

The Oregonian

Published at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1887. Postoffice No. 100. Second-class postage paid at Portland, Oregon, October 10, 1887. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 27, 1918. Paid for by subscriber.

(BY MAIL)
Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$3.00
Daily, Sunday included, three months, .90
Daily, Sunday included, one month, .30
Daily, without Sunday, one year, \$2.50
Daily, without Sunday, three months, .75
Daily, without Sunday, one month, .25
Sundays, without Sunday, one year, \$1.50
Sundays, without Sunday, three months, .45
Sundays, without Sunday, one month, .15
Sunday and weekly, one year, \$1.50

(BY CARRIER)
Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$3.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month, .75
How to Herald: Send postal check or your local bank, stamps, coin or currency for the amount. Address: The Oregonian, 200 Broadway, Portland, Ore. Postage to be paid by addressee. Single copies, 5 cents. Foreign postage, 10 cents. Foreign postage, 10 cents. Eastern Business Office—Vance & Company, 100 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Portland, Tuesday, Dec. 27, 1916.

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS WILL DO.

All Democrats favor a downward revision of the tariff, and never waver or wobble or weaken in that opinion until the practical work of framing a tariff bill is imposed on them by the country. Then difficulties arise, growing mostly out of the refusal of Democratic states and Democratic producers and manufacturers in Republican states to permit a literal application of the great Democratic doctrine of tariff for revenue only to their particular industries.

The next Democratic House is strong for tariff revision, as Democratic Houses always are—before they meet. The New York Herald has made a careful canvass of members-elect, with the gratifying result that 216 members say firmly and boldly that they are for revision (downward, too) of the Payne-Aldrich tariff. This is 90 more than a majority. Of the 286, 207 are Democrats—11 more than a majority—and 79 are insurgent Republicans.

It might thus appear that the doom of the wicked Payne-Aldrich tariff is sealed. No Democrat and few Republicans will suffer that legislative incubus long to cumber the statute books. Not they. But, of course, the work of tariff revision must proceed wisely and effectively. There must be no wholesale upsetting of business or intelligent and injurious assaults on the tariff as the Government's chief source of income. But the doctrine of high protection must be abandoned and a real customs revenue producer substituted. The wary and judicious members of the present Congress are going to enact a real tariff for revenue law is thus explained by the Herald:

It should be explained that while a big majority of the Democrats favor the principle of tariff for revenue only, they do not all of them, in their private talks, say that they are not literally for that law, but that they will finally cast their vote for some products which come from their own sections. This would indicate that they will not finally cast a great deal of the protective principle.

It is not the intention to harden your Democratic Congressman may always be depended upon to abandon theory in party professions and listen to the seductive voice of the "interests." There will be tariff revision, certainly, but with reservations. The tariff revised by the Democrats will be a give-and-take affair, just as a Republican protective tariff is always, and it will not satisfy the country. No unscientific tariff based on political expediency and state or sectional selfishness ever will.

MR. TAFT'S ECONOMIES.

Whatever Mr. Taft's merits or shortcomings may be as a partly leader and an interpreter of popular opinion, there are two particulars at least, in which he can stand comparison with any man who ever filled the office of President. No President ever exercised greater care, in appointing judges; none ever sought more diligently to fill vacancies in the courts with discriminating care. Although he has been criticized for almost everything else he has done or left undone hardly a word has been said against his nominees for the Supreme Court, the Commerce Court or the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is conceded by everybody whose opinion of much value there is, that he has been chosen for these important positions than those whom Mr. Taft fitted upon after deliberating upon the merits of all the candidates in his careful and judicial manner. The other respect in which Mr. Taft has shown uncommon ability is in the reduction of the wasteful and wasteful business methods of the Government.

Taft is not the first President who ever tried to check the spendthrift habits of our officials and departments in Washington. Although he is the first who ever succeeded. The inertia of long established custom, the sullen determination of entrenched officialdom to be as slothful and careless in the future as it ever was in the past have been too much for every President before Mr. Taft who tried to take the dragon in hand and make it obedient to the rules of good behavior. Of course we do not mean to say that Mr. Taft has done all that can or ought to be done in the way of saving public servants what they are paid for, but he has accomplished enough to deserve the gratitude of the taxpayers. Not all of the \$100,000,000 which Senator Aldrich said could be saved to the public by a thrifty management of the Government has been saved, yet by any means, but certainly Mr. Taft has made a good beginning, which, according to the old saw, is half the battle.

