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 48-60 Tribune building. Chicago, rooms 510-512 Tribune building.

PORTLAND, MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1909.

WHOM IT MOST CONCERNS.

It is the owners of small properties, who work on their own account, of people in ordinary lines of business and of wage-workers who need steady employment—these are the persons most deeply concerned in careful and efficient government, in moderate and judicious public expenditure and low taxation.

But there are those who have only the very rich—a small class—always before their eyes, and who demand increase of public debts and extravagance in administration, in order to "get" them. "Let's have what we want," they say, "and take it out of the multimillionaires." A most foolish endeavor; for the very rich are but a small number, and even their great wealth is, comparatively, but a small factor. Owners of small properties possess far the greater part of the wealth of the country; and most of the stock even of the richest corporations is held by a multitude of small owners, many of whom have all their available capital therein.

It is a problem, always, to keep the methods of aggregated wealth under lawful and reasonable control. But it is not to be done by piling up public debts and levying high taxes. No other policy could do so much to make the rich richer, oppress the owners of small properties and make difficulties for labor. It is a matter of concern to owners of small or moderate properties, and to those who have ambition or expectation of small or moderate personal possessions. But the blatant socialist orator or shallow newspaper can see nothing but the "multimillionaire."

THEY "UNGRATEFULLY AVER."

Judge Munly, it would seem, has a right to his expression of indignation at the course purposed by Messrs. Albee, Nottingham and their associates, towards their Democratic confreres in recent political endeavor. "Albee and Nottingham," says Munly, "attained their eminence when elected to the State Senate by the vote of practically every Democrat in Multnomah County. Now these gentlemen, in their ambition for place and power, ungratefully aver that the Democrats are rank partisans."

A true bill is this indictment. But Judge Munly should know that when "ambitious" men like these want to rule their own party and find they can't, they are usually fit for just such enterprises as this. It is simply what is to be expected. The "ingratitude" of the present time is a proper sequel to the "ambitious" method and performance of last year.

Nobody had a right to blame the Democrats for their part in the performance last year—except in so far as a multitude of them called themselves Republicans and entered their names as such, in order to draw Republican ballots in the primary and vote thereon for the nomination of Albee, Nottingham and other Statement-onesters, and so tie them up to the election of a Democratic Senator; nor was anything else expected than that these nominees would receive in the election "the vote of practically every Democrat in Multnomah County." It was a shrewd Democratic game, played to the "ambition" of Albee, Nottingham and the rest of the "reformers." But still, it is not apparent why or how the Democratic brethren could expect this class of reformers to fling away their "ambition," at any future time, and help those who had helped them.

The disinterested spectator must, however, sympathize with the feelings of Judge Munly on the subject, and admit that he has a right to his expression of indignation.

IMPROVED CHANNEL TO SEA.

The United States Engineers will today begin making the annual survey of the channels at the entrance of the Columbia River. That this survey will reveal an increased depth of water there is a certainty. The ease and regularity with which vessels of from 23 to 24½ feet draft have been crossing in and out at low water, and at quarter or half tide, offer the strongest possible evidence of the improvement that has followed extension of the jetty. There has never been anything problematical or uncertain about the ultimate result of this improvement. It is and always has been simply a matter of engineering. There is a certain amount of water pouring into the sea from the Columbia River. So long as this great volume of water straggled seaward through three or four channels, some of them miles apart, the greatest depth found in any of them was unsatisfactory.

The jetty is now gradually forcing this water into one channel, which is steadily deepening under the increased scouring pressure produced by the restrictions of the jetty. The advantages to Portland of this increased depth of water at the river entrance cannot be over-estimated. There has never been any question about keeping the channel between Portland and Astoria in good condition for any vessel that could cross the bar with safety, and, with that vitally necessary portion of the route to the sea in good shape, there will be small likelihood of shipowners ever again attempting to discriminate against the Columbia River. Soundings made during the month of May show a depth of more than 28 feet on the bar, and it is believed that the official figures will make an even more favorable showing. This is, of course, much better than the depth of a year ago, but it is only a beginning. The work of improvement must be pushed forward until there are not less than 40 feet of water on the bar at low tide. There is a sufficient amount of water passing out of the Columbia easily to produce this depth, if it is kept in proper confines.

