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 40 pages, 3 cents; 42 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage double rate.

Eastern Business Offices—Verre & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building. Chicago, Steger building.

European Office—No. 3 Regent street, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1912

ROOSEVELT AND ROOT.

Colonel Roosevelt is being persuaded, apparently, that his war on Root for chairman is likely to fail. The Colonel is entitled to his own temporary chairman if he can get such a chairman; but he would have to have absolute mastery of the convention, and to be able to convince the delegates that the National committee was inspired by a hostile purpose in naming Root and that he would not get fair play. But he knows, and all know, that all factions and all interests will be given a hearing and a full opportunity for action with Mr. Root as chairman.

Mr. Roosevelt's friends argue that the National committee has no right to designate the temporary chairman, and that the convention itself alone has that power. It is undoubtedly within the right and authority of the convention to have its own temporary chairman; but the convention seldom asserts it. Only once has the choice of the committee been rejected. In 1884, the National committee selected General Powell Clayton, a Southern politician; but the convention substituted John R. Lynch, a mulatto and a Mississippian who was widely and favorably known. The convention's sole motive was to please the negro vote. The change was not in the interest of any candidate; nor did the controversy take that form.

The National committee has had a large voice in the affairs of National conventions, because the committee is the party's machinery, and until recently organized service by recognized party leaders has been thought to be indispensable. The committee has arranged all the preliminaries of all National conventions, even to the extent of hearing and determining contests. If the convention is not pleased with any recommendation or decision by the committee, it has but to reject it. But the work of hearing all contests would be interminable; and no convention has ever been willing to undertake it. Therefore the committee has done it.

The National committee made an exceedingly wise choice in Root. It put Colonel Roosevelt