The economies which have been effected by his Administration and for which he should have the credit are not with his many places, some of them unneeded. It is surprising in fact to notice the quiet way the President seems to have of peering into dark corners and investigating little leaks down which the public funds have been in the habit of disappearing.

economy where heretofore there has been waste. That there is room for still greater saving in the postal expenses is matter of common knowledge, but naturally there are limits beyond which the people do not wish the matter pushed. Economy in the postal service is highly popular, but the most unpopular thing any member of Mr. Taft's Administration could do would be to cripple the service which in the postoffice renders to the public in any particular. The taxpayers want their money judiciously spent, but they desire to have it spent, not hoarded, if adequate returns can be obtained. The American people want their postoffice to be placed on a par with the postoffices of other civilized nations and at the same time it will be found that they are willing to pay every employee in the Department fair wages. There is no popular demand for economy carried to the point of scripping the pay of postal employees and this fact Mr. Taft has no doubt recognized.

His reforms in the matter of expenditure have been carried into the Army and Navy as well as the Postoffice. The Army expenditures have been cut down at his behest and it has been found also under his gentle insistence that we can get along very well with fewer battleships than some persons had supposed indispensable. Along these lines where Mr. Taft's savings for the people can easily be reckoned in dollars and cents they foot up to a substantial sum. He has effected other economies which do not lend themselves so easily to exact computation but nevertheless they are well worth keeping account of. The change in the public mind which will require the people to do a fair day's work will save the public millions of dollars in the long run, but the chances are that Mr. Taft will not reap much popularity from it. On the contrary the indolent clerks will shriek with rage and nobody will think it worth while to keep the other side of the affair before the public. The country is not always most grateful for the best service. Sometimes it never even hears of quiet and laborious efforts to do its business well. There is no doubt that Mr. Taft's continuing his government's efforts to bring the Government service up to something like a modern standard of efficiency. It is reasonable to expect also that he will continue to accomplish something. Perhaps before his term ends he may even get his reforming hand upon the slovenly personnel of the Postoffice. There is no reason to believe that Mr. Taft will be mentioned by historians as the President who put our Government expenditures upon a basis of sensible economy. Few Presidents have ever received a more honorable tribute from posterity.

PORTLAND'S "JUNK" DEPARTMENT.

Portland is paying interest on \$1,000,000 bridge and ferry indebtedness which has accumulated except the bonds. This debt will begin to mature, for the most part, eleven years hence. No sinking funds have been provided and it seems that the only way to meet the maturity of the old bonds will be to sell new ones to take their place.

It is interesting to note that the ferries have been free there have been no revenues from tolls wherewith to pay either for maintenance, renewals, interest or sinking fund. All this expenditure, therefore, has had to be paid for out of taxes. The city and its taxpaying citizens, as well as the heavy, common consent has put sinking fund out of the city's official finances.

Too little account has been taken, in this business, of depreciation. This loss has been heavy, but citizens are not aware of it. They imagined that somehow the bridges and ferries would last forever or that renewals would be taken care of in some way at the other fellow's expense. This system gave valuable improvement to people of the city at the expense of the city and the next generation, because more numerous, would be more able to pay. But those who come hereafter have to meet expenses and debts of their own.

Right here is one of the most potent reasons for limitation of public functions and public utilities. It is necessary for this city to have public bridges and ferries and to pay for them out of general taxation. But there are other things which it is not necessary for the city to own; electric light plants and street railways, for example. The city is very near the border line of prudence when it goes into the docks business. All these things mean public debt, bonds and interest. Some classes of citizens urge that after the public has secured improvements through creation of debt it should not create more debt. But it would be impossible for a community to borrow money for present and future needs if it shall repudiate its debts of the past.