To connect with this 40-foot channel, which will be needed by the ships of the future, there must be a 30-foot channel in the river, which, of course, will be easier of accomplishment than the 40-foot channel on the bar. The two projects must be carried on simultaneously, however. Vessels of 25 and 26-foot draft now pass from Portland to the sea without delay, where twenty years ago expensive delays and lighterage charges were necessary for vessels of 16 and 17-foot draft. The building of the North Bank road to Portland and increased development throughout the Columbia basin have doubled and trebled the number of producers who are interested in improvement of this channel to the sea, and never again should any difficulty be experienced in securing the appropriations necessary to carry on the great work.

THE ELECTION TODAY.

Possibly there may be some disposition to revive the Republican party in Oregon. Possibly that sentiment may manifest itself today. True, indeed, this is not a political election—not an election in which party issues or divisions are paramount. Nevertheless Judge Munly is a Democrat and is a candidate for Mayor as a Democrat. Mr. Simon is the Republican candidate, and so, to an extent, it is a party issue. Mr. Albee is the candidate of a Republican faction that contends for a position that it hopes will give it control of the Republican party hereafter.

This is the situation for the election of today. Of course, we do not forget the Socialists and Prohibitionists. Each of these parties has its candidates, and each will poll no inconsiderable vote.

In a local election, like this, there can be no clear division on party lines. On these local issues many Democrats will vote for Simon. Considerable numbers of Republicans will vote for Albee. This is a kick of a Republican faction that is "petering out." Munly will get a strong vote on party grounds. As it looks now, he will be the second man in the race, but Simon will receive as many votes as both Munly and Albee.

Local questions and issues of all sorts are involved in this municipal contest, and great numbers, perhaps a great majority, will vote on the phases of these questions as they may be presented to their minds. Yet certainly a large number of voters will think it a good time to cast a vote that may tend to rehabilitation of the Republican party in Oregon.

FERRERO AS AN OBSERVER.

Readers of Signor Ferrero's stimulating works have begun to suspect that the distinguished Italian may possibly be something of a George Bernard Shaw among historians. His love of novelty and paradox is so apparent that one half questions whether it does not bewray him now and then into a preference for startling effect over sober truth. Of course there is no inherent impossibility that he may be right about the conduct, characters and motives of the ancient Romans, and all other historians wrong, but it stands to reason that in a field where Ferrero has so many predecessors, many of them among the brightest minds in the world, if what he thinks he sees had really existed some of them would have been likely to find it. We must not forget, however, that now and then a great discovery has lain in plain sight for thousands of years, and savants have walked over it and stubbed their learned toes on it, without so much as dreaming that anything worth while was there. Then on a day came along some man with no scales on his eyes and actually saw it. Thus it was with Galileo's first law of motion. Thus it was with Darwin's formula of natural selection and the survival of the adapted.

Ferrero has put forward some views of Roman history which would undermine a great deal of fine poetry and make no end of oratorical flights absurd if they were to prove tenable. Take Shakespeare's Cleopatra, for example, the serpent of old Nile, she whom age could not wither nor custom stale. Ferrero has withered her with a stroke of his blighting pen, and transformed her into a disagreeable old hag, homely and cunning. To explain the miracle of her performance at Actium, he has posed us with the greater miracle of Antony's falling in love with such a specter. Aside from little plays of this sort, which are manifestly directed to the galleries, Ferrero has done one valuable service to Roman history. He has applied to its interpretation more thoroughly than any of his predecessors the economic idea. In his opinion the important events of the ages which led up to the empire and the splendid reign of Augustus were the consequences of economic changes. This opinion, taken by itself, will not be overthrown and in assigning greater weight to the vicissitudes of agriculture, commerce and exchange than Gibbon has done or any preceding historian, Ferrero has undoubtedly brought us nearer to the exact truth. Still it is one thing to discern causes and another to trace their effects. We may admit that Ferrero has done the first feat; it is by no means certain that he has been so successful with the second.

His recent observations upon American affairs seem to indicate that the Italian historian of Rome is neither a very accurate observer nor yet a correct interpreter of what he does see. To jump to the conclusion that he is equally inaccurate in writing history would not be strictly just, because a man may walk through the living world with his eyes shut and still see the world of books, inscriptions and monuments clearly enough with his mental vision. All the same it was hard to fool Gibbon concerning the affairs of his own time, and there have been few shrewder practical characters than Xenophon. Ferrero has been writing some articles on America for the Paris Figaro in which he says among other astonishing things that our Government exercises unheard of authority over corporations. Suppose the novelties he has published about Horace and Cicero were as ignorant? Of course they are not, for Signor Ferrero has read all the documents touching on Roman history; but where under heaven did he get any such notion about the relations between our Government and the stiff-necked corporations? In his own country, the government owns the railroads. So does the government of France, for the most part, and that of Germany, too. Here the most the authorities have done toward controlling the railroads is to forbid with more or less success the habit of rebating and make some doubtful regulations about fares and combinations. The very idea of government ownership or anything like real control of the railroads is strange to us and to many citizens repulsive.

