

The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Entered at Portland, Oregon Postoffice as Second Class Mail. Postage and
Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(BY MAIL)

Daily, Sunday included, one year.....\$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months.....\$4.00
Daily, Sunday included, three months.....\$2.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month.....\$.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year.....\$7.25
Daily, without Sunday, six months.....\$3.50
Daily, without Sunday, three months.....\$1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month.....\$.50
Sunday, one year.....\$2.00
Sunday and weekly, one year.....\$2.00

(BY CARRIER)

Daily, Sunday included, one year.....\$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months.....\$4.00
How to Remit—Send Postoffice money order, express order or personal check or money order, bank draft, cashier's check or at the sender's risk, give postoffice address in full, including county and state to 28 pages, 2 cents; to 40 pages, 3 cents; to 40 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage.

Eastern Business Offices—Terry & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building, Chancery Street, building.

PORTLAND, TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1911.

REVISION AT THE SPECIAL SESSION.

The disposition of Congress toward reciprocity and tariff revision at the extra session will not be quite the same as that of the body which has just expired. In the House of Representatives, of course, the change of sentiment will be complete. A large Democratic majority will replace a Republican majority and naturally tariff legislation will be correspondingly affected. But the Senate has altered also.

It is estimated by those who have made a study of the subject that fully fifty of the Senators who will assemble in answer to the President's call are progressives. Not all of these forward-looking men are Republicans by any means. A considerable number of them are Democrats. The fact is that both parties have their conservatives or standpatters and progressives. Mr. Balliett, who makes some pretensions to being the leader of the Democrats, is perhaps the most independent participant in the Senate. But it is impossible to conjecture how the Senate will deal with the tariff from the designations of its various groups. All of the Republican progressives are ardent protectionists, while the Democratic progressives claim, at least to be revenue tariff men.

The reader who depends upon these indications, however, is apt to be misled. The Democrats who theoretically stand for a low tariff are likely in practice to vote against revision which affects their own localities. On the other hand, the Republican progressives will no doubt advocate revision which goes somewhat beyond merely adopting the reciprocity agreement with Canada. Men do not always feel bound to follow their theories with strict accuracy when it comes to a matter of practice.

The President, it is said, hopes that at the special session Congress will not attempt to carry interference with the tariff beyond the adoption of the reciprocity agreement. His preference would be to allow the schedules to remain as they are until the Tariff Board has had time to report upon them. Still his own words indicate pretty clearly that some schedules might very well be handled without waiting for any further investigation. Mr. Taft has said more than once that the wool schedule, for example, is indefensible. If it is indefensible it may very properly be reduced at once.

A large amount of information was gathered concerning wool, cotton and other subjects while the Aldrich tariff was under way. This ought to be of some service at the extra session. Where any duty is manifestly injurious to the country, or where it is declared by all unprejudiced students to be iniquitous, there is no good reason for delay in dealing with it. There are several such duties can hardly be denied. Very likely the President will not object to the reduction of these schedules at the special session. Some observers believe that he has made a more careful study of the tariff than he had deemed necessary when the Aldrich revision was under way and that it will now be less easy to mislead him that it was formerly. If this is the case we may expect him to join heartily in an effort to cut down the duties on several schedules at the special session. But a general revision would be a very different matter.

Mr. Taft apprehends some disturbance to business even from a partial revision at this time. No doubt there would be a little flurry, but nothing of consequence. Business men know that the tariff is in unstable equilibrium. Nobody has expected that the country would tolerate the Aldrich tariff a great while and business is prepared for further reduction of the schedules. But it is not prepared for a general overhauling of the tariff. Should the Democrats be foolish enough to undertake an old-fashioned orgy of revision there is no likelihood that their work would be approved by the Senate. Even if it were Mr. Taft would certainly veto it and the country would sustain him in doing so. Party dependency forbids the Democrats to think of general revision. The attempt if they were to make it, would almost certainly be a failure. The concentrated forces of opposition would defeat it as they have defeated every other such attempt and it is not wise for a party just emerging upon a lease of power to invite disaster.

