, the people realize the pressing necessity of autocracy in such a crisis as this. It is the only way. Give us leaders and let them lead. Give them authority and let them use it. If they fail, they can be replaced.

But failure, or at least costly mistakes, beyond number—costly to the youth of the land, our most precious possession—surely will follow if the men at Washington try to conduct this war on the lines of a debating society.

Strangle a few score senators and congressmen who are quibbling over the food bill. Rightly or wrongly, the country at large wants Hoover to take hold of that vital department. That is undoubted. Give him a chance. Don't strangle him with committees and community rule. It's a one man job. If he fails, there will be time to find a better man.

A one man job. That's just it. In a great measure, in an unprecedented degree, this whole war, from our standpoint, must be a one man affair. The country expects that the one man is to be given the power to actually lead. It expects that he is not to be hampered and restricted. It cares little for party and less for playmate personalities.

And that one man is the President of the United States. He is our elected leader. He is responsible for the conduct of the war. He must be given every authority such leadership and responsibility requires. He must be vested with truly autocratic power. He must be supported, not hampered, by Congress.

Such is the wish of the country. Such is the need of the hour. Loyal Republicans would have it so, just as much as Democrats. There is no other way.

That pretty phrase, lipped so often at the time of declaration of war, "Stand by the President," must be a reality. And largely, it would seem, it is no such reality in Washington today.

If the powers which the President must have, and which he will receive, sooner or later, are abused, he, and his party will be fittingly rebuked by the sovereign people at the appropriate time. If they are well exercised, the country will rally round him as a Lincoln.

But if Senators and Congressmen and officials, who keep muddying the legislative and administrative waters, think they can survive the ultimate wrath of the people, they are mistaken. Partisanship, personal selfishness, sectionalism and hair-splitting will never be forgiven. The national leaders of tomorrow are these men who are big enough to forget everything but their determination to help win the war. They will survive. The others, the little men, will sink into deserved and unpleasant oblivion.

ACTION.

Senator McNary made his maiden speech in the Senate the other day in behalf of his amendment to the food bill, seeking appropriation of \$20,000,000 for aid of Oregon irrigation projects.

That looks good to Eastern Oregon.

It shows we have a real man on the job, who means to do more than draw his salary and play politics.

Says the Portland Journal, relative to the McNary effort:

"Construction of irrigation projects in Eastern Oregon by the federal government is much to be desired. For years the reclamation service has been investigating and procrastinating in this field. For a long time the reports of the field forces have been on file at Washington giving details and construction cost of the feasible projects throughout the arid section of the state. For years the reclamation chiefs have been spending the money contributed by the state of Oregon to the construction of projects elsewhere.

"Senator McNary should be commended for his efforts to secure an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the construction of new projects. More than half of this sum has already been put into the reclamation fund in Oregon money, while very little, relatively, has been expended here."

The Journal then goes on to explain why it thinks it was proper for Senator Chamberlain to oppose the McNary bill, as he did. It says that when McNary introduces the proposal again, as a separate bill and not an amendment, he, Chamberlain, will support it. Undoubtedly McNary will try a separate bill, as he has promised to stay with it until he gets results. And if Chamberlain does actively support it, Oregon should have a most excellent chance of getting that money and our long delayed share of federal aid for irrigation.

In which case we will be profoundly grateful to Senator McNary.

THE OREGON STAR.

The Eugene Guard says that everyone knows that one of the stars in the American flag represents Oregon, but few and very few at that know which one belongs to us. Every state in the Union has its own individual and particular star and its placement on the square blue is definitely regulated by law and executive order.

Oregon can easily be located on the flag—the fifth star down the left hand side. In 1912, on the 26th day of October the last executive order concerning the flag was made and it provided for the specific arrangement of the stars. They were to be arranged in horizontal rows of eight stars each. Starting in the upper left hand corner and placing each row from left to right, the star corresponding to each state is named in the order of the state's ratification of the constitution.

Thus, star No. 1, in the upper left hand corner, is for Delaware. Star No. 48, in the lower right hand corner, is for Arizona.