The fact known to every student of social subjects is that corporations in this country do pretty nearly as they like, while in Europe they are driven with a firm hand and a tight rein. The governments of Germany, France and Italy, though they have experienced many vicissitudes, have for all that usually been in the habit of governing, while ours has pretty generally applied the Jeffersonian principle of permitting things to run themselves. Government with us for the first century and a quarter of our National life, admitting some notable interludes of efficiency, consisted mainly in spinning intricate theories about the constitution and drawing salaries and pensions. Naturally, therefore, when the great modern corporations began to develop, the European nations had a marked advantage over us. Their governments faced the problem as they had faced many others just as difficult, and mastered it forthwith. Our government began to debate about its authority and ended in a sea of words, while the corporations strengthened themselves and finally barely missed capturing the constituiton itself. Very likely in course of time they will be brought to obey the law which has first created them and then taken fright at its monstrous children, but to say that they are tyrannized over is absurd.

THE FIGURES OF PROMOTERS.

Political promoters at Portland, who are endeavoring to commit the city to the inauguration of a municipal light plant, in the construction and management of which they expect to have a hand, obtain and publish statements from officials at Seattle to prove how successful the system is there, and what it "saves" to the city.

Seattle, observe, is in the bond-selling stage and construction stage of this business. Money is plenty now—still coming in from bonds—and projects of extension go finely on. At this tentative stage, and in the face of private competition which there is a struggle to crush, the natural thing for the promoters and officials, who wish to justify themselves, is to reduce rates, boast of it, and trust to future taxation to make up deficits. This is the process at Seattle. It's the old thing, tried in many a town and city, always with the same result. The reason lies on the face of things, in the general experience that no great public enterprise, involving labor, management, skill, efficiency and ceaseless care, can be carried on under public administration as cheaply and efficiently as under private direction.

For illustration of the accuracy and trustworthiness of the processes upon which results are obtained from figures borrowed from Seattle, some of the advertisements published by our exploiters to influence the vote at Portland today tell us that under the system of public control "Seattle gets her light at rates 100 per cent below those of Portland!" That would cut out the whole cost and make the supply of light at Seattle free. But your political promoter, who expects to obtain the reward for his patriotic endeavor somehow out of "the system," isn't troubled by a thing like that. He is the high-minded philosopher, to whom figures can't lie, and who follows "the truth," whithersoever it leads him.

WHY EMPLOY TORTURE?

In refusing the other day to convict a burglar who had been tortured by the police to make him confess, the Chicago jury perhaps allowed their humanity to get the better of their prudence, but it is difficult to blame them for it. The practice of torture in the secret chambers of police departments seems to persist in spite of the law and the teachings of common sense. It is thinly disguised under the humorous name of "third degree," but changing its name does not change its nature, nor does it make evidence thus obtained any more reliable. Records from the days when torture was a regular judicial process to obtain evidence shows that it produced much more falsehood than truth. A witness upon the rack would say anything his tormentors desired in order to secure a cessation of misery or a speedy death. It was more from the knowledge that it failed of its purpose than from humanity that torture was abolished in civilized countries by law. That it is so often retained here by the arbitrary practice of the police is no credit to our system of criminal procedure.

Obviously the police resort to it to save themselves trouble. It is so much easier to obtain what passes for evidence by beating a prisoner or knocking his teeth out, or giving him the "water treatment" than it is to make an honest investigation of the facts that the temptation to officials is naturally strong. Their mode of life, their association with criminals and toughs, tends to brutalize them, and in time they think nothing of inflicting the severest injuries upon a person to compel him to own to a supposed crime. Of course, if they torment him enough, he will confess to anything they accuse him of. Evidence wrung from a prisoner by torture has no weight in court. Juries invariably discredit it, and the Chicago case shows that they are even willing to go farther and make it a ground for acquittal. What is gained then by applying the torture? Nothing except perhaps some transient reputation for acuteness in discovering crime.

