

THE DAILY MISSOULIAN

Published Every Day in the Year. MISSOULIAN PUBLISHING CO. Missoula, Montana.

JOS. M. DIXON—Editor and Manager. A. L. STONE—Managing Editor. LOUIS M. THAYER—News Editor.

Entered at the postoffice at Missoula, Montana, as second-class mail matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. (In Advance) Daily, one month \$0.65 Daily, three months 1.85 Daily, six months 3.50 Daily, one year 7.00 Postage added for foreign countries.

TELEPHONE—BELL 455-456 Private Branch Exchange Connecting All Departments.

MISSOULA OFFICE 129 and 131 West Main Street Hamilton Office 221 Main Street, Hamilton, Mont.

MISSOULA PRESS

SUBSCRIBERS' PAPERS. The Missoulian is anxious to give the best carrier service; therefore, subscribers are requested to report faulty delivery at once.

TO ADVERTISERS While The Missoulian takes every reasonable precaution to guard against typographical errors in its advertising columns, printers are but human and we will not be responsible for errors which may inadvertently occur.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1914.

But life is sweet, though all that makes it sweet Lessen like sound of friends' departing feet: And death is beautiful as feet of friend Coming with welcome at our journey's end. —Lowell.

LOOKING UP "It's always morning somewhere."

Our faith in human nature has had a bit of a strain during the past week; we had been flattered ourselves that something of the savage had been eliminated from our systems and it was a rude shock to that belief to see the great nations of Europe rushing to war.

But now comes a manifestation which strengthens our belief once more, that there is more of tenderness in the human heart than there used to be. The telephones of The Missoulian were busy yesterday with inquiries as to the progress of events abroad. But it was noted that there were just as many inquiries as to the condition of the lady of the White House as there were regarding the wars.

The sympathy of the whole nation goes out to Woodrow Wilson in this, his hour of greatest affliction. He is not the president of our country, he is not a statesman, he is not a political friend or foe—he is a fellow being, a comrade in the battle of life, and the hearts of his nation, which is our nation, too, beat in strong sympathy for him that this burden should be added to a load which seemed already too heavy for mortal shoulders to bear.

His sorrow is our sorrow and his grief is our grief. There is no heart so hard as not to soften in this hour. There is no partisanship so bitter as not to yield in this trial.

And to Woodrow Wilson, citizen and comrade, goes the tenderest sympathy that the human heart can yield. Hours like these are times when words cannot express properly or satisfactorily the prompting of the heart. To the man in the White House there pours out a wealth of brotherly love that shows that there is something human left in the heart, after all.

In the gossip before the bulletin boards yesterday, in the inquiries over the telephones, in the queries of personal callers, there was tender regard when the situation in the White House was mentioned. And, later, when the sad message came that the end had come to the gentle lady in the nation's home, there were expressions of sorrow, whose sincerity could not be questioned.

And let us believe that this view of the human heart is the right one; that this phase of human character is the one which most truly portrays it, rather than that its reality is revealed in the passion-torn scenes across the sea. We stand this morning with bowed heads in our sorrow for the man who is thus deprived of a companionship which was beautiful and helpful. We speak our word of sympathy and leave him with his dead and with the sustaining presence of Him who giveth and who taketh away, of Him who doeth all things well. —THE OPTIMIST.

THE CITY DEFIED

Not very long ago, The Missoulian commented upon the action of the city commission in refusing to permit the transfer of a saloon license from a location which had been closed, to some other place on the same street.

The approval with which this action of the council was received was not confined to The Missoulian office. It was shared by all who want to see Missoula a decent town. And we believe the action was approved, too, by the saloon people of the city.

But the action of the council did not prevent the owner of the saloon from going ahead with his plans. He moved his saloon across the street and there, in defiance of the order of the city government, proceeded to establish himself and to resume the business which had been interrupted by the sale of the building he formerly occupied.