The following list will show you at a glance exactly the location of each state:

- First row—No. 1, Delaware; 2, Pennsylvania; 3, New Jersey; 4, Georgia; 5, Connecticut; 6, Massachusetts; 7, Maryland; 8, South Carolina.
- Second row—No. 9, New Hampshire; 10, Virginia; 11, New York; 12, North Carolina; 13, Rhode Island; 14, Vermont; 15, Kentucky; 16, Tennessee.
- Third row—No. 17, Ohio; 18, Louisiana; 19, Indiana; 20, Mississippi; 21, Illinois; 22, Alabama; 23, Maine; 24, Missouri.
- Fourth row—No. 25, Arkansas; 26, Michigan; 27, Florida; 28, Texas; 29, Iowa; 30, Wisconsin; 31, California; 32, Minnesota.
- Fifth row—No. 33, Oregon; 34, Kansas; 35, West Virginia; 36, Nevada; 37, Nebraska; 38, Colorado; 39, South Dakota; 40, North Dakota.
- Sixth row—No. 41, Montana; 42, Washington; 43, Idaho; 44, Wyoming; 45, Utah; 46, Oklahoma; 47, New Mexico; 48, Arizona.

THE ABANDONED FIGHT. Readers of Colliers Weekly, who have been familiar with its editorial section for the past few years, have recently missed the familiar paragraph in the upper right hand corner of the second page hitherto devoted to knocking "booze." For years the campaign has been carried on. The paragraph was always there. Whatever else there was in the magazine, whatever else was discussed editorially, the reader was always sure to find something in this paragraph amounting directly or indirectly to an argument against the use of liquor and in favor of prohibition.

The sudden abandonment of a feature that was gaining more power every week seems strange. The victory was not yet won. Why should the campaign be given up? The victory was not won, but it seemed almost won. We wonder if that was the reason why the work was stopped. It surely looks as if this were so. And we reason it out thus: The United States, at war with Germany, needs a revenue far beyond any former needs with which to carry on the war. Colliers has taken the position that the big part of the revenue should be derived from increased borrowing rather than from more and higher taxes. Internal revenue from the liquor business furnished a big share of the country's income and if this were cut off by national prohibition the chances are that whatever borrowing were resorted to there would still be levied extra taxes to help make up for the loss of the liquor revenue. Colliers does not want this and so it has stopped its fight for prohibition.

We trust that our old friend does not give up its antagonism to patent medicines on the ground that they help furnish revenue.

WHISKEY, NOT BITTERS.

Unwilling to be the "goats," druggists of Bend have denied that bitters purchased of them are responsible for the drunkenness which has occurred in town since the passage of the bone dry law. They say that whiskey is the real offender and that bitters has been named as the culprit because thereby no violation of the law is connoted. It is no crime to sell or have bitters in your possession. With whiskey, however, it is different. You are breaking the law if you have it, and if you bought it in Oregon the vendor is a law breaker. Once whiskey is evident there is a whole chain of law breaking to follow up. So the user who is apprehended asserts that he has been using bitters instead of the interdicted whiskey.

The druggists have a just grievance if conditions are blamed on them when in fact other causes are at fault. No one cares to be named as a law breaker, nor to be charged with assisting others to break the laws when in fact he is doing no such thing. Bend druggists conduct legitimate businesses and they know from their books just how much truth there is in the allegations that it is their sales of bitters that have caused the trouble. If it is whiskey that's at fault it is time the fact were recognized. Then steps should be taken to end its use.

A FIRE ALARM.

The question of a fire alarm raised by Editor Pierson, of The Labor Bender, has been discussed intermittently for years. We agree with him that an alarm is desirable, and if we are to have the best protection, necessary. The only question is, what shall the alarm be, and how obtained?

Undoubtedly it must be some form of noise, bells or whistle. There are only two bells in town, at the high school and on the Baptist church. The latter has probably given the alarm for more fires than any other thing in town. It is centrally located, and served well enough when all our fires were in the business section. There is no one regularly on duty at the church, however, and no quick means of communication, so that for a fire in any outlying section it is practically useless. The school bell is also out of the question. Of whistles there are only those at the mills, and we believe that, because of the interference their use for city fires would cause in their own operations and system of fire protection, the mill companies quite properly prefer not to have them used.