With today's election the end of city government by suspicion, prejudice and whimsy is doubtless in sight. Take the case of Chief Campbell. Mayor Lane makes up his mind that the Fire Department is all wrong in face of frequent and regular demonstrations that it is efficient and well handled, and he sets out after Chief Campbell's scalp. He has so far failed to get it, since he has been unable to prove anything against the Chief. The latest trouble is about those fire engines. Bids are called for several engines. The specifications are prepared under direction of the fire Chief, and three of the four fire engine manufacturers of the United States offer bids, utterly disproving the Mayor's contention of "fixed" specifications in favor of one concern. But this one concern happens to submit the lowest bid, and the Mayor's Executive Board accepts it and prepares to close the contract. But is the Mayor done for? Certainly not. He adopts the simple expedient of refusing to sign the contract. Why? No reason, except that he won't. That's all. But perhaps he will before the courts are through, since to the courts the matter has gone. Yet it is rather discouraging to any person or firm having business with the city to have to go into court to compel the city to enter into a contract or carry out an obligation that was made or assumed on its terms, and that is repudiated or held up because the successful bidder happens not to be persona grata to the Mayor.

"The boldest band of buccaneers that ever got together," is the classification given the Senate finance committee by Senator Tillman. It is perhaps needless to say that the fiery Southern Senator must have been left out on some of the cruises which this band of buccaneers have been making. It was Senator Tillman who, in making a plea for an appropriation for one of the worthless navy-yards in his district in the South, advanced the argument that he had "stood in" for every appropriation that had been asked for by his colleagues for similar schemes, without making too close a scrutiny of its merits. And yet there are certain features of this prolonged tariff legislation that suggest that a less appropriate name than "buccaneers" might be applied to quite a number of the patriots who have their fingers in the tariff revision pie.

Through an injunction issued by the United States Circuit Court at St. Paul, the Interstate Commerce Commission has been restrained from enforcing its order compelling the opening of the "Portland Gateway" for passenger traffic bound to Seattle. This order will probably tie the matter up in court until after the exposition is over and the need of an open gateway is less pronounced. The failure of the contending roads to reach any kind of an agreement on this matter hardly bears out the original reports of the Harriman-Hill peace pact. The inconvenience and annoyance that must be experienced by the traveling public until the Portland Gateway is opened should appeal to the railroad managers with sufficient force to cause a change in their policy.

United societies of German-Americans, representing large part of the German-speaking population of the city, have issued a sheet which attempts analysis and comparison of the various measures on the ballot to be used today, with recommendation to the elector how to mark his ballot—Yes or No. Rejection of the proposed charter is advised; also rejection of the electric light bonds and the bridges at Broadway, Market and Sherman streets. Electors are advised to vote Yes on the proposition to pay principal and interest on water bonds out of the water fund; also Yes on the proposal that the city shall pay out of the water fund the cost of all mains of ten inches size or more. They favor also the crematory bonds.

Perhaps Judge Munly may be elected. But The Oregonian thinks not. He is reported as having said, last night, that the election of Mr. Simon would be disgraceful and highly injurious to the city, adding:

> It is due, perhaps, to this pervasive feeling of dreaded public evils at the menace of Mr. Simon's candidacy, as well as to the arousing of the civic conscience, that I have had a cordial reception by the people in every part of the city visited by me.

The statement is not creditable to Mr. Munly. It becomes not a candidate to speak thus about a competitor, and at the same time to assume for himself a character of superior personal conscience and civic virtue. No speech is lovely that carries such assumptions, and a canting tone with them.

"Skinny" Madden, the Chicago labor leader charged with extortion by demanding $1000 for calling off a strike which should not have been ordered, has been convicted, but has taken an appeal to a higher court. On being convicted, Mr. Madden said that he considered the verdict a "bad thing for unionism." It is hardly probable that legitimate, honest "unionism" will agree with its recreant leader. The verdict was a bad thing for the particular kind of "unionism" exploited by Madden. For the other kind, it was decidedly advantageous, as it serves to correct the impression that all union labor sanctions the acts of its leaders, whether such acts are lawful or otherwise.

Over in Helena the Government has begun suit to recover mineralized lands from the Northern Pacific. The Government's attorneys there, like those in Portland, must be young men, who expect to live a large part of the time the matter shall rest in the courts.

Perhaps it would clear matters up somewhat in the quarreling Democratic party if it could be arranged first to give every Democrat a job; and then to pass out what is left to an occasional Republican.

Perhaps Lightweight Nelson could "lick" Heavyweight Mistah Johnson. There's no need of Jim Jeffries lowering his dignity if Nelson can save the white race from its present disgrace.

You might reach a compromise in those thirty-five initiative measures by voting Yes on the few you understand and approve, and No on those you oppose or don't understand.

Mr. Kellaher was foudest of all the candidates, saying they were in the fight to finish. It's too bad that the white feather has not a weaker voice.