But it is from the point of view of the public welfare that general revision is most to be deplored. It would accomplish nothing desirable, while it would almost certainly put off the effectual revision of the most injurious schedules for several years. Of course the forces of rigid protection understand this and we may expect them to work with more or less subtlety for the undertaking of a general revision. They need fear very little from that, while an attack upon the schedules separately would do them serious damage. The sound precept to follow in revising the tariff is to "divide and conquer." Hitherto the practice has been to unite as many enemies as possible by an assault on all the duties at once.

We sincerely hope that the Democrats will manage to shun this rock. If they suffer their craft to strike it shipwreck is almost certain to ensue. The President expects them to work with him for a degree of tariff reduction as can be secured under current conditions. He thus pays them the high compliment of assuming that they will live up to their party principles. If they fail to do so the country will know whom to blame.

"Dum dum" or soft-nosed bullets are being used in the present war in Mexico by both federals and revolutionaries.

tionists. The use of these terrible mangling missiles is forbidden by the rules of war in all civilized countries and their use in Mexico is further evidence that the present struggle is not one in which men of a very high order of civilization or intelligence are engaged. The loss of life among either the rebels or the government troops has not been heavy, but the strife has reached a point where it is not apparent that much quarter would be given by either of the contestants if the opportunity arose for either to deny it.

COLONEL ROOSEVELT ON THE RECALL.

Colonel Roosevelt told the people of Arizona some things about their proposed constitution that they doubtless wanted to hear and other things they did not. He, enough, want to hear. The Colonel was just a trifle delphic about the initiative and referendum, so far as he gave utterance to the latter. The afterglow profound opinion that it is good for some states and not very good—not good at all, indeed—for others. But the Colonel patricially and enthusiastically informed the people that, if that was the sort of thing they wanted, why they wanted, and were entitled to have, that sort of thing.

But Colonel Roosevelt does not like the recall, when it comes to the judiciary. Not at all. You Arizona people made a sad mistake there. You did, indeed. You really ought not to have done it. But of course since you have decided to recall the judiciary when it suits your sovereign pleasure, you will have to take the consequences. Besides, its nobody else's business.

Here in Oregon we have the recall flourishing like a green bay tree. Naturally it will occur to any citizen of Oregon, who has observed the workings of that interesting and more or less potent device, that it is unlikely to intimidate the judiciary by the constant menace of removal from office, why it may not be just as unwise to subject other important public officers, such as governors, mayors and representatives in Congress, who have grave and responsible duties to perform, to intimidation and perpetual annoyance through popular clamor or prejudice or momentary public passion? Why the recall at all for the self-seller that Main will go Republican next year?

Incidentally it may be remarked that there never has been the slightest suggestion of use of the recall on any Oregon judge. Will anyone say that we have no judges who ought to be replaced by other and better judges?

AS TO THE INCOME TAX.

The Federal income tax amendment is not yet out of the wilderness, but those who favor it can see light ahead. Since January 1, 1911, it has been ratified by 19 states. Before that date seven had acted upon it favorably, so that it has now been adopted by 26 legislatures. Should nine more favor it the amendment will become part of the constitution.

There is no particular limit to the time for ratification. Apparently a legislature may act whenever it gets ready, be it now or a century from now. Again a legislature which has once rejected the amendment may change its mind and decide to ratify. It seems on the other hand, that a ratification which has been made and certified to Washington, can not be reconsidered. Hence the chances favor adoption. New York is one of the states which rejected the amendment at first, but now, it is reported, the prospect is brighter for it at Albany. In some other states there may be a similar change of sentiment as time passes.

Thus far the amendment has fared better in the popular branches of the state legislatures than in the upper houses. In the Arkansas senate, for instance, it was rejected after the assembly had ratified it. The senators seemed to see in the amendment an infringement of the doctrine of state rights so precious to some Democrats. Legislators who take this view of the amendment forget that Congress has already an unquestioned right to tax incomes. All it need do is to appropriate the tax according to population. The new provision would not add a jot to the Federal power or lessen the rights of the states. But it would enable Congress to tax incomes in terms of money and relieve it of the necessity of taxing incomes under the pretext of taxing population. This would be a great practical gain, of course, but it would really add nothing to the Federal authority nor would it subtract anything from the sovereignty of the states.