This city will have to carry the bonds and pay interest on every "junk" it has. The \$1,000,000 should furnish wholesome lesson for the future. Public finances are seldom wisely administered. They have not been wisely administered in Portland in the past. The present administration comes nearest to a proper treatment of affairs in many years.

OREGON AND THE RAILROADS.

As we approach the new year this question presents itself to every man interested in the development of the Pacific Northwest—will it pay to encourage the building of more railroads? Every one is familiar with the record of the various companies, called the Harriman lines. What they have done during the last five years to open up for settlement several fertile, but hitherto inaccessible, regions in this state was well summarized in The Oregonian yesterday, together with the setting forth of definite plans for the immediate future. Corporate and physical union of this important railroad company with the North Coast lines has forged a stronger commercial chain to the coast than ever before. Oregon's new Eastern horizon is the Rocky Mountains.

For the present larger view, what is the obligation of Oregon to the railroad? From more than one source whose intelligence and sincerity cannot be questioned, we learn that capital has become timid respecting railroad investments. Prospective returns are considered too small and too uncertain. So far as it applies to the rich but undeveloped Pacific Northwest, and particularly to Ore-

son, there is no fear that new lines will not create enough traffic under normal conditions to sustain them and to earn satisfactory dividends, but capital fears disastrous legislation by this state as well as by the Federal Government.

When Judge Lovett, the head of the Harriman lines, declared publicly a few days ago that he favored Government regulation of railroads, he virtually admitted the justice of this principle. A reasonable inference is that all railroads in good faith will acknowledge and respect it. Here in Oregon will not our best interests be served if we promise the railroads a square deal and then make good the promise? Oregon's greatest material need is large capital to build new highways, which should enable a million new people to make homes and engage in profitable industry; therefore, our attitude toward railroads must not be just that of Illinois, New York or Kansas, where there are enough miles of railroad for present needs. With us it ought to be a give-and-take proposition clearly understood.

Oregon must demand that the railroads shall be servants of commerce, not masters; that they shall keep out of politics and not indulge in corrupt practices. Oregon must show that she will be as fair in the matter of regulation in the future as she has been in the past. But why should the single tax paper be so mightily disturbed all at once over the effect of these "harmful" publications in The Oregonian? On December 19 this single tax paper printed prominently an article headed "Bond Buyers Beware" and "The Oregonian's Bond Buyers Beware." The article was signed "Dr. Cook is now trying to prove other men bigger liars. He has a heavy job on his hands. His task also includes the job of trying to convince the public that the single tax is a good thing. He is well founded; also that the methods of his critics and detractors, if applied to Peary, would discredit the exploit of that explorer. However, the doughty doctor 'will take Peary's word, in preference to either that of Rasmussen or the Eskimos from the North last year, claiming polar honors. His same brassy courage he exhibited some years before in asserting that he had scaled Mount McKinley. Now his return from the Arctic, exhibiting him in his old-time brazen-faced nerve. He fled from public contempt to the most sequestered parts of the earth and now comes home with new samples of Munchausenism."

Dr. Cook showed himself a man of brassy courage when he returned from the North last year, claiming polar honors. His same brassy courage he exhibited some years before in asserting that he had scaled Mount McKinley. Now his return from the Arctic, exhibiting him in his old-time brazen-faced nerve. He fled from public contempt to the most sequestered parts of the earth and now comes home with new samples of Munchausenism.

It is taken terrific nerve to display one's self as the biggest liar the world ever saw. Therefore, Dr. Cook does not lack admiration entirely. As a wielder of English, he is skilful, too, far more so than Peary. His sheer audacity in retorting to his critics and in inventing excuses for Cook and Peary makes him world-wide attention and draws him into dispute away from his own exploit; he picks flaws and falsehoods in the words of those attacking him. "False statement No. 1" he says in serious tone and "False statement No. 2" and beyond.

All this disputation comes to nothing. The only important matter is Cook's fakery. His own records disproved his Polar claims and joined him with the Ananias members. Besides, it was impossible for Cook and Peary to have scaled as high as they have. George Kennan has ably pointed out, to have carried enough provisions for the alleged journey. Peary, it will be remembered, employed numerous supporting parties and finally had barely enough food for himself and his negro companion on the final dash for the axis point.