Yesterday the commissioners met and formally revoked the license, the manager of the saloon having, meanwhile, been arrested for conducting his business without a license, it being held that the license expired automatically when the old place was closed, the city having refused to sanction its transfer.

There are several points to be considered in this case. The first one is that the state law limits the number of saloons in a city and the number in Missoula is in excess of the legal limit. There have been no new licenses granted here since that law was passed and the number can be brought down to the legal figure only by the revocation or the expiration of licenses in effect.

There are too many saloons in the city for the good of the community. There are too many saloons here for the people in the business, viewed purely from a business standpoint. These are facts which, we believe, will not be disputed. Certainly, they cannot be successfully contradicted.

The city commission has authority to act in this matter. It acted but its authority was defied. As the explanation has been made to The Missoulian, the defense of the manager of the saloon is that he is not the responsible party and that the owner, who is responsible, is now in another city. That is dodging the issue. We don't know what the law is in this matter but we presume the supreme court's policy of a liberal interpretation of the statute will make this plea look cheap.

Missoula doesn't want any more saloons. She does not want as many as she has. And we believe, as has been said, that this desire is shared by the saloon men, themselves.

But the main question which rises in this consideration is the fact that the city has been openly defied by a saloon. We hope the commission will stand pat in this matter. There should be no backing up. The saloon business is none too popular now and its standing is not improved by open defiance of the municipal government.

SENATOR MYERS

We print below a letter from Senator Myers, complaining of a recent article in The Missoulian, entitled "Justice for the Flathead."

Senator Myers evidently wholly misrepresented the spirit of the article in question. Instead of criticizing the senator, we attempted to the best of our ability to give him the full measure of credit in having the house appropriation for the Flathead raised from \$100,000 to \$250,000 in the senate.

In the article in question, we even reprinted the Washington telegraph dispatch telling how after the adoption of the obnoxious rider in the senate drafted by the Indian office, providing for the reference of the whole matter of expenditures in irrigating Flathead lands to the attorney general's office, Senator Myers got busy with Congressmen Evans and Stout among the house members and finally succeeded in defeating the senate rider in the house.

The Indian office officials, in the meanwhile, were using their entire influence to have the obnoxious provision sustained.

We stated in the article, and properly so, that "the powers that be at Washington seem determined to crush both the white settler and the Indian allottee on the Flathead lands. We do not believe their action is inspired through malice, but rather through blind ignorance."

The action of the bureau officials of the Indian office in drafting and securing the adoption by the senate of the rider in question over the vigorous protest of both Senators Myers and Walsh again abundantly corroborates our former statement.

The Indian bureau officials did not ask for a similar limitation for any other Indian reclamation appropriation.

Possibly we may have technically erred in saying that "when the Indian bill was introduced in the house, the commissioner of Indian affairs actually recommended an appropriation for Flathead irrigation, based on an estimate made for merely keeping in repair the ditches and reservoirs already constructed."

As a matter of fact, the Indian bureau officials did call on the reclamation engineers for an estimate as to what it would cost to merely keep in repair the work already done. This is a matter of official record. It is true, that the Indian office officials, in lieu of the \$275,000 appropriated last year, opposed any greater appropriation than \$100,000 for the current year.

If we mistake not, Congressman Evans in his speech in the house, urged the defeat of the obnoxious senate rider, recited all these facts and made the statement that if the house accepted the recommendation of the Indian office, that it would take over 30 years to complete the Flathead irrigation project.

No one in Montana doubts, or has doubted that Messrs. Myers, Walsh, Evans and Stout have each done everything within their power to overcome the hostile attitude assumed by the present Indian bureau officials toward the Flathead irrigation project.

From day to day, The Missoulian news columns have told the story of their efforts. In the editorial in question, we tried to show how they had in a great measure succeeded in over-

coming the hostile opposition of the powers that be at Washington.