We fear, however, that their worship, agreeable as it is, may be more satisfactory to themselves than to the Lord. The ruler of the universe, according to all accounts, is an extremely democratic being who sets as much store by a beggar as by a millionaire. He is not at all displeased by the sight of a "crowd of rubneck Christians." Indeed that is the sort he likes best unless the authorities are mistaken. We are informed by one who is supposed to know that the Lord and those near him in Paradise rejoice more over one sinner that repents than over ninety and nine just men who need no repentance. It follows with fair certainty that the rubber-neck Christians who offend Dr. Aked's deacon are just the sort who do not care to worship "in a crowd of rubneck Christians who go to church one Sunday and to a baseball game the next." No doubt there is something serenely satisfying in exclusive worship. To have the Almighty all to oneself and impress him satisfactorily with one's personal importance is an opportunity to be valued and certified to Washington, can not be reconsidered. Hence the chances favor adoption. New York is one of the states which rejected the amendment at first, but now, it is reported, the prospect is brighter for it at Albany. In some other states there may be a similar change of sentiment as time passes.

Thus far the amendment has fared better in the popular branches of the state legislatures than in the upper houses. In the Arkansas senate, for instance, it was rejected after the assembly had ratified it. The senators seemed to see in the amendment an infringement of the doctrine of state rights so precious to some Democrats. Legislators who take this view of the amendment forget that Congress has already an unquestioned right to tax incomes. All it need do is to appropriate the tax according to population. The new provision would not add a jot to the Federal power or lessen the rights of the states. But it would enable Congress to tax incomes in terms of money and relieve it of the necessity of taxing incomes under the pretext of taxing population. This would be a great practical gain, of course, but it would really add nothing to the Federal authority nor would it subtract anything from the sovereignty of the states.

MAINE PROHIBITION BATTLEGROUND.

Nearly everybody professed to gain some comfort from the political upheaval in Maine last September, with the possible exception of the stand-pat Republicans. The Democrats saw therein a forecast of return to National power; the progressives read a lesson on tariff revision; liquor dealers detected promise of the opening to legitimate traffic of a long closed field and even the prohibitionists found cause for rejoicing.

It is to be no longer doubted, however, that the real issue in Maine was constitutional revision on the subject of prohibition. Maine's example, perhaps, had some influence in later state elections, but developments have shown clearly the real cause for the Democratic landslide in a rock-ribbed Republican state.

Maine has had statutory prohibition since 1854 and constitutional prohibition since 1884. During this long time prohibition has been a constantly recurring issue that has entered into every political problem in the state. Failure to enforce the law in many districts resulted in numberless propositions and laws for better enforcement and affected the political fate of countless candidates.

In a statement prepared for the New York World late last year by the Associated Prohibition Press we observe that admission is made that prohibition has been partially nullified in Maine "by hostile officials and interstate traffic." In this statement a note of rejoicing is found over the defeat in the 1910 election of the "nullifying" Republican state administration. It is declared that better enforcement is expected.

Whatever may have been done concerning enforcement in Maine the Democratic Legislature and the Democratic Governor seem to have heard an anti-prohibition note in the election returns. The Legislature has adopted a resolution providing for re-submission of the prohibition amendment at an election to be held September 11 and the Governor has signed the measure.

The National Prohibitionists had

planned a campaign for 1911 for the enactment by Congress of legislation prohibiting Interstate traffic in intoxicating liquors. It would not be surprising, however, if this campaign were now made secondary to a concentration of effort to maintain Maine in the ranks of the prohibition states. The popular faith in the old saying that "as Maine goes so goes the Union" was strengthened by the general political results in 1910. State-wide prohibition, as a principle, has been notably weakened, too, by results of elections on prohibition amendments in Georgia and Oregon. In Georgia statutory prohibition went into effect in 1908. In 1910 a constitutional amendment was defeated and a Legislature elected that repealed the statutory provision, irreversibly retaining local option. In Oregon, both statutory and constitutional prohibition were defeated and local option material ground by the enactment of the home-rule amendment.

It is impossible to forecast the results of the re-submission election in Maine, but whatever the outcome, it should serve to lay aside the prohibitory issue for the time being. The Colonels' withdrawal from the contest indicates that he considers the port's interests more important than his own.