The dispute is going off on too many side issues. Dr. Cook is leading it in those directions. His critics will make headway faster by calling him back to the main question.

TWO MORE NEW JUDGES?

The Dallas Observer makes some highly sensible observations, printed elsewhere, on the proposed amendment to the judicial amendment adopted by the voters in November. The voter wanted to adopt the scheme of a three-fourths jury verdict in civil cases, and that was about all he wanted or intended to approve.

The Supreme Court properly concludes that there was no purpose to confer or change the status of the inferior courts or to load up the court with a great mass of new work or to deprive the court of its original jurisdiction except in emergencies or for special reasons.

So it would appear that the vast excitement into which the lawyers and other judge-makers and job-providers have permitted themselves to be thrown by the new amendment through the expected heavy increase of the work of the Supreme Court has no substantial foundation. It is a mere haste to give the court two new judges who will be trifling precipitate. No election impends, and there is really no sufficient reason why the five judges now on the bench cannot give their undivided attention to their work.

A SETTLED ISSUE IN ENGLAND.

It turns out that the result of the recent British election was not nearly so revolutionary as many believed it. The Liberal has retained their majority but it is formed of a number of different elements which may not remain harmonious as time passes and events develop. The one point which was definitely determined by the election is that the hereditary principle upon which the upper house of Parliament is now based must be abandoned. It is not quite so clear that the Lords will lose their veto power, although it is probable, judging from the course of British history. Formerly the King as well as the peers had a veto upon measures passed by the Commons, but after a struggle much fiercer than that between the Lords and Commons has been the veto of the crown was definitely given up. The King still gives through the form of assenting to bills, but the form is empty. He could not refuse his assent no matter how much he might desire to do so.

The British courts never enjoyed a veto over acts of Parliament. In this respect they are less powerful than the American judiciary. An act of Parliament becomes virtually a part of the constitution of the British Empire at once. Hence the only check there is upon the supremacy of the House of Commons is the power of the Lords to throw out a bill. They have exercised this power very freely

whenever there has been a Liberal ministry. There are many peers who never appear in Parliament except when it is necessary to vote down some Liberal measure. On such occasions they cast their votes with stupid subservience to their class and then disappear until another similar emergency arises. It is this practice which has driven the Commons to the point of requiring the Lords to resign their office. Very likely some compromise will end the difference for the present. The House of Lords will probably be made at least partially elective. Thus it will become responsive to the popular will and may have a long career before it is finally abolished. Still if it ceases to act as a check upon the Commons it is interesting to speculate as to what its present function can become.

The Portland Journal, which apologizes for the abominable and revolting Liberal measure, has published a new dispatch from Salem, with suitable headlines, setting forth that bond-buyers think the amendment dangerous and are finding grave fault with it otherwise. The Oregonian has sought to print facts about the matter, but why should the single tax paper be so mightily disturbed all at once over the effect of these "harmful" publications in The Oregonian? On December 19 this single tax paper printed prominently an article headed "Bond Buyers Beware" and "The Oregonian's Bond Buyers Beware." The article was signed "Dr. Cook is now trying to prove other men bigger liars. He has a heavy job on his hands. His task also includes the job of trying to convince the public that the single tax is a good thing. He is well founded; also that the methods of his critics and detractors, if applied to Peary, would discredit the exploit of that explorer. However, the doughty doctor 'will take Peary's word, in preference to either that of Rasmussen or the Eskimos from the North last year, claiming polar honors. His same brassy courage he exhibited some years before in asserting that he had scaled Mount McKinley. Now his return from the Arctic, exhibiting him in his old-time brazen-faced nerve. He fled from public contempt to the most sequestered parts of the earth and now comes home with new samples of Munchausenism."