When a Michigan senator, working with the Indian bureau officials, raised an objection to Senator Myers acting as conferee, by right of his position as ranking democratic member of the senate committee on Indian affairs and Senator Myers had declined to accept, "if it was believed by one senator that his appointment was unfair and asked that his name be withdrawn as a conferee." The Missoulian said that the senator "allowed his feelings to be hurt too easily."

We still think so.

Senator Myers is a courtly gentleman. If we did not entertain so high regard for him personally, we would not be of the opinion that he has again "allowed his feelings to be hurt too easily" in misinterpreting an article intended in friendly comment of his efforts to overcome an adverse departmental attitude towards the long suffering white settlers and Indian allottees on the Flathead lands.

The senator's letter is as follows: "To the Editor of The Missoulian—In your paper of the 18th instant appeared an editorial entitled 'Justice for the Flathead,' which contained many misstatements of fact and much injustice to me. Generally, I prefer to remain silent under misrepresentations rather than go into print to correct them, but that article contains so much misstatement and injustice that I feel the facts should be given.

In that article you say that the commissioner of Indian affairs recommended an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project, for the coming year, for only sufficient to keep in repair the ditches and reservoirs already constructed. That is not correct. The senator recommended an appropriation of \$100,000, and the house voted just that amount. In the senate that was raised to \$250,000, although I asked for \$100,000.

You state that I am chairman of the senate Indian committee. That is not correct. I am not the chairman, but only a member of that committee.

You state that had I served on the conferee committee, in charge of the Indian appropriation bill, I would have been chairman of the conferee committee. That is not correct. That place belonged to Senator Ashurst, who is chairman of the senate Indian committee.

You state that I declined to serve on the conferee committee to consider the Indian appropriation bill because I allowed my "feelings to be hurt too easily." That is not correct. I had other motives.

You said: "The bill is now in the hands of the enemies of the measure." That is not wholly correct. There were on the conferee committee friends of the project, disposed to get for it the best results possible.

The whole tenor of your article is to the effect that in a feeling of pique or hurt pride I simply laid down and abandoned the Flathead project and the settlers thereon and left them to their fate in the hands of their enemies. That is wholly erroneous. In doing what I did I had in mind a clearly defined plan of action, involving the influence of higher power and influence than any on the conferee committee, which I felt would achieve all of the results that I could achieve on the conferee committee and possibly more and with less friction than if I served on the conferee committee.

After the appropriation for the Flathead project had been increased

in the senate to \$250,000, and on a later day, after three days of debate and struggle and after a number of objectionable amendments to the appropriation had been proposed and defeated, an unjust and obnoxious amendment, requiring a vague opinion of the attorney general of the United States on certain vague matters before any of the money appropriated could be used, was, despite my earnest opposition and vigorous protest, put on the Flathead appropriation. It was intended to cripple the work and would have done so.

I was so incensed at the adoption by the senate of this outrageous amendment that I refused to abide by the action of the senate and straightway went to the house and there conferred with Representatives Evans and Stout about beating it there and ultimately eliminating it in conference, and it was defeated in the house. Word of this reached enemies of the project, in the senate.

When the matter came before the senate for the appointment of conferees to meet house conferees and adjust differences in regard to the Indian appropriation bill between senate and house, according to the usual but not invariable custom of the senate, I was in line to be one of the conferees. Senator Townsend, who had supported the obnoxious amendment which I had fought, opposed my serving as a conferee because I had fought that amendment on the floor of the senate and had refused to abide by the action of the senate but had gone to the house and worked with house members to procure its defeat. His claim was that on account thereof I could not with consistency and propriety go into conference and stand up for the action of the senate and make a fight for the very same amendment about which I had gone to the house and there worked against.

Inferentially he questioned the right of Senator Ashurst to serve on the conferee committee because Senator Ashurst had opposed another amendment, relating to another matter, which had been adopted in the senate. Senator Ashurst immediately met that objection by arising and proclaiming that although he had opposed such other amendment, he would go into conference and fight for it to the last ditch, since it had been adopted by the senate.