"Portland's bank clearings are running a little larger than Seattle," says the Argus, "but that is because Seattle hasn't yet gotten on to Portland's system of padding them." It would be of no use whatever for Seattle to discover "Portland's system of padding." If it never would and never could exist in Seattle. The principal item which figures in this "padding" in Portland is a matter of more than \$2,000,000 per month that is being spent in this vicinity by the railroads for new construction work. As nearly all this is paid out for labor it circulates in a great many channels of trade and thus shows up well on the bank clearings figures. Then there are the stock yards which are paying out more than \$25,000 per day in this vicinity. Instead of in Seattle. Meanwhile Portland sawmills are turning out more lumber every twenty-four hours than is manufactured in the same period in any other city on earth. The wages paid to the army of mill workers, loggers and stevedores also assist in the "padding" which Seattle has not yet "gotten on to." The Oregonian hopes that Seattle will thoroughly investigate this system of "padding." While it may not be adopted in Seattle, it is worth studying.

The incident is deeply regretted on account of the cause of negro education, for which the name and endeavor of Booker T. Washington stands. Otherwise it was a trifling occurrence investigated by a hysterical woman, naturally frightened at seeing a strange negro closely scanning the door numbers in her vicinity, and exaggerated by the foolish flight of Dr. Washington when accosted by her husband. Tragedies sometimes grow from small beginnings and it would be a tragedy, indeed, were this incident to cast a painful blight upon the educational work of a man who stands for the uplift of his race in the United States.

RUBNECK CHRISTIANS.

Dr. Aked's resignation from his fashionable New York pulpit, with discouraging remarks about his congregation, has set many pens in motion. Much of the comment upon the affair is rather critical of the reverend Doctor. He came to America, it is remarked, expecting to set a great furor going. He thought the dueling tones of his pulpit oratory would gather the multitudes together like the sands of the sea. Since nothing of the sort happened he has taken himself elsewhere in huff. It seems that some of his rich parishioners are disposed to say "good riddance" as his sacred garments vanish in the dim distance. One deacon is reported to have said that for his part he did not care to worship "in a crowd of rubneck Christians who go to church one Sunday and to a baseball game the next." No doubt there is something serenely satisfying in exclusive worship. To have the Almighty all to oneself and impress him satisfactorily with one's personal importance is an opportunity to be valued and certified to Washington, can not be reconsidered. Hence the chances favor adoption. New York is one of the states which rejected the amendment at first, but now, it is reported, the prospect is brighter for it at Albany. In some other states there may be a similar change of sentiment as time passes.

There is no particular limit to the time for ratification. Apparently a legislature may act whenever it gets ready, be it now or a century from now. Again a legislature which has once rejected the amendment may change its mind and decide to ratify. It seems on the other hand, that a ratification which has been made and certified to Washington, can not be reconsidered. Hence the chances favor adoption. New York is one of the states which rejected the amendment at first, but now, it is reported, the prospect is brighter for it at Albany. In some other states there may be a similar change of sentiment as time passes.

We fear, however, that their worship, agreeable as it is, may be more satisfactory to themselves than to the Lord. The ruler of the universe, according to all accounts, is an extremely democratic being who sets as much store by a beggar as by a millionaire. He is not at all displeased by the sight of a "crowd of rubneck Christians."

Indeed that is the sort he likes best unless the authorities are mistaken. We are informed by one who is supposed to know that the Lord and those near him in Paradise rejoice more over one sinner than repents than over ninety and nine just men who need no repentance. It follows with fair certainty that the rubber-neck Christians who offend Dr. Aked's deacon are just the sort who do not care to worship "in a crowd of rubneck Christians who go to church one Sunday and to a baseball game the next." No doubt there is something serenely satisfying in exclusive worship. To have the Almighty all to oneself and impress him satisfactorily with one's personal importance is an opportunity to be valued and certified to Washington, can not be reconsidered. Hence the chances favor adoption. New York is one of the states which rejected the amendment at first, but now, it is reported, the prospect is brighter for it at Albany. In some other states there may be a similar change of sentiment as time passes.