Dr. Cook is now trying to prove other men bigger liars. He has a heavy job on his hands. His task also includes the job of trying to convince the public that the single tax is a good thing. He is well founded; also that the methods of his critics and detractors, if applied to Peary, would discredit the exploit of that explorer. However, the doughty doctor 'will take Peary's word, in preference to either that of Rasmussen or the Eskimos from the North last year, claiming polar honors. His same brassy courage he exhibited some years before in asserting that he had scaled Mount McKinley. Now his return from the Arctic, exhibiting him in his old-time brazen-faced nerve. He fled from public contempt to the most sequestered parts of the earth and now comes home with new samples of Munchausenism.

Not satisfied with a population of 4,766,883 for Greater New York, statisticians of Gotham now present figures for Largest New York and claim a population of 5,605,837. This is not the work of boosters, but of men earnestly interested in knowing how many people live in the chief American city and its immediate environment. Walter Laidlaw, executive secretary of the Federation of Churches and Christian organizations, gives to the New York Times the known and the estimated population within 19 miles of the City Hall. The total population of New Jersey with 1,543,932 and Nassau and Westchester counties, New York, with 1,914,644; total suburban, 1,735,576. The ratio of increase in the suburbs during the past ten years was far greater than in the city of New York. If they are going to ignore rivers and city boundaries and count the population in and around New York as one community, it will not be many years until London will be taken second place among the cities of the world.

While the Commercial Club is preparing plans for larger publicity work next year, it should not neglect the opportunity to encourage the energetic women to make their homes in Oregon, women of the type described by the Centralia (Ga.) Courier, which says: "We have one woman who raised 1000 bushels of corn, 500 pumpkins, 9 children and a shirtless husband on 80 acres of land." What a valuable asset such a woman is to any community. Perhaps she has similar neighbors.

The career of Clara Morris painfully exemplifies the truth that great ability does not always bring happiness any more than great riches. In her prime she was a charming actress. Few could throw more paths into tragic scenes. But for many years she suffered from a drinking mania and old age found her poor and almost blind. In thinking of such lives as hers one could find comfort in the belief that human beings will be better again and live on earth under happier stars.

The practice of following Merry Christmas with a drunken New Year's does not commend itself to a discreet judgment. It is not too late to reform it this winter, since the next holiday is still a few days off. Why not save ourselves the trouble of making a drink and give it to Portland's new college? It is commendable to endow a school of sobriety and give it a good name. It would be a great deal better on January 2, 1917, than it did on the same day last year.

The abandonment of the inhuman lockstep in the Walla Walla prisons moves one to ask why the recipient of the lockstep should be retained anywhere. It is an inheritance from the time when prisoners were looked upon as legitimate subjects for every possible cruelty and degradation. In a century which professes to be Christian the lockstep is as anomalous as the refusal to pardon convicted with underearning and socks.

At this late date the Pennsylvania Historical Society is paying honors to Gen. George Gordon Meade on Dec. 31. A dinner will be given in his honor. The Union soldiers who commanded the army of the United States will be present, namely, Generals Nelson A. Miles, John C. Bates and S. B. Young. These men served in General Meade's command in the Civil War.

Pardon for Chris Evans, Junior partner of that celebrated firm of Sontag & Evans? Remembering how they terrorized California for nearly a year, it is curious to reflect that a community cannot carry a punishment through a long period of time.

Rain at Christmas time is so much of a variety in New England as to be subject of thanksgiving. Out here it is a matter of course.

A cold snap is in process of formation for this Coast. It is time, Plumbers are entitled to some consideration.

Approval of baldheaded men by a woman's club will meet disapproval by men who sell hair restoratives.

WHAT THE VOTER TRIED TO DO

Purpose in Voting for the Three-Fourths Jury Amendment.
Dallas Observer.
Passing upon the Supreme Court verdict recently adopted by the voters of Oregon, the Judges of that court held that the amendment does not abolish all courts save the Supreme Court, as had been argued by many lawyers, nor is the authority of the Circuit Courts and County Courts taken away or abridged in any manner. Until other legislation shall change them, the Circuit and County Courts will continue to exist and to exercise the same power and jurisdiction they exercised before the adoption of the amendment.