The city might, however, arrange for the installation of an independent whistle at one of the mills to be used for city fires only. Then, with a system of alarms worked out so that one hearing the whistle would know in what part of town the fire was burning, we should be in better shape to protect ourselves against a conflagration.

CLEAN UP YOUR TOWN.

A town looks like its citizens. Is there anything wrong with your town?

Are the back lots filled with rubbish?

Are the basements filled with trash?

Is there rubbish leading to exits that people would have to pass over?

If there are any of these conditions existing, then there is something wrong with your town.

If your tongue was coated, your back ached and you had chills, you would go to a doctor. You would go because you were sick.

Your town is sick. It gets clogged up like your system and is coming to the only doctor it can come to. It is coming to you.

People judge a town by its looks. If there have been any fires in your town from moss on the roof, from defective flues or from rubbish in the basement, it is too bad.

Property that could have been taxed and thus helped to reduce your burden is beyond the power of taxation.

Food that could have been eaten is destroyed.

Gold with all its alchemy can not substitute; it has purchasing power, not food value.

Clean up your town.

It will mean dollars and cents to you.

It may mean the saving of a life.

Your own home may be destroyed by the careless act of a neighbor.

His home is in the same danger as yours.

Sunlight, fresh air and cleanliness never start spontaneous combustion; lack of ventilation and accumulation of filth and dirt will.

This is your town.

You live in it. It is what you make it.

Remove those unsightly and dangerous piles of rubbish.

Clean up and fix up.

This is your home town.—Fire Marshal's Bulletin.

PROVIDING FOR VISITORS.

Auto tourists, again this year, are finding camping places on the banks of the river where they are resting and enjoying the scenery. Undoubtedly as time passes more and more will visit us and stay for a short or a long time depending on the hospitality we show toward them. Is it not worth while to make an effort to keep them here for a long time? Except for activity on the part of the Commercial club two years ago,

SEE ME

Did you ever stop to think of it, just how much your eyes are worth to you? What would you do without them? Treat your eyes square. Treat your eyes right. If you think there is something the matter with your eyes have them examined by one who is competent to treat them. Examination is free. We have our own factory here and are able to do the work.

Optometrist DR. C. H. FRANCIS

with Myron H. Simons, O'Kane Building

SEE BETTER

An engineer setting grade stakes can arouse more speculation than any other form of activity.

The second installment of your subscription to the Red Cross fund is payable today.

The Bear that walks like a man seems to be proficient also in running like a deer.

We have no street cars but women can find employment in Bend factories.

Our old friend, Hostetter, comes pretty near being in the bootlegger class.

The Kaiser to the Crown Prince: "My son, don't you feel a draft?"

The passing of the smoke from the forest fires improves our view.

The weeds must be all drying out of the Oregon feet this summer.

The rain is giving us absent treatment, and it does not work.

Warning to motorists: Observe the traffic law or pay your fine.

Jack Frost has joined the other enemies of the country.

How are the plans for the Bend fair coming along?

Some folks fight booze; others are booze-fighters.

Those Russian women troops must all be Tartars.

Some drafts cause colds; others, cold feet.

METOLIUS RED CROSS CHAPTER RECOGNIZED

(From Thursday's Daily.)

Meeting last night chiefly for the disposal of a mass of routine business, the Bend chapter of the Red Cross formally approved of the organization of a branch chapter at Metolius, the second to be formed since the Culver branch was recognized.

Mrs. W. C. Birdsall was appointed to the position left vacant by the resignation of Mrs. Harry K. Brooks from one of the chapter committees.

BITTERS, NOT WHISKEY.

(From Wednesday's Daily.)

I have noticed the wall of the local druggists in the Bend Bulletin of July 28 and 30, to the effect that it is "whiskey, not bitters" that should be blamed for what drunkenness there is in Bend, and claiming that they "have the legal privilege of selling malt extracts which are virtually five per cent beers."

Anyone reading those publications can easily see why the druggists are so ardently defending their sales of such bitters. Since the bone dry law went into effect, the sale of bitters has increased about 500 per cent, and such a large sale of bitters must necessarily create large profits for the druggists who handle them, as they are sold at \$1.25 per bottle.