Vote early today and not oftener than once. Except that you should vote No about thirty times, more or less, on those initiative measures.

Prisoner Martin, in the County Jail, says opium is the worst enemy of mankind. No, there is one yet worse—the man who eats opium.

Strange why the British should fear German invasion. Every invasion thus far has improved British character.

The defeated candidates will find in the roses the beauty and purity they were so eager for in politics.

Roses, if nothing else, ought to cheer up the flagging candidates.

Don't worry about a "flood." There isn't going to be any.

AS TO UNEARNED VALUE.

A Professor of Political Economy Unmuzzles His Wisdom on It.

PULLMAN, Wash., June 5.—(To the Editor.)—I was surprised to read your editorial on "A Phase of Socialistic Jargon" in the issue of June 3. The Oregonian has too high a standard to afford to indulge in editorials of such a nature, which bring it down to the level of some of its contemporaries in the Northwest; for The Oregonian's style and character have been above those of other papers in this part of the United States. When you refer to the idea of "unearned increments" or "surplus value") as "merest flummery, fudge, gibberish and balderdash" you gain nothing. Language akin to billingsgate is not reason or reasonable. Whatever we may think about Socialism, it is but fair to acknowledge the validity of certain contributions. Socialists have made to economic thought. Unearned values involve real problems which are not at present as pressing as they will be in a decade or two. When you remark that "the phrase, unearned value, is never heard except from the mouth of some most shallow person," you are striking out blindly. Professor Seligman, of Columbia University, than whom there is no more scholarly economist in this country and who is known as a conservative, once remarked that Karl Marx was one of two of the greatest economic thinkers in the nineteenth century. One of the keenest discussions of value is found in Marx's chapters on surplus value. It can do no harm if we give Socialists, or even anarchists, a square deal. Passionate bigotry serves no good purpose.

Very respectfully yours,
CHARLES E. STANGELAND,
(Professor of Political Economy.)

The Reply Direct.

Dear Sir.—I have your letter of June 5th. You misunderstand. Your language is that merely of "bookish theoric." Our difference arises, I suppose, from point of view. Point of view, on either side, depends. I further suppose, on our different and differing relations with the world of affairs. I rely—and have always relied—upon my own initiative. You, a professor of political economy in an institution supported by the state, rely on the state. You are a Socialist; perhaps don't know it—certainly don't wish to acknowledge it. I detest the whole creed and all the suggestions of Socialism; for it is a scheme to compel the active, earnest, industrious and willing members of society to carry the lazy, ignorant, idle, worthless and vicious—to compel this policy by law.

As to property, my position is that a man owning property is entitled—has a right—to the growing value of it. From your letter I suppose you think yourself prepared to deny this. Perhaps that is natural, on the part of one accustomed to draw his support from the public treasury. What I call the natural growth of the property to the owner you call "unearned" and think government ought to take it away from the owner. I do not. Moreover, if this be the true doctrine or policy, there can be no accumulation of property.

You study your textbooks and dream over them—I am a man who knows what "improbus labor" is. What I gain by my labor and by the growth of the value of the property I have acquired is rightfully mine. Of course I pay all taxes. But I insist that taxes shall be moderate and reasonable; and I deny that the Government has the right, or that it is its duty to confiscate the value of my property and use it for support of "society"—on the notions of socialistic theorists, or any other. This theory of property, moreover, is the theory of those defined by the Roman historian, as "eager for the wealth of others, prodigal of their own." Little is new in this old world.

I say government has no right to confiscate the natural growth of one's property on the assumption that the owner has not "earned" it. Government may, of course, confiscate one's whole property; but is it right? Government is omnipotent. But to set up the theory that Government may confiscate growth of values is to destroy the basis of property and society. The theory that this is social justice is absurd, and government would do well to stop support of colleges that teach such stuff. The sooner, therefore, the colleges of all the land stop commendation of Karl Marx as "a great economic thinker" the better. Were you even passably acquainted with the modern literature of economics, you would know that Marx was sent to the dust heap long ago. Don't quote your stale, discredited, socialist authors to me. There isn't a thinker or man of affairs who doesn't know that most of the theoretical stuff taught in the colleges, in the name of "political economy" is a curse to the country, and the rest of it of no actual use.

I have not written very courteously, I know. But your letter from the chair of political economy at Pullman is of so lordly an air as to call for answer with plainness.

H. W. S.

Professor Chas. E. Stangeland, "Professor of Political Economy," Pullman, Washington.