As to that portion of the amendment which seeks to invest the Supreme Court with original jurisdiction in habeas corpus and quo warranto proceedings, the court is of the opinion that it was not the intention of the voters to thrust upon the Supreme Court the burden of hearing, considering and determining in the first instance every such application as might be presented. Such a construction, it is pointed out, would overburden the court with a mass of original business, including the examination of witnesses, hearing arguments of counsel and considering the merits of the cause. It is suggested, therefore, that the court should refer such cases to the district courts for hearing, and then determine in the first instance every such application as might be presented. Such a construction, it is pointed out, would overburden the court with a mass of original business, including the examination of witnesses, hearing arguments of counsel and considering the merits of the cause. It is suggested, therefore, that the court should refer such cases to the district courts for hearing, and then determine in the first instance every such application as might be presented.

The fact is, not one voter in a hundred knew what he was voting for when he was dabbling with this amendment. Probably not one in 50 characterized the measure as "quo warranto" proceeding if he met it in the road in broad daylight. What the average voter saw in the ballot box was a "providing for a jury in civil cases." That was enough to lead him to vote "yes." He didn't know what jurisdiction he was conferring upon the Supreme Court, nor what additional duties he was imposing upon that body, and he doesn't know even now, after the court has spent much valuable time in an effort to ascertain the voters' real intention in passing this measure. The voter had no intention farther than to authorize three-fourths of a jury to return a verdict in civil cases. He probably not one voter in a hundred knew that any further change in the judicial system was contemplated by the proposed amendment.

The U'ren pills are always sugared-coated, and the jury clause was the coating in this particular instance. The voters were misled, and they were misled in the inside might have, either on the state's judicial system or on his own part. The voters had no intention in trying to ascertain the voter's object in passing this amendment. Farther than to provide for a jury verdict in civil cases, the voters had no intention in trying to ascertain the voter's object in passing this amendment. Farther than to provide for a jury verdict in civil cases, the voters had no intention in trying to ascertain the voter's object in passing this amendment.

REVIVAL OF STATE RIGHTS TALK

Suggestion Made That Roosevelt's Position Is Misunderstood.
PORTLAND, Ore., Dec. 25.—(To the Editor)—Are conditions preparing for a revival of the old state rights discussion of 50 years ago among the New Englanders, as expounded by ex-President Roosevelt?

It seems probable Roosevelt is misunderstood on the question. He sees no need of it, and he probably has no intention of attaining a larger National consciousness, and in consequence they have to have a new and expanding framework to meet the conditions. His statement of principles as to National and state relations and involving this constitutional interpretation, but the new development of Justice Marshall's view that the Constitution contains a spirit as well as a letter; that even the loss of the Constitution would not stand in the way of the National welfare where its liberal application would be subversion of National or popular will, especially where no immediate opportunity or time to amend the Constitution to remedy the danger or defect in the Constitution. The Constitution was made for the people, not the people for the Constitution. The Constitution remains of the same thing, placed after "day" and it means another. If Jesus had meant that the thief would be in heaven that day, it would have been the direct talking to heaven of Elijah. I have no doubt that hundreds of Bible students in Portland believe in the resurrection of the dead, but they have no place at death, but merely sleeps in the grave.

Yours sincerely,
ALICE FAUS.

Champ Clark Latin Scholar.

When Champ Clark becomes Speaker of the House, those who like to bewail the passing of the ancient and modern languages, will have a new champion to talk about. For Champ Clark is about as good an offhand Latin scholar as one would find from time to time to prevent himself from getting rusty on the subject, and if, need be, he could recite from Horace or Virgil, word for word, just as long as anybody would listen. On one occasion, during the last session, another member of the House sprung a passage from the Jovial Horace on the original text of the book at one and looked at it with much interest.

He says, Beacher reported, "that when he was a boy he used to go to Sunday School, but he always studied his lesson out of a leaflet. He says it's the best thing he ever did. Each time he saw the inside of 'Gimme another armful.'"

Beer Free and Otherwise.

Buffalo Commercial.
An elderly German tapster in New York says he doesn't think Colonel Abe Siskup's feat of drinking 30 bottles of beer in 24 hours is any great shakes. "When I was a young man," he said, "I worked in a brewery where we received 40 beer chocks daily. Each chock entitles a man to a glass of beer, which was served at the brewery bar. I never had any checks over and wasn't a drunker, and I was a good customer at the saloon near the brewery, too. We used to go to the saloon at noon time because there was more fun in taking a beer than you paid for."

