The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.
Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(By Mail.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Weekly, one year	1.50
Sunday, one year	2.50
Sunday and weekly, one year	3.50

(By Carrier.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	9.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75

How to Remit—Send postoffice money order, express order or personal check on your local bank. Stamps, coin or currency are at the sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

Postage Rates—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 16 to 28 pages, 2 cents; 30 to 44 pages, 3 cents; 46 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage double rates.

Eastern Business Office—The S. C. Beckwith Special Agency—New York, rooms 48-50 Tribune building. Chicago, rooms 510-512 Tribune building.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1909.

THE HUGHES PLAN.

The effort of Governor Hughes, of New York, to make the direct primary stand for the will of the people—and for the will of the political parties through which the people are represented—is excellent in intent and purpose. It is admitted by Governor Hughes, as by all other sane men, that there must be leaders of the people and leaders of parties. His point is that the people are to choose their leaders, and not permit ambitious men to usurp that function. Very well. But how is it to be accomplished?

An outline of the plan proposed by Governor Hughes and his supporters is offered, by which an effort is to be made, first, to assure the leadership of parties to the masses that compose them, and to bring the men of light and leading in parties to the front; and second, to prevent members of one party from nominating the candidates of another;—which is one of the intolerable consequences of every direct primary law hitherto attempted. The chief parts or points of the plan urged by Governor Hughes, and of the bill offered in the Legislature of New York by his friends, are thus summarized:

Designation of candidates for nomination by party committees instead of the convention system.

All candidates for party committees are to be nominated by petition only, signed by a specific number of enrolled voters, and are to be elected annually.

The basis of representation of each committeeman is made proportionate to the vote cast in his district for the candidate of his party for Governor at the preceding Gubernatorial election.

The state committee may be elected from Congressional, Senatorial or Assembly districts, as the parties may for themselves determine.

There is to be an official primary ballot, with the names of all the candidates grouped under the title to the office and numbered consecutively, the party candidates receiving a preferential position.

All primaries are to be held on the same day, and there is to be general enrollment throughout the state.

Party platforms are to be framed by a party council to consist of the members of the state committee and the candidates nominated for state offices.

Provision is made for severe punishment for attempted corruption at the primaries, and the lavish expenditure of money is restrained by provisions limiting and defining the purposes for which money may be expended.

To the requirements stated in the last paragraph everybody must agree. But as to the rest, what is this elaborate plan? Party committees are to take the place of the convention system. This would maintain a system for enforcement of party principles, through party action, and the party platforms would be put forth by the committees instead of by conventions. But the selection of the committees would fall back upon the activity and skill of party leaders and workers, the same as selection of delegates to conventions heretofore.

Is it to be supposed that the masses of a party would take more interest in the selection of members of the committees than they have taken hitherto in the election of delegates to conventions?

The object of the direct primary, as developed by its results, is to destroy leadership in politics. It will fail, of course. In all the affairs of men there must be leadership. The Hughes plan would make but a slight change of method; the result would be the same. What the Republicans are trying today in Portland is virtually, the Hughes method. A committee is to "suggest" party candidates. It is all right. It is, however, the convention system, the representative system, in a new dress or under a new name. And it's right so far; for it is impossible to get away from the representative system, which presupposes leaders and leadership, composed of men of intellectual activity, fittest and strongest and of best qualifications;—yet such leadership it is the purpose of the direct primary to destroy, and to substitute for it nincompoop leadership, which disgusts all people of intelligent purpose, makes them turn away from their party in contempt and vote for its opposites, or remain silent. The effect of the direct primary, whatever its purpose, is to eliminate the brainy leadership of the dominant party in a state, and to reduce it to pitiful impotence, such as that witnessed in the Republican party of Oregon, since this scheme or method was adopted.

A GULLIBLE HISTORIAN.

Signor Guglielmo Ferrero can see things in the backward and abysm of time a good deal clearer than what lies under his nose. The Literary Digest has translated some remarks which the eminent historian made about this country after his return to Italy, and they certainly do sound as if somebody had been fooling the man who penetrated so deeply into the wiles of Cleopatra. Take this for an example and imagine with what a thrill of horror Mr. Bryan must have perused it: "The real masters of the great Republic are not the millionaires, nor the trusts, nor the politician class, but the people." Do the people rule? Indeed they do, replies Signor Ferrero; but the average American citizen would reply, "Indeed they don't," and one inclines to wager that the man who pays the bills which the trusts heap up for him knows rather more about it than does the Italian savant. There are some things which life teaches better than books.