VANCOUVER'S COSTLY VENTURE.

Tried Municipal Ownership of Lights, and Lost Heavily.

PORTLAND, Or., June 6.—(To the Editor.)—Whoever wants to know something of the glory and beauty of municipal electric light plants should try and find out something of the history of a similar venture just across the state line at the City of Vancouver. It is but a very few years since that city invested in a complete plant and secured a manager and necessary force to run the establishment—the people own, so to speak. By some strange and mysterious combination of circumstances, the great public utility establishment began to deriorate, the lights with equal regularity grew dimmer and dimmer, the bills for light service got higher and higher, while the cost of operating and maintaining the people's own electric light plant kept steadily increasing. In fact, the management of the public utility plant announced that it would require entirely new equipment, service cables, etc. This, of course, meant a new issue of bonds, more taxes wherewith to pay more interest and many other pleasing features which form so inseparable part of municipal enterprise.

A cry of despair had gone forth from the sovereign taxpayers—"Come, let us dispose of the public utility plant," became the battle-cry of the citizens of Vancouver. "We have had all we want of city light, with its officeholders, plants, wire-pulling, etc." They advertised for bids, sold the plant at a most melancholy price and freed themselves from the bunco game of municipal public utility sham, with its extravagant expenditures and accumulation of debt.

E. C. BROWNING.

Kansas Experiment in "Deep" Books.

Kansas City (Mo.) Dispatch.

A girl in Ottawa, Kan., having been told by her mother not to bring any more books from the library unless they were "deep" books, the next day marched up to the circulation desk and asked for Jules Verne's "Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea."

Power of Mind and Teeth.

Philadelphia Dispatch.

Elizabeth Nugent, of Bustleton, Pa., declared that in a fit of coughing she had swallowed her artificial teeth, and was hurried to a hospital, where, in preparing her for an operation, a nurse found the teeth in a seam of the girl's dress.

HOW KELLAHER "GOES IT BLIND."

No Previous Provision for Installation of Lighting Plant.

PORTLAND, June 6.—(To the Editor.)—A few days ago I asked Mr. Kellaher, through the columns of The Oregonian, whether or not the commissioners which will have charge of the proposed municipal lighting plant have had any experience in the operation of an electric light and power system, either municipal or private; and so far he has not answered me. Why not? It is very important that the commission have knowledge of how to operate a system of this sort, as its success depends upon the officers whom they will select and the men whom they in turn will also select.

There are several municipal plants in this country which are operating at a profit and giving good service at the same time and there are plants which are doing the very opposite. This all depends on how the plant is managed.

I would like to ask Mr. Kellaher a few more questions. Has he asked the local power company whether they will supply power at a low rate of 1¾ or 2 cents per kilowatt hour? If they will, it would not be necessary to issue $2,000,000 of bonds and run the risk of losing it by inefficient operation.

Does he know that from 40 per cent to 60 per cent of power generated at the power house by the turbines (I am assuming that water will be used to generate power, inasmuch as it is the cheapest and is the basis for his comparative statements of the Seattle plant and Portland's proposed plant) is lost in transmission to the lamps and motors? Has he calculated this?

Where will he put the plant if it is constructed? Why has he not told us before? Who has ever heard of a power corporation issuing bonds before it has selected a power site on which the operation of the plant and consequently the system depends as far as the supply of power goes? Who would buy a bond of a company of that sort? Why has not Mr. Kellaher come out with everything and told us where this plant will be built and of the operating efficiency of the men of the commission? Are the people of Portland going to be mislead by a man who will give only part of the information of an expensive project of this sort?

Again, does he know that there are three power corporations: Mount Hood Railway & Power Company, Oregon Light & Power Company and the Portland Water Power & Electric Company, that intend to build power lines to Portland in the near future? With four companies in the field, is it necessary to have a municipal lighting plant?

Monday the citizens of Portland will decide whether this city will go farther into debt and construct a $2,000,000 power system on such meager information as Mr. Kellaher has given so far. You should vote "no" on a thing like this.

RICHARD DAVIS, E. E.

HIGH SALARIES OBJECTIONABLE

This Reason Urged Against City Government by Commission Amendment.

PORTLAND, June 5.—(To the Editor.)—I want to indorse what The Oregonian has said about the proposed new charter.