Armed Camp Not Needed.

New York Tribune.
With the consummation of the Louisiana purchase and the scheme of our domination of the continent was so soon fully realized as to assure us thereafter perpetual exemption from the services of a formidable neighbor. From that time forward it was reasonable to hope that America would not have to make and keep herself in the service of a formidable neighbor. Any convincing evidence that the hope was vain.

In the Old Days.

Harper's Weekly.
Eve had just tied a garland of maple leaves about her ankles.
"What on earth are you up to, my love," asked Adam.
"I am trying on my new hobble skirt, sweetheart," returned the partner of his joys with a sweet smile.

WHERE WAS THE GREEK'S SOUL?

Answers Offered to Questions Suggested by Portland Resident.
PORTLAND, Dec. 24.—(To the Editor)—The Greek laborer who met with an accident (as above upon the skull) which threw him into a comatose state for a period of 18 months, and on whom a surgical operation was performed at St. Vincent's Hospital recently, seems to have elicited numerous questions.

I note The Oregonian's question, "Where was his soul during those 18 months that he lay unconscious?" We ask where the soul when a person is in slumber? It has certainly not left the physical body, or the earthly mechanism in which it dwells. The link or chain which connects the two had not been severed. Hence he was not dead, but very keenly alive, else the masterful skill of the surgeon-knife would have been used in vain.

Referring to Tennyson, who proclaims the same question about the resurrection of the dead, the Scriptures, where Jesus said—St. John, chap. XI, verse 4—"This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God. In the nation that I live, he will be alive. Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." In the 14th verse he most emphatically says that Lazarus is dead, and that the resurrection of the dead is a future thing, and that when a person is placed in a hypnotic state, Respiration even ceases, but the soul is not dead. I think a soul or spirit would be glad to "come back and reunite with the flesh," if its earthly work were not yet completed.

As the Greek did not die, how then could he be judged, using the theory of many persons who are looking for and awaiting a great judgment. He was not dead, but he was not judged. Then the Greek has not appeared before the great tribunal. He has neither been acquitted nor convicted. He is in a comatose condition, and the surgeons who performed this delicate and most wonderful work did not give him life, but they did give him a soul, which judiciously removed the cause which hindered the spirit from expressing itself. No physician or surgeon would be so foolish as to create a principle in any being. He can simply help nature to aid itself. In conclusion, then, we deduce these facts: that the soul of the Greek was not dead, but he was not judged, and he had no choice but to remain.

MRS. PORTIA MURRAY.

Souls Await Last Trump.

PORTLAND, Dec. 24.—(To the Editor)—Referring to the article in The Oregonian of December 23, "The Soul of the Greek," where the soul of the Greek, or the immortal part of him, during those 18 months that he was in a comatose condition, and he was not dead, but he was not judged, and he had no choice but to remain.

His soul was in the same place that anyone else is in, and if you will take a concordance and look up in the Bible all the places where the word sleep, slept and asleep are found, I think you will agree with me that the soul can and do sleep in the body. Your article seems to coincide with the common false belief that the soul leaves the body at death, while if you believe the Bible, the soul merely falls asleep. All this fanciful talk about "the spirit took its flight" is the imagination of those who have no knowledge of the Bible. The Bible teaches that "we shall all sleep" until the sounding of the last trumpet, when we shall arise again, and we shall live. "The immortal part of us—our souls of course, and how can our souls arise from the grave and be resurrected in the body? We are already gone to Heaven?"

In no place does the Bible promise that we shall go direct to heaven after death, except in the tongue, and telling of the deaths of the patriarchs such expressions as this are used, "and he fell asleep," and "he slept." The Bible says "the dead know not anything," so that from the time of death, or falling asleep of the soul, until the last trump is sounded, the soul is not in the body, but the souls of the patriarchs even, who have slept thousands of years, because the sound of the trumpet would be the next thing they were conscious of after death.