That I would not do in regard to the obnoxious Flathead amendment, I had thought it in the senate and followed it to the house and there, in concert with our representatives, laid plans for the defeat of it. I would not go into the conferee committee and there contend for that obnoxious amendment. To have done so would have been to stultify myself. Neither would I promise nor pretend that I would, at the same time not intending to do so.

Senator Townsend's objections simply had the effect of sounding me as to what I would do if I went on the conferee committee and I would not promise to do something which I did not intend to do. Unless I can serve honorably on a conferee committee I do not want to serve on it at all. The only way of which I know of getting things is to get them in a fair, square, straightforward manner. If I can not get them in that

way, I know of no other way which I would be willing to use. I felt that, under the circumstances, if I should go on that conferee committee I would have to stand to the last ditch for that obnoxious amendment and that I would not do. Therefore, I declined to serve on the conferee committee. In doing so I had in mind a method of obtaining what I wanted for the Flathead project and could reasonably expect, which I believe less friction than if I served on the conferee committee. I was satisfied if I served on the conferee committee I could at best but deadlock it on the obnoxious amendment. I believed that off of the conferee committee I could bring influence to bear which, if it did not eliminate the obnoxious amendment, would at least deadlock the conferees on that amendment and throw it back into the senate, where I could be free to fight it in a second contest off of the conferee committee. I did bring to bear upon the conferees a higher influence and the conferee deadlock on the Flathead amendment and it was thrown back into the senate for a second contest. I had reason to believe that upon a second contest it could be defeated. I talked with many senators about it and I believed there would be a better understanding of it upon a second contest. When, as a result of the deadlock, it came back to the senate, Senator Walsh and I succeeded in defeating it by a large majority. This it was completely eliminated, which is all that I could have done with it had I been on the conferee committee.

As to the amount of the appropriation—ultimately it was reduced in conference to \$200,000, and the conferee report was adopted by both house and senate. That is the amount the Flathead project will get for the coming year, without any strings or conditions to hamper its expenditures. That amount is really all I expected to get out of the conferee or had reason to expect to get when the senate increased the appropriation from \$100,000 to \$250,000. These appropriations which are increased by the senate over the house allowance are always cut down some in conference. That has always been the case with the Flathead appropriation. The house would allow so much, the senate would increase it so much and the conferee would make some reduction in the increase. Last year the house allowed \$200,000. The senate voted \$375,000. The conferee resulted in \$325,000. The great handicap this time was that the Indian bureau started off with a recommendation for only \$100,000. It was impossible to more than double that in conference. The house conferees caused the reduction from \$250,000 to \$200,000. Senator Walsh and I appeared before the conferees and the house conferees announced that the bill would fail of passage before they would agree to more than \$200,000; that if \$200,000 should not be agreed upon they would have the house go back to \$100,000. The senate conferees were a bit in standing for \$250,000 so long as there was any use of doing so and for your special information I will say that Senator Lane, who served in my stead

on the conferee committee, held out to the last for \$250,000 and never did give in. He refused to join in making the final report to the senate and refused to sign it, because it did not give the Flathead project \$250,000. I could have done no more had I been in his place.

The obnoxious amendment against which I waged a fight was ultimately eliminated in the senate. Had I served on the conferee committee and eliminated it there, the result would have been in nowise different. As to the amount appropriated, in view of the very low recommendation of the Indian bureau, \$200,000 is all that could be obtained.

The bill in its final form has been adopted by both house and senate and before this letter is well on its way will have been approved by the president. I have waited patiently, before correcting your misstatements about me and the improper construction you put upon my actions, until the final result and until my action should be vindicated by the attainment of every result that could have been attained by a different course. Now that I have obtained by my own methods, the best and most discreet to be pursued in my judgment, all that could have been obtained by any other method, I can see no cause to be critical about methods. The fact that all has been obtained which could possibly have been obtained makes it inconsequential that I pursued different methods from what somebody 2,500 miles away thinks I should have pursued. I suggest that when you may desire to criticize me and characterize me as faithless to my constituents, you should state correctly the facts and I think you should restrain your desire until final results may be obtained and you may be in a position to say upon the whole case, including results, whether or not I have been culpable.