It seems to me that the said proposed charter ought to be rejected because of the high salaries it proposes to pay the city officers—if for no other reason. The argument that high salaries will secure better administrative ability is fallacious and misleading, if not pernicious. A high salary attracts the plunder element in public affairs. It does not attract conscience, or a high sense of honor. It appeals directly to cupidity and personal advantage. It is the pool in which the plunger swims and grows ponderous. An honest, self-respecting man would be satisfied with modest compensation and the gratification he would have in the sense that he had served his fellow citizens well and faithfully.

Nay, there are competent men who would not regard the money compensation at all, as George Washington did not in the Revolutionary War. He got his pay in a high sense of duty discharged, and there are men of that kind alive yet.

A man who regards the salary as the chief thing in securing a public office is not well qualified to discharge the duties of office to the highest and best interest of the public. He takes the place for his own personal advantage and not from a sense of duty. It is not more ability that is needed in public office, but more integrity, more downright honesty. Almost any good average citizen has sense enough to run a city office as it ought to be run, but a good many who have sense enough do not want to run it that way. Too many regard office as an opportunity to make money, by any means within reach—and high salaries attract just that kind of people.

The salaries proposed in the suggested charter, I think, are twice as much as they ought to be, and for that reason the amendment ought to be voted down.

LEVI W. MYERS.

Method of a Snake-killing Dog.

Lewiston (Me.) Correspondence Philadelphia Record.

Edward McCoy, of this city, who is in charge of a gang of men engaged in peeling bark on the mountains adjacent to Granville, reports that Towser, the camp dog, killed a six-foot blacksnake. The dog is a peculiar specimen, with the trait of kindness to children, but loathing a snake. The dog circled 'round and 'round his coiled-up snakeship just beyond striking distance, darting backward and forward as opportunity appeared to afford, until finally the snake was caught off its guard, and, grasping it back of the neck, he shook it as a terrier would a rat. On examination it was found that the reptile's back was broken in three places.

Pig That Barks Like a Dog.

Saco (Me.) Dispatch to the New York World.

Fred M. Thim, of this city, a well known electrician and railroad man, has at his home in lower Beach street a pig that barks like a dog.

The black and white markings of the pig are much like a hound. Its ears also much resemble those of a hound in their size, shape and the way they hang.

Mr. Thim has had many visitors to see the animal and hear it bark. All say it is startling to hear such sounds come from a pig, and there is an impulse to jump.

Trolley Poles as Fire-alarms.

Philadelphia Dispatch.

When fire breaks out in Caldwell, N. J., the firemen are summoned by beating upon the hollow steel poles that carry the trolley wires. When the first alarm is sounded others rush to the poles with clubs, and soon the air resounds with noises that may be heard for miles through the valley. Then the locomotive whistles in the Erie railroad yards scream and the firemen quickly respond from the four corners of the town.

Not a Bomb, but a Bullfrog.

Camden (N. J.) Dispatch.

An Italian shoemaker, of Belleville, N. J., was badly frightened by sounds coming from a box which a stranger asked him to hold for a while. Thinking a bomb was inside, a policeman was called, who opened the box, out of which jumped a big bullfrog.

WOE! WOE! IF THIS BILL PASSES.

Here's a Breezy but Truthful Letter on McKenna Measure.

PORTLAND, June 6.—(To the Editor.)—The saloon has long been the football of politics, and legislation directed against the saloonkeeper, the liquor dealer and the brewer is the principal amusement of many politicians. The mixologist makes a fine target, and the missles thrown at him are not bouquets, but meant to hurt. About every scheme on the calendar has been worked at his expense. In Portland this year he faces what seems to be about the last word in legislation this side of prohibition. Mr. McKenna is after him, and Mr. McKenna can think of more ways to make his life burdensome than any prohibitionist yet heard from. If the McKenna act becomes law the Portland liquor men will write a new Book of Job. If the people of Portland will drink, Mr. McKenna proposes that they shall do it in sackcloth and ashes. His law confines the retailing of liquor to the saloon, and makes of the saloon a place where none would journey unaccompanied by a colossal grouch. The thirsty who have the temerity to enter a saloon will drink on parade, because Mr. McKenna will have no paint on the glass doors or windows, nor anything obstructing full view from the sidewalk. Those who walk may rubber in and feast their gaze upon the unhappy performers. Neither will there be joy nor comfort inside the saloon. Chairs are taboo—likewise benches or seats of any description. Music there may not be—even the phonograph is on the blacklist—and the saloonkeeper may not indulge a taste in art, pottery or shrubbery. The patron must stand up and drink swiftly, thus fostering the treating habit, for it will be desirable to drink deeply and be gone. Nothing but real coin of the realm will be accepted in exchange for liquid joy. Symbols or tokens in the line of beer checks, "come-backs" or "splits" are rigidly barred. The saloon must consist of one room, with but one entrance. If the ice man bumps your shinbone with a 100-lb. hunk of congealment, don't cuss him out, but blame it on Mr. McKenna.