These bitters are bottled under different names, the chief among them being Hostetter's Bitters. Hostetter's Bitters are sold in 18 ounce bottles labeled "25 per cent alcohol." If the druggists claim they have a right to sell malt extracts containing "five per cent beers," why do they insist on selling Hostetter's Bitters containing 25 per cent alcohol? The answer is perfectly obvious.

Another statement of the druggists in The Bulletin of the 28th reads as follows: "The druggists of Bend have endeavored from the outset to live up to the spirit of the prohibition law." What is the "spirit" of the prohibition law? Let us analyze it and see. The prohibition law says it shall be unlawful to sell any intoxicating beverage containing more than one-half of one per cent alcohol, yet Hostetter's Bitters con-

tains 25 per cent alcohol, or FIFTY times as much alcohol as the prohibition law allows. Then the druggists try to excuse themselves by saying that Hostetter's Bitters is a "proprietary medicine." The instructions on the bottle says to take two table-spoons full three times a day, and a bottle, containing 18 ounces, would be enough to last about six days when taken as a medicine. Yet the druggists will sell to any customer one or a dozen or more bottles a day, and as many more each succeeding day, they want the people to believe they are selling it as medicine.

Living up to the "spirit" of the prohibition law. If whiskey had printed directions on the bottles to take two table-spoons full three times a day, I presume the druggists could apply the same logic and sell it under the guise of a medicine. I would like to see the ten-year-old school boy who could not tell us why the druggists sell so much bitters as a "medicine."

In the recent cleanup campaign in Bend, over 200 empty Hostetter's Bitters bottles were picked up in one alley. In another alley over 30 empty bottles were picked up. There were from a dozen to fifty or more such empty bottles taken from the rear of many rooming houses in the city, and altogether there were taken to the city dumping grounds approximately one thousand empty Hostetter's Bitters bottles. This condition was not in existence before the bone dry law went into effect. The question naturally arises, if such bitters are so valuable a remedy now since the state has gone dry, why were they not before? Maybe some of the druggists can give us a little enlightenment on this. Time and again I have stood on the sidewalks of Bend and watched drinking men go into the drug stores to buy bitters, and took the bitters away from them as soon as they came out of the stores.

There were ten arrests on and immediately after the past Fourth of July, on the grounds of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and every one of these men swore under oath that they had gotten drunk on Hostetter's Bitters, and there were one or more bottles of Hostetter's Bitters taken off the person of each one of them. Time and again men have been arrested for being drunk, and Hostetter's Bitters were found in their possession, and any one skilled in such things can easily tell when a man is drunk on such bitters or whether he is drunk on whiskey. Do the druggists of Bend want us to believe that these rowdies purchased such bitters for "medicinal purposes," or that they had their pockets full of Hostetter's Bitters as a blind to prevent us from knowing that they had become drunk on whiskey? If so, where was the whiskey?

The police department of Bend, as well as the sheriff's office, are constantly on the lookout for violators of the prohibition law. As fast as they are discovered they are promptly arrested and prosecuted.

If the local pharmacists can substantiate their broad assertion that "liquor is being brought into the city in considerable quantities, and can be readily obtained," they at least owe it to themselves and to the business in which they are engaged, to inform the officers, to the end that they may be no longer made the "goats" in this unfortunate situation.

And if they will inform the police or sheriff's office of that fact, and where it can be found, the violators will be searched out and prosecuted. In such a manner they might thus be able to show that something besides their bitters was causing the drunkenness and thus exonerate themselves to some extent, and to some extent substantiate their claims that "whiskey, not bitters" was causing the drunkenness.

Can the druggists of Bend come forward and swear under oath that they have steadfastly refused to sell such "stomach bitters" to every man who they knew was an habitual drunkard and who would drink anything he could get hold of which had alcohol in it? I challenge them to do so.

L. A. W. NIXON.

Straw 'Reserves' Called Out

THE SECOND "DRAFT" ON STRAW HATS is now in order. Give your poor old yellow straw a furlough. Doubtless it's seen hard service and deserves to be retired.

A. L. FRENCH, The Men's Toggery

The Store That Sets the Pace