The words of Jesus to the thief on the cross, "Verily, I say unto you, this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," are taken by some to mean that the soul goes direct to heaven, but that is a mere matter of where you place the comma. Placed after "day" and it means another. If Jesus had meant that the thief would be in heaven that day, it would have been the direct talking to heaven of Elijah. I have no doubt that hundreds of Bible students in Portland believe in the resurrection of the dead, but they have no place at death, but merely sleeps in the grave.

Yours sincerely,
ALICE FAUS.

Everybody Presumed to Know Whisky!

The Docket.
In the case of Treadwell vs. State, 53 Southern Reporter, 296, a bottle of whisky was introduced in evidence, and a witness requested to open it, and taste the liquor, and say if it was whisky. The witness objected to do so, on the ground that the witness was not shown to be an expert. The Supreme Court of Alabama held that this objection was not availing, and the following is its reason: "It is hardly to be supposed in this day and generation that expert testimony is required in the trial of a case involving the question of whether or not a liquid is whisky. It may require a connoisseur to tell the different brands of a superior from an inferior article, but the law makes no such distinction in prosecutions for violation of liquor laws."

Date of a Murder.

PORTLAND, Dec. 24.—(To the Editor)—On what date was Miss Gling murdered? Miss Gling was Miss Gling murdered in a hotel, and when was her murderer hung? A. K. B.

Catherine Gling was murdered Dec. 3, 1894; Harry Hayward was hanged Dec. 11, 1896.

Life's Sunny Side

The late ex-Governor Allen D. Chandler, of Georgia, was famous in the South for his quaint humor.

"Ex-Governor Chandler," said a Gainesville man, "once abandoned cigars for a pipe at the beginning of the year. He stuck to his resolve till the year's end. Then he was heard to say to his wife: 'By actual calculation I have saved, by smoking a pipe instead of cigars this year, \$38. But where is it?'"

Some little girls were boasting of their respective families. They had passed from clothes to personal appearance. The minister's little girl boasted: "Every package that comes for my papa is marked 'D. D.'"

"The tramp had walked a good three miles and was particularly thirsty. A sudden turn in the road brought him to the foot of a steep hill at the top of which stood a large building. He paused a moment before attempting the Herculean feat of storming the hill. He felt hungry and thirsty. He glanced to the left. "There is a man sitting on a 'ferry' traveler, and refresh thyself." The tramp was sorry the sign was attached to a pump handle. However, water was being pumped, and he commenced to pump. The spout remained dry. He pumped with more vigor. Still no water. After 10 minutes of hard work, when all things about the pump, and continued his journey. At the top of the hill he mentioned his grievance to a native. "The owner of that house," he said, "has some big water cisterns which he has filled from a stream in the valley. He is too lazy to fill 'em himself, though; so he rigged up that pump and connected it with his cistern, and now—"

The tramp was already sprinting across the road.—Tit-Bits.

"One of your countrymen," said Miss Ellen Terry at a luncheon in New York, "spoke very bitterly the other day about the divorce habit among the rich. He said that some children in Newport have five and six fathers. He was mistaken. I was struck with five fathers is unfortunate."

Miss Terry smiled.

"But these children," she said, "to whom the gentleman referred, do not realize their misfortune while they are children, for they see very little of their fashionable mothers, and they are Newport boys whose mother called him to her and said: "Robert, your father and I are going to get separated. With which of us do you wish to remain?" "The boy hesitated, his mother waited anxiously, and then he replied: 'With the woman who has the most fire from thousands of appraising eyes is to my mind a Joan of Arc of the first water.'"

WOMEN ARE HEROINES OF FASHION

Course Required by Those Who Carry Canes, Dolls and Dog Muffs.
New York Times.
"I've been under fire more than once," said a well-known veteran of two wars the other day, "but I'll take my hat off to our American girls for real heroism. Any young woman who is brave enough to adopt some freak fashion or Broadway up and down town, and who is not afraid of afternoon under the Gatling-gun fire from thousands of appraising eyes is to my mind a Joan of Arc of the first water."

"Do you refer to the hobble skirt and the ding-a-liner hats?" his companion asked.

"No, they're far too common now to count, though when they first came out it took nerve to wear them in