Another of his observations reads queer to one who is to the manner born and knows where the shoe pinches. "Every class, high and low, is conscious of genuine equality. This is the explanation of the comparative simplicity in which the great capitalists live. The people would resent and refuse to tolerate a display of magnificence which is merely individual and egotistical." Sancta Simplicitas. As for the simplicity in which our millionaires live it has never been noticeable. Their automobiles, their $100,000 dinners, their $5,000,000 palaces do not speak of simplicity exactly. It is probably true that no aristocracy in the world was ever so arrogantly lavish of display and so recklessly wasteful as is our coterie of millionaires. What the American people would tolerate from the plutocrats is not for a foreigner to say nor is it easy to guess how they would abolish this display of wealth no matter how much they disliked it. If Signor Ferrero had taken pains to study our governmental system a little he would have discovered that it is the courts and not the people whose wishes are decisive on questions of property.

WILL SIMON BE THE CANDIDATE?

It seems to The Oregonian most likely that Joseph Simon will be nominated for Mayor. It knows he does not want to be Mayor, yet it believes he would accept. Moreover, if he should be a candidate, The Oregonian would recommend his election, on the ground of his fitness for the position. His knowledge of our municipal affairs is equal to that of any man, and in such affairs he has tact and judgment unsurpassed. It is on this ground that The Oregonian would support him, and expect his election.

It may be supposed that, if a candidate, he will be the Republican candidate; but it is not on that ground that The Oregonian would urge his election. The city needs a man for Mayor who is a man of affairs; a man who understands its municipal life, and can be depended on for clarity of judgment and firmness of purpose. It is an era in our history when best judgment in business and fullest knowledge of the requirements of municipal administration are needed. Who can meet these requirements better than Joseph Simon?

It may be alleged against him, and doubtless will be, that in our municipal and political affairs years ago his course was deemed by many open to criticism and censure. But times change, and men are changed with them. Like all men, as they grow older, Mr. Simon must turn away from the past, to the present and to the future. Men may say about him one thing or another. But it never will be asserted that he is not competent for this office, or that he has used political opportunity or official position for his own pecuniary profit. The Oregonian believes that, though he cannot want the office, he will accept nomination for it, if tendered with practical unanimity. The election will be in the hands of the people. The Oregonian cares not to say more now, but will say more hereafter, should occasion call for it.

ECONOMY IN PRACTICE.

The relations between Mr. E. H. Harriman and the United States Government have not always been of the most pleasant character, and for that reason there may be some bias in the opinions that the railroad magnate may venture regarding the Government. For all that, Mr. Harriman's recent remarks about the prodigal wastefulness of the Government in conducting its business were not devoid of merit. It was this enormous waste, caused by lack of business sense in the administration of public affairs, that has made a considerable portion of the deficit which we are now facing. Mr. Harriman's right to offer expert criticism is fully demonstrated by the remarkable showing which he is making with his "Pacifics." The reports of these roads for February and for the eight months ending with February have just appeared, and they offer an interesting study in economy practically applied.

Business on the Southern Pacific was so much poorer than for the eight months ending with February, 1908, that there was a deficit in gross earnings of $6,046,764. Had Mr. Harriman operated his road by the same extravagant system that the Government business was operated, this deficit would have remained in evidence in the final accounting, as it remains with the Government. But the application of business methods, by cutting the suit to fit the cloth, enabled Mr. Harriman to reduce operating expenses for the eight months to the extent of $10,425,667, thus transforming a $6,046,764 loss in gross revenue into a gain of nearly $4,000,000 net revenue. On the Union Pacific there was a comparatively trifling increase of $218,795 in gross revenues, but a decrease of $4,936,369 in operating expenses swelled that trifling increase to more than $4,700,000.

Incidentally this transformation of a $6,000,000 decrease on the two roads into an increase of $8,000,000 in net revenues is a striking manner demonstrates the value of the enormous investment made in betterments on the two roads. The expediture of more than $100,000,000 in rebuilding these roads was at the time regarded by many practical railroad men as a dangerous extravagance from which adequate revenues could never be secured; but the expenditure has been more than justified since the decreasing traffic has made retrenchment necessary. The administration of Government affairs may never reach the degree of perfection that is noticeable in the railroad business, but there could be an enormous saving effected if these business methods were only partly used.

OBJECT LESSON IN PROTECTION.

The steel trust, the most prominent member of our large family of infant industries, which have not yet been weaned from the protection pap bottle on which they long have nourished, is unintentionally presenting some excellent arguments against continuation of the present protection which it enjoys. A London cable announces acceptance by the Glasgow Corporation of a bid by the Lorain Steel Corporation to supply tram rails and fish plates at $29.50 per ton delivered in Glasgow harbor. The next lowest bid submitted was that of an English firm which has hitherto supplied nearly all of Glasgow's requirements. Its bid was $41 for the rails and $60 for the fishplates. The stock argument against reduction in the steel tariff is that it would necessitate reduction in the wages of the American steelworkers in order to meet the competition of the foreigners.

This argument is quite effectually disposed of when an American concern can ship steel rails 800 miles by rail and 3000 miles by water and deliver them to the foreign consumer at nearly $12 per ton less than they can be sold by the cheap labor concerns against which our infant industries demand so much protection. The American rail buyer also has in this transaction a glimpse of what effect the protective tariff has on his interests. These rails, which are laid down in Glasgow at a cost of $29.50 per ton, delivered, are unobtainable at the mills in this country for less than $28 per ton. The rail and steamer freight from Lorain to Glasgow, including rehandling at tidewater, will cost more than $5 per ton.

This transaction is only one of many constantly being negotiated, in large part of them the discrepancy between the American price and the foreign price being much more pronounced. To this fact is probably due the attitude of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Schwab regarding the tariff on steel. "I believe in a reduction," said Mr. Schwab. "I feel just as Andrew Carnegie does on that matter. American labor can make the best steel in the world, and with it we can compete with the world. I know that the American workmen can produce more steel in a given time than any others in the world. We have nothing to fear from a cut in duties because we have the best goods. It is true that we pay our workmen more money than any other nation, but you always have to pay skilled workmen the highest wages."

In view of the dire predictions regarding the effect of tinkering with the sacred tariff and the fear expressed that there would be no employment for the American steelworker until the matter was settled, it is interesting to note the present condition of the market. The volume of business in fabricated and structural steel for the month of March was the largest ever recorded in a single month. At the close of the month there were pending orders for more than 120,000 tons of steel rails. With these facts considered, there is excellent reason for believing that our representative infant industry will survive any treatment which it may receive at the hands of the tariff revisionists.

THE DISORGANIZED DEMOCRATS.

More striking than anything else, perhaps, in the current debate upon the Payne tariff bill is the evidence of a moral relaxation in every section of the country which it brings to the front. No industry is willing to rely upon itself. No man engaged in farming, maufacturing or the exploitation of natural resources is brave enough to depend upon his own exertions. They all demand help from the Government. They all urge their god-given right to tax the whole country for the support of their particular business. This is, of course, exactly what we ought to have expected from the long course of education our business men have undergone in the relaxing effects of a prohibitive tariff; still the spectacle is a sad one. The good old American spirit of self-reliance and manly independence seems to have disappeared and one is almost moved to fear that it has gone forever. Every man hopes to get rich by taxing his neighbors. Nobody is willing to undertake to accumulate a competence through his own unaided efforts. When our natural resources are exhausted, as they will be within a few years at the present rate of consumption, we shall behold in its full beauty the consequence of trying to get rich by robbing one another through tariff schedules.

In this process of mutual plunder the Democrats are quite as eager as anybody else. Belonging as they do to a party which has no principles, they are free to indulge in a far wilder liberty of exploitation than the Republicans. The latter are somewhat under the rein of party obligation. They have given pledges to the country which their leaders feel compelled to keep, and the sense of public duty on the part of their foremost men restrains the eagerness of individuals for local pickings from the tariff table. Mr. Cushman, of Washington, for instance, thinks the earth will stop turning on its axis and the pole star shoot shrieking from its sphere if the duty on lumber is lowered. Still the President and the party chieftains in the House say it must be lowered, and Mr. Cushman hushes his disquiet the best he can. There are times when even the most rampant individualists must admit that party discipline is an excellent thing and one of those times emerges when the tariff is about to be revised downward in the face of a hundred hungry beggars who have been pauperized by decades of public alms. Nothing but the party whip vigorously laid on will quiet their ravenous growls.

Unfortunately for the Democrats they have neither party whip nor those binding party principles which might with conscientious men take the place of a lash. Their membership in the House illustrates all the delectable incidents of anarchy. Their leader is little better than a harlequin. Their party men are united by no common belief, nor are they animated by any common purpose. Each acts by himself in a strenuous effort to grab all he can from the public for his particular district. Concerning these hungry Democrats but a single general truth can be stated, which is that they are more thoroughgoing protectionists than the Republicans as far as their local interests are concerned. They are willing to sacrifice nothing but the general welfare of the country. This they would trade with a whoop of joy for a duty on lemons or figs, or whatever it is that their constituents happen to raise or make. The fact is so plain to everybody that it needs no emphasis that a downward revision of the tariff must necessarily diminish the protection on some articles. Somebody must cease to extort quite as much as he now does from his fellow citizens. Naturally no participant in the delightful privilege of taxing his neighbors wishes to lose his share, and yet, unless some of them do lose their shares in whole or part, the tariff must remain as it is.

Here is where the great benefit to the country of a party with consistent tariff revision principles would come in. Its influence would strengthen enormously the hands of Mr. Taft and those sincere Republicans who are striving for an honest revision, because they could say to the recalcitrants, "Unless we reduce the tariff the country will turn the job over to the Democrats." But as things are no such threat can be made since the country knows from past experience and present indications that there are no Republicans so greedy for tariff favors as the disorganized and unprincipled Democrats. When the party was given power on a tariff reform platform, it produced the Wilson bill, a veritable abortion, which betrayed every hope of the honest revisionists. At the present juncture the Democrats are repeating the performance of the Wilson bill as nearly as may be. Each man is grabbing for what he can get. Each listens eagerly for an opportunity to trade favors with the protected trusts. For an example of utter and shameless debauchery of morals, commend us to the Democratic forces in the present Congress. From the hurly-burly one shining truth stands out unmistakably. If we obtain any relief from the oppressions of the tariff it will be through the efforts of Mr. Taft. His sense of public honor and his desire for the general welfare will undoubtedly accomplish something, but for whatever is done no thanks will be due to the Democrats. Besides the petty interests of their particular districts they care for one thing only, and that is such base partisan advantage as they can snatch here and there as the Payne bill progresses. It is a sad spectacle to see a once great party reduced to this miserable condition, but the fact is as it is and it must be faced.

The Government crop report, giving the condition of the growing grain in the United States will appear today. If it is as bearish as the March report on "stocks in farmers' hands," there should follow a slump in the wheat market. This, of course, is contingent on the speculative public placing any credence in the report. That the foreign buyers who are actually in need of wheat, which is scarce the world over, are not much disturbed by the possible bearishness of the report was noticeable in yesterday's market. In the face of the uncertainty that always precedes the appearance of a Government report, the Liverpool market advanced 3 cents per cental yesterday, and a cargo of Walla Walla wheat from Portland sold at the highest price of the season. Meanwhile the Pacific Northwest, with very little old wheat on hand, is viewing with pleasure the excellent conditions of the growing crop, which already promises to reach bumper proportions.

It is, of course, very appropriate for woman, lovely woman, to make this vigorous protest against the increased duty on gloves, hosiery, perfumery, etc., but what's the matter with the tariff on woolen goods? To be sure, some of the woolen apparel worn by women does not attract much attention, but it costs money just the same. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, our imports of woolen dresses and dress goods for women and children reached a total valuation of $9,135,687 and the duties collected thereon amounted to $9,232,854, or something more than 100 per cent. Some of the American women can get along without gloves and can wear cotton hose, but most of them have use for woolen or near-woolen goods, and it would seem strange that they have not made more fuss over the heavy duty on these goods than over that on something not so necessary to their comfort and health.

A grave duty confronts the man who has taken Esther Mitchell from the asylum at Stellacoom and assumed her care and control. The wisdom of taking her back to the place where her reason became unsettled through indecent and cruel play upon her religious emotions may be doubted. Yet as the man who was the greatest sufferer through the practices of the "Holy Rollers" is willing to undertake the task and face the consequences, there seems to be no valid reason why he should not take the strangely misguided young woman home and assume responsibility for her future actions. Indeed, the disposition to do so, in view of all the circumstances, is an exhibition of a kind and courageous spirit on the part of O. V. Hurt, of Corvallis. It can only be hoped that he will be equal to any emergency that may arise in the performance of this self-appointed task.

"About every Democrat who can find anything in his district that needs or asks for Federal nursing is a protectionist." Thus does the new York Sun epitomize the course of action of the Democratic members of Congress. It is noticeable, also, that all Democratic newspapers in Oregon have ceased to howl against "tariff robbery." Because "George" is going to "stand in" for "protection of the industries and interests of Oregon." The true free-trade or revenue tariff doctrine is to be had only from independents here and there—more of them of Republican than of Democratic antecedents.

The Pennsylvania Legislature has passed a law prohibiting the sale of "rots and spots," as spoiled and cracked eggs are termed. A law of this kind in Oregon would be highly desirable from a pure-food standpoint, but at certain seasons of the year it would cause a famine in the ham-and-egg industry at popular-price restaurants, and it would also work a hardship on theater-goers who might wish to vent their displeasure on some "ham" Hamlets. In other words, there would be no eggs to throw at the Hamlets or in the omelettes.

The French newspaper correspondents complain bitterly that Colonel Roosevelt talks about nobody and nothing but himself. It is high treason with Frenchmen for anybody to talk of anybody but themselves.

"The restless action of a people already great, but still childish." This is a French estimate of the American people as personified by Theodore Roosevelt. For an offhand estimate it is not greatly out of line.

That assembly will meet today to name the next Mayor of Portland, and other city officers. That is what it meets for. But we'll know more about it in June.

Hereafter in Nebraska saloons may be open only between 7 A. M. and 8 P. M. Evidently the early-to-bed movement is well under way in Nebraska.

Mrs. Taft prefers the Jersey and has one to keep down the grass on the White House lawn. This is one more item showing Mr. Taft's wisdom.

ORATORY IN NEW TARIFF DEBATE

How Will It Compare With Forensic Efforts of Other Decades?

Washington (D. C.) Star, Rep.

Will the present tariff debate inspire any brilliant oratory—produce any masterful treatment of the subject?

Twenty-five years ago Colonel Morrison of Illinois introduced his famous horizontal tariff bill. He himself was not an orator, and his lieutenants had to do the talking. Frank Hurd of Ohio was the most brilliant of the number, and his speech was a fine specimen of his best powers. It was heard by a packed chamber, and loudly applauded. The bill was killed through a Democratic defection, led by Samuel J. Randall.

Roger Q. Mills was the leader of the House in the 50th Congress, and reported a tariff bill. He was a speaker of power, and succeeded in passing his bill through the House. There was some excellent debate, but no speech on either side of the chamber stood out as of the highest quality.

It was in the 51st Congress, which followed the election of General Harrison, that a memorable tariff debate took place. William McKinley was the leader of the majority and John G. Carlisle the leader of the minority. Mr. McKinley's first lieutenant was Nelson Dingley, and Mr. Carlisle's Roger Q. Mills. It was an exceptionally strong quartet. But the most telling speech was made by Thomas B. Reed, who descended from the chair for the purpose. He cared little for ornament, and was prejudiced against oratorical display, but on this occasion he spoke at some length and with thorough preparation. His satirical description of the free-trader going into action produced almost five minutes' of laughter, the Democrats themselves joining in it heartily. During the debate Mr. Carlisle was transferred to the Senate, and when the bill reached that body he discussed it in a speech which was greatly admired.

The ablest speech in favor of the Wilson bill in 1894 was made by the author. He was a scholarly man and a close reasoner, and while he left a sick bed to close the debate and spoke with his head heavily bandaged, he acquitted himself brilliantly. In the Senate, where the bill was picked to pieces, the most noteworth speech was that of David B. Hill, which, however, concerned itself more with the constitutionality of the income tax provision than with the general tariff problem. The Supreme Court afterward sustained Mr. Hill's position.

The debate on the Dingley bill produced no showy speeches on either side. The desire was for early action, and figures of speech were subordinated to arithmetical figures.

Are there among the new members Hurds and Reeds and McKinleys and Carlisles awaiting their chance? And is there anything in the topic now tempting to old members? A man may be an old member either of the House or Senate and enjoying his first opportunity to talk tariff to a practical point. Twelve years have passed since the Dingley bill was debated and became a law.

WOMAN LOSES $2000 AT BRIDGE

Society Folks Gamble During Entire Trip of an Ocean Liner.

Paris Dispatch to the New York World.

There was high play at bridge whist on the Kronprinzessin Cecilie during every day of the voyage just ended. Those who were the steamer's passengers, who have arrived here, are still talking excitedly about the gambling.

For it was done not by men in the ship's smoking-room, but by three fashionable New York women who are as well-known in London and Paris society as in New York.

Of the three, she who won a large amount, is of a Knickerbocker family, daughter-in-law of a very wealthy man whose fortune, founded in California, has been vastly increased in New York. One of the losers is wife of a leading New York banker; the other loser is her married sister.

These three and a male friend, who chanced to be aboard, played bridge almost continuously from the time the steamer left New York. Whatever the stakes were, the broker's wife and her sister lost steadily. They played partners probably, for toward the voyage's end the broker's wife said to a friend:

"I intend to insist on my sister getting out of the game. She cannot afford to lose so much. I shall keep in it, but, hereafter, we will take turns at having a dummy as a partner."

On the last day of the voyage the banker's wife was on deck, seemingly much perturbed.

"I am $2000 loser," she confided to a friend, and added bitterly, "I hadn't any idea of losing so much."

All the passengers heard rumors of a big game going on and were intensely interested. But, as far as they could learn, nothing ruffled the players' serenity; the millionaire's daughter-in-law put her winnings in her purse most politely; the losers parted with their money most agreeably.

ONE DAY'S WORK OF 75-YEAR-OLD

Unusual Speaking Experience of Ex-President Eliot, of Harvard.

Harvard Bulletin.

The recent visit of President Eliot to the University of Texas and the city of Austin is typical of his experiences during his stay of 10 days in Texas. To judge from the newspaper accounts his visit to Dallas, Austin, San Antonio, College Station, Houston and Galveston have been one long ovation.

His programme at the University of Texas and at Austin was as follows: At 10 o'clock in the morning there was a presentation of the faculties of the university to President Eliot in the regent's room; at 10:15 o'clock there was an educational conference which lasted half an hour, and then the invited guests were presented to Mr. and Mrs. Eliot; at 11 o'clock the party moved to the auditorium to listen to an address by President Eliot; on the conclusion of this address President Eliot inspected the university, and at 1:30 o'clock he was entertained by President Mezes of the University of Texas at a luncheon; at 4:30 o'clock he addressed both houses of the Texas Legislature, and at 5 o'clock gave another address on municipal government under the auspices of the Business League; at 7 o'clock he was present at a dinner given by the Harvard men in the various faculties of the Uiversity of Texas. Early next morning he left for San Antonio.

No Red Light on Cow's Tale.

Wilkesbarre Dispatch to the Philadelphia Record.

Cows and pedestrians have the right of way over automobiles, Alderman Donohue, of this city, has decided. He was trying Charles Russel, an automobilist, of Scranton, charged by Jacob Lieb with running down a cow and injuring it at a street crossing in this city. Lieb wanted $65 damages. Russell declared the cow and Lieb had no right of way, but Donohue decided that they had, and Lieb was not required to hang a red light at the cow's tail, either. He fined Russell $4 and costs for using profane language, and continued the damage case.

Spring Fever.

Louisville Courier-Journal.

When I peruse the seedman's book,
That handy guide,
And at the tempting pictures look,
Then I decide
To purchase hoe and spade and rake
And gleefully a garden make.

But when the poultry book I read,
See Wyandottes
And Plymouth Rocks of stately breed
In handsome lots,
I feel I really cannot sleep
'Till I begin to chickens keep.

NORMAL WORK AT MONMOUTH

Student Body Issues Letter on Behalf of the School.

The following statement in behalf of the Monmouth Normal School has been sent to The Oregonian with request to print:

The student body of the Oregon State Normal School at Monmouth requests the courtesy of a hearing in regard to the Normal School controversy. We feel that our school and its faculty and students have been grossly wronged not only in the failure of the Legislature to provide support but in the unjust and untrue statements published in many papers.

The Monmouth school has been operated since January 1, 1907, without state funds. In addition, great publicity was given the fact that the Board of Regents had closed the institution in 1907 for lack of funds and little notice taken of the fact that the same board accepted large donations from friends of the Normal and reopened it in August, 1907. These facts coupled with the natural fear of students and their parents that the school might be unable to complete the year, combined to shake confidence and make a handicap almost insuperable.

In spite of all these reverses, the old "Monmouth spirit" rose to the occasion and alumni and friends raised and paid into the state treasury $6000 to enable the regents to carry on the school during the year 1907-8. The local school district doubled its special tax and added $5000. Tuition receipts amounted to more than $3000. The faculty donated in salary reductions $5000, making a total provision of $19,000 for the year's budget, not one cent of which was supplied by the state.

A similar plan was followed for the present year 1908-9, only of necessity the resources were more limited. The local school district paid the salaries of the principal and the training department and of the four critics, and other expenses to the amount of $5000. Seven additional instructors were employed, five accepting the mere pittance of $50 a month, and two, President Ressler and Mr. Butler, donating their services. The teachers' salary sacrifice this year amounts to nearly $6000. Tuition receipts will be about $2500. The cash donations will amount to over $3000, making a total for the year of about $17,000, with not a penny from the state.

Last year Monmouth students paid $25 tuition, double the charges made at the other State Normal Schools and at the State University and Agricultural College. This year the students have cheerfully paid the same fee and when the regular session of the Legislature adjourned without making an appropriation, a student mass meeting was called, when 110 students subscribed over $1400 in order that the school should not be closed. Practically all of us are self-supporting and yet we gladly put up our hard-earned money, both because we want Normal training and because we mean to stand by our school to the very last.

We are also self-respecting and resent bitterly the unfair and untrue charges against our school. We know and every fair-minded person may know by the least investigation that Monmouth is and has been a bona fide Normal School. Under the adverse conditions 48 graduates were sent out last year and there will be over 40 the coming June. Of last year's senior class, 45 are now teaching, two are students in college and one is married. Ninety-three of last year's 174 students are known to be teachers. Most of the remaining have returned to school this year. Ninety-one and eight-tenths per cent of the graduates during the past five years are still teaching and the percentage for the whole 27 years is over 60.

These and other reliable and authentic statistics have been published from year to year and are available to all. Our school and its good name and reputation are the capital of graduates and students, and the loss of the capital through abuse and misrepresentation means bankruptcy. Monmouth cannot be crushed. Like Truth, "though crushed to earth, she will rise again." Very truly yours,

THE STUDENT BODY.
By P. M. Stroud, Pres't.
Mary Whitney, Sec'y.

LOTS OF AMERICANS MOVE ABOUT

Change to One City for Residence and to Another for Trade.

Delineator.

The extent of our migration to and fro in the United States is seldom realized. A few facts will suggest the general condition. One-sixth of the white population of the city of Washington changes every year, while the change of the colored population is even more extensive. In a quarter century, Los Angeles has grown from a few thousands to a great city. Mobile and Memphis have doubled twice in the 13 years from 1893 to 1906. In our census we count only the net growth or the net loss. In many instances thousands move out annually while more thousands move in. A generation ago the men were in great excess in Muskegon, Mich., because of the lumber industry, while now there is an equally great excess of women, due to textile factories; and yet the population of the city is not much greater than in the former period.

Before the Civil war, and for some years after it, the migrations of our people were almost all westward, and few but the poor or the young changed their homes. Now our well-to-do families are on the move; and not a few of them migrate eastward. Some sections of the country are building up for one reason while others are building up for an opposite reason. Almost no one ever moves to Washington, D. C., to go into business, or to practice a profession or a trade; and almost no one ever moves to Buffalo or to Portland, Or., for any other reason. Washington, D. C., is the grave of young men who are lost in the departmets of Government, but it is the top of the world for old men who wish to retire and still keep an interest in life. On the other hand, Chicago is even today, with all its development, a very live place for the young man, but a very good place for the old man to get out of or to keep away from.

Ballot Education Needed.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

Evidently there is need for a school of instruction for voters. Many ballots were spoiled in the recent primary here. In the Fourth ward one man did not pay any attention to the names of the candidates on the ballot, but wrote: "I vote for Allaman for Mayor, for Fogt for Councilman, for R. Fred White for School Board, and I don't give a d—n for the rest." He even dated the ballot.

An Omar Parade.

Denver Republican.

Suggestion for the lineup of an Omar Khayyam parade in Bohemia, on the hundredth birthday of Edward FitzGerald, translator of the "Rubaiyat":

Omar Khayyam Drum Corps
(Drums muffled to give effect of distant rumbling).
Heroic Figure, representing Omar reading Book of Verses Underneath the Bough.
Bacchantes on Foot, Each Bacchante bearing a large Jug of Wine and Small Loaf of Bread.
Gilded Cage Containing Bird of Time.
Writers of Unread Version of Omar, Headed by Dick LeGallienne.
Large Float Containing Seven Tons of Uncut Omars. Written by the Preceding Translators.
Automobiles Containing Omar Khayyam Lecturers, and Composers Who Have Set the Quatrains to Music.
Tentmakers' Quartet, Giving Vocal Selections.
Extra Large Float Containing Omar Khayyam Properties, Consisting of One Moon, One Fire of Spring, Several Winter Garments of Repentance (slightly worn), Seven Roseless Rose Bushes, Eleven Guests, Star Scattered on Stage Grass and one Large Grape Arbor. Entire Float Shaded by Black Canopy Labelled Gloom.
Procession of Omar Khayyam Parodists, in Chains.
Float Containing One Potter, Making Imperfect Vessels of Clay, Which Are Cast to the Multitude.
Distillers and Brewers, Carrying Banner Showing How Omar Has Boosted Business.
Cages Containing Quatrain Misquoters.

Life's Sunny Side

A woman who visited the British Museum, at London, recently, inquired of an attendant: "Have you no skull of Cromwell? I have been looking all around for a skull of Oliver Cromwell."

"No, madam," replied the attendant. "We've never had one."

"How very odd!" she exclaimed. "They have a fine one in the museum at Oxford."—Ladies' Home Journal.

* * *

"Got any work this mornin,' Mistah Boyd?" asked old Billy Bulger, sure in the knowledge that no work would be intrusted to him.

"No," was the response, and then, before Billy could ask for the customary contribution, "but wait a minute. Lawyer Phillips has owed me $20 for 20 years. Collect it, and I'll give you half." The merchant, knowing how bad was the debt, winked at a waiting customer.

The old man found the lawyer in the middle of a group of prospective clients and influential citizens. Thrusting through the group he called in stentorian tones:

"Mistah Phillips, suh!"

"Well?" queried the lawyer, much annoyed.

"Mistah Boyd done tell me that you've owed him $20 for about 100 years, and kin you pay him, suh?"

The lawyer hurried to Billy's side.

"You idiot," he said sotto voice, "do you want to ruin my business? Here!" and he thrust a $10 bill into the old man's hand.