I have given the best efforts of my service here to the Flathead reservation and its interests. I have made it the special object of unceasing labor and effort to the best of my ability, under disadvantageous circumstances. In this I have been loyally supported by Senator Walsh and Representatives Evans and Stout. I am sorry to say there is much hostility in congress to the Flathead reclamation project and apparently some opposition to it in certain administrative quarters. This is something beyond the reach of the Montana delegation and something for which no member of it is responsible. We can only combat it to the best of our ability. I know that the settlers on the Flathead reservation have a number of just complaints and our entire delegation is now conscientiously working on them to the best of its ability and hopes to relieve some of them. I ask the publication of this communication.

H. L. MYERS. Washington City, July 30, 1914.

A GOOD CREED Editor, Missoulian—I have just read your editorial, "Beating the Game," in your valued paper of July 27. I would like to say that the Christian Science Monitor is not in politics, and does

not advocate the views of any political party. It is therefore unfortunate that this impression has gone out. It is always refreshing to look on the bright side of things in the face of seeming obstacles, and this is what Christian Science is doing. Business confidence has been more or less in the balance, and if the Christian Science Monitor saw a brighter outlook, it was right to immediately voice it in order to throw the weight into the right scale, and thus aid the entire country. There is great need for more constructive thinking and since Christian Science stands in the foreground, demanding right thinking, it is natural that Christian Scientists have been subject to closer observation than that which would befall other individuals who do not stand for the teachings of Christian Science.

Very sincerely yours, WILLIAM C. KAUFMAN, Christian Science Committee on Publication for Montana. Great Falls, Aug. 1, 1914.

COMMUNICATION

Editor Missoulian—The residents of East Cedar street, across the Rattlesnake, would like to thank Mr. W. Beacom, street commissioner, for his kindness in putting back the little foot bridge across Rattlesnake creek, said bridge having been put there by Mr. Price, but owing to the high water had to be taken down and also for speaking a good word to changing lights, said change to be made when new Cedar street bridge is finished. For several blocks East Cedar street would be in total darkness if the change were not made. For these little things we are grateful as they mean a great deal to the East Cedar street people. A SUBSCRIBER. AUG. 4, 1914.

PROVIDENCE GETS PRINTERS' MEET

Providence, R. I., Aug. 6.—All arrangements have been completed for the reception and entertainment of the hundreds of delegates and visitors who will be in Providence next week for the convention of the International Typographical union. It will be the 60th annual session of the organization and will be attended by representatives of local unions throughout the United States and Canada. The sessions will begin Monday and continue until the end of the week. A large amount of routine business is to be transacted and some proposed amendments to the constitution are to be considered. But so far as is known no matter involving any important change in the policy of the organization is to be brought before the convention this year.

Bruce McRae is to have the feature part in "Newly Married," the Edgar Selwyn farce which will tour the principal cities the coming season.

Aluminum Steam Cooker. THIS NINE-PIECE SET. Is made of pure sheet aluminum of a hard, thick grade, superior to anything in the market. DIRECTIONS: How to Make a Roast, Bean Baker and Cereal Cooker, This Set Makes a Perfect Steam Cooker, Vegetable Acids Do Not Affect Aluminum, Boston Baked Beans. Regular Retail Price \$4.00. The Missoulian Offers this handsome set of aluminum ware to its subscribers who pay one year's subscription in advance, for additional, only \$1.65. By Mail, Add Ten Cents. The Daily Missoulian for one year and the nine-piece Aluminum Steam Cooker for \$8.65. THE DAILY MISSOULIAN