The hotelman is placed on the retired list. He may have no bar, nor may he keep anything malt, spiritous, vinous or jaguous for sale. He may serve drinks in his public dining-room, but only with a meal, and only in sealed bottles. He may not serve a guest in his room. The process of serving drinks with meals in the dining-room is elaborate. The hotelman must go outside his own establishment, make an outright purchase of a saloonkeeper, and bring the proceeds of this transaction to his guest. Then and there, with proper ceremony and adequate solemnity, the boniface may draw the cork. The McKenna act reserves unto him this inestimable privilege. All drinks served in hotel dining-rooms will require this stately though complicated function, because only drinks in sealed bottles may be served. It will be seen from this that Mr. McKenna has an eye particularly on the insidious cocktail, that preliminary canter to a good dinner. It is a mixed drink. It must be compounded. It must go, as must the hilarious highball, the reckless rickey, the geysering gin-fizz, and all other drinks gregarious, miscellaneous and indeterminate. They are anathema. They are mixed. The guest may drink, but, by Heck! he will drink a whole bottle or drink not at all.

The McKenna act does not overlook the brewer or the wholesale liquor dealer. Heretofore they have supplied to Portland families the beer, wine or spirits for home consumption. The new law would make it illegal. They may sell only to licensed saloonkeepers. The staid citizen who has sorter sidestepped the saloon, and taken an occasional jorum at odd times, in the sanctity of his home, will have to replenish his supplies piecemeal, at the saloon, or do without. This means going to the saloon and making his purchase in full view of the passing throng, and, being there, he might as well treat himself or any acquaintance he may meet, later proceeding to his home with a bundle under his arm and such dignity of demeanor as he can muster. All suitcases seen downtown on Saturday afternoons and evenings will not be coming from or going to the railroad depots. Shoe boxes, lunch baskets and various innocent-appearing contraptions will cover a multitude of sins and some liquor. Tailors will have to make larger hip pockets for Portland's trousers.

Just how the clubs will wriggle around the law does not yet appear. It being unlawful to retail liquor in any room other than that used for saloon purposes, and that room restricted to having but one entrance, no chairs, benches or seats of any sort, no tables, either card, pool or billiard, no music or games, the clubs will not attract the gentlemen who have hitherto lolled in undisturbed comfort at the Commercial, Arlington, University, Elks, Concordia and other palaces of luxury and good cheer.

Life is real, life is earnest, and a drink is not its goal. Still, it's often a friendly milepost. But if we are good, we will be happy, and Mr. McKenna is trying to make us good. His formula is simple: Make it so blamed uncomfortable and conspicuous to drink at all that we will all swear off; hammer the saloonkeeper into retirement or a blind pig; put the hotels and clubs out of commission, and put such a crimp in the wholesaler and brewer that they will sell out and move their businesses to Idaho.

Then—the millenium!

GEORGE E. FAREWELL.

JUG-HANDLED FINANCIAL SCHEME

So Writer Labels Gothenburg Liquor Plan to Rob City of Revenue.

PORTLAND, June 5.—(To the Editor.)—What will be the result of the "500,000-in-1912" movement, started off and carried along with such enthusiasm, if the Gothenburg petition becomes a law?

If this corporation obtains a franchise giving it a monopoly of the liquor trade of the City of Portland for ten years, under the agreement that it shall pay to the city an average of $382,500 yearly, the city will receive into its treasury no more revenue with a population of 500,000 in 1912, than with our present population, nor would it receive any more until the expiration of the Gothenburg franchise, no matter how great the population.

Putting aside all other arguments, isn't this a jug-handled financial scheme entirely in favor of the private parties behind the Gothenburg movement? Messrs. Crofton and McAllister advance the argument that their scheme is not only a solution of the liquor question, but is very advantageous to the city from a point of revenue. They fail to state wherein this will be true under a population greater than we now have.

Of course the Gothenburg plan will not be adopted by the people, but the specious arguments advanced by its promoters should be exposed so that few, if any, of our citizens will be fooled by them.

If we want "500,000 in 1912," we do not want the proposed Gothenburg system, any more than we want the drastic and fanatical McKenna act. Half a million population in three years is not chimerical, and progress toward this much-wished-for consummation will continue along sane, orderly lines.

GEORGE I. THOMPSON.