Back to the merchant toddled the old man.

"Well, Billy," said the merchant, "did you get it?"

The old man grinned.

"I got my half, all right," he chuckled; "but you'd better look out when you go back to get your half—he's right smart hot over it, suh!"—Success.

* * *

Maud (at reception)—How wonderfully composed Ethel looks this afternoon.

Belle—Naturally. It took her over two hours.—Boston Transcript.

* * *

Dr. P. S. Henson once delivered his lecture on "Fools" at the New York Chautauqua. In introducing him Bishop Vincent said:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we are now to listen to a lecture on 'Fools' by one" (the audience broke into a roar of laughter, and after it had died away Biship Vincent added) "of the most brilliant men in America."

Dr. Henson rose and with a genial smile said: "Ladies and gentlemen, I am not so great a fool as Bishop Vincent" (another roar of laughter, after which the speaker added) "would have you believe."—Cleveland Leader.

* * *

At one time both Montague Matthews and Matthew Montague were members of the British House of Commons. Mr. Matthews was a big, powerful giant of a man. Mr. Montague was thin and emaciated. The Speaker frequently confused the two.

"I can't understand it," said Montague Matthews. "There's as much difference between us as there is between a horse chestnut and a chestnut horse."—Everybody's.

* * *

A friend was once talking with a crazy woman, when a stingy man passed by.

"Do you see that man?" said she, with a cunning smile. "You could blow his soul through a humming-bird's bill into a mosquito's eye, and the mosquito wouldn't wink."—Catholic News.

* * *

"Do you find poultry-keeping pays?"

"Well, no; I can't say that it pays me, but I think it pays my boy Jim."

"How's that?"

"Well, you see, I bought him the fowls. I have to pay for their keep and buy the eggs from him, and he eats them."—Illustrated Bits.

* * *

"Your business college for young ladies seems to be all right."

"It is all right."

"Do you give the girls a good practical business training?"

"In reply to that question I can only say that 60 per cent of our graduates marry their employers the first year."—Louisville Courier-Journal.

* * *

She doesn't have to watch her wheaten loaves,
When using one of those new-fashioned stoves.
She seats herself at ease and reads a book;
Sing hay! The fireless cooker and the cook!
—Chicago Tribune.

* * *

"How do you get on so well with your wife? Don't you ever have any differences of opinion?"

"Of course we do; but I don't let her know it."—Cleveland Leader.

* * *

Othello had just smothered Desdemona.

"She was snuffed out by her new hat," he explained.

After this statement few believed him guilty.—New York Sun.

* * *

Teacher—Now, Harry, can you tell me what an island is?

Small Harry—Yes, ma'am. An island is a place you can't leave without a boat.—Chicago News.

* * *

"What makes you say that your late uncle was eccentric?"

"Didn't he cut me off in his will?—Detroit Free Press.

Widow's Biscuits Kill Bridegroom.

Atlanta, Ga., Dispatch.

Joshua B. Crawford, aged 85 years, one of the wealthiest men in Atlanta, who three weeks ago married Mrs. Belle Salvage, of St. Augustine, a widow of about 35, is dead here. Several months ago Mr. Crawford was in St. Augustine and stopped at the boarding-house kept by Mrs. Salvage. Mrs. Salvage was an excellent cook, and while Mr. Crawford became an admirer of all the dishes she prepares, he fell in love with her biscuits, proposed and was accepted. The marriage proved a big surprise to the people of Atlanta, where Crawford had lived for 60 years. In spite of the excellence of the bride's biscuits, Crawford died of acute indigestion.

NEWSPAPER WAIFS.

"You are a liar!" exclaimed the first man, hotly. "Maybe so," replied the other, "but thank goodness, I'm not sensitive."—Philadelphia Ledger.

"When they summon you to court, Miram, will you corroborate my assertions?" "I dasn't say I'll go as far as thet, sir, but I'll stand by what ye says."—Baltimore American.

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread," remarked Lightwit, meeting Sharp at a reception the other evening. "That's right, my boy," rejoined Sharp, extending his hand, "but I'm delighted to see you here, just the same."—Chicago Daily News.

"Yes, sister'll be down in just a minute, maybe. Don't you think she's awfully funny?" "Why, no." "Don't you? Well, anyway, you know she's a big story-teller, don't you?" "No." "Well, she is, just the same. She said she had a string to you—but I don't see any."—Cleveland Plain-Dealer.

It was at the musicale. "Do you play?" asked the long-haired individual. "Oh, yes," replied the man in the red tie. "Do you play Beethoven?" asked he of the long hair. "No, but I'll play you a game of pinochle if we can get away from this racket," replied the man in the red tie.—Philadelphia Record.