The death of Tom L. Johnson, ex-Mayor of Cleveland, now impending

has said Miss Carrie Holbrook, president of the Y. W. C. A. of this city in a talk last Sunday. "Don't talk to chauffeurs in the streets, don't attend theaters without escort, eschew cheap shows and chewing gum." Wholesome advice, truly, and greatly needed by a large class of thoughtless but innocent young girls who unconsciously cheapen themselves by doing the "don'ts" noted.

The idea of Booker Washington annoying a white woman is ridiculous. Some woman of an excessively nervous temperament may perhaps have been frightened when she saw him looking around for a chauffeur, but her husband ought to have had sense enough to understand the situation. A woman married to such a simpleton has every excuse for being nervous.

PORT OF PORTLAND PROBLEM.

It is questionable whether the resignation of Captain Crowe from the newly appointed Port of Portland Commission has simplified matters, although the reason for his resignation is commendable. The work which is now being carried on by the Port of Portland is entirely too important to be interrupted or hampered by any family row. Captain Crowe apparently thought that his withdrawal would tend to restore harmony, without which best results are impossible.

The Oregonian has at various times criticized some of the work of the Port of Portland. This paper never favored the building of a large river towboat at a time when sailing vessels were rapidly disappearing from the ocean. It would be a waste of money. Operating expenses, insurance, depreciation, repairs and interest on the investment would be more than double the sum paid out last year for chartering extra boats when emergencies arose.

Capable Oregon boys are not crowding the vacancies at West Point. Perhaps they are waiting for actual service.

Colonel James Jackson is a veteran fighter, to whom the smell of powder smoke is incense. Naturally he scents war.

Mexicans would better not kill Americans, for the Colonel's Rough Riders are the boys to make reprisal.

The old reliable Oregon, in fresh armor and always ready, will stop the invasion at the start.

If these jingoes continue to talk war, we shall have war.

Mailboxes on streetcars will prevent tie-ups.

near future. It is the knowledge of these facts that has caused many Portland taxpayers some misgivings about engaging in the practice of "swapping horses while crossing a stream."

Captain Crowe, by reason of his profession and experience, was well qualified for the position on the new board, but the manner of his appointment, being at variance with that prescribed by law, raised a doubt and prompted to interfere with complications which might prove disastrous to work of the Hume interests. The personalities injected in the present trouble, if the Port of Portland has for some time competing successfully with Seattle in the coastwise passenger traffic came to light yesterday, although it had been realized by officials of the steamship companies for a long time. It is believed that the court is well known to the officials of the Pacific Navigation Company, who are planning to extend the route of the fast steamers, the Yale and the Harvard, from San Francisco north to Portland.

Grounds for the contest will be found in an alleged unconstitutionality of the people's act. It will be contended that the provisions of this act fall under police power of the state. It is also to be contended that the police power is regulate and not to inhibit and that the act as passed by the people is plainly an inhibition.

With these contentions in view it will be declared that neither the Legislature nor the people have the right to make an act of this nature which is plainly and simply inhibitory in its nature and in its construction.

Members of the Hume family have been in the city recently investigating questions of this character. They have not yet got to the bottom of the story.

Portland's bank clearings are running a little larger than Seattle's, says the Argus, "but that is because Seattle hasn't yet gotten on to Portland's system of padding them." It will be contended that the act as passed by the people is plainly an inhibition.

Portland's steam rates between Seattle and San Francisco are \$20 and over, while from Portland to San Francisco \$15 and \$18 first-class.

The fare from Seattle to Tacoma by boat is less than 50 cents and \$4.35 by rail. Thus it will cost less than \$5 for a traveler to go from either Seattle or Tacoma by rail and return by boat.

The steamship rates between San Francisco and Los Angeles are \$20 and over, while from San Francisco to Los Angeles by rail and boat is \$12 and \$15 first-class.

The greater rates between San Francisco and Los Angeles are \$20 and over, while from San Francisco to Los Angeles by rail and boat is \$12 and \$15 first-class.

The fares between Seattle and Tacoma by boat are less than 50 cents and \$4.35 by rail. Thus it will cost less than \$5 for a traveler to go from either Seattle or Tacoma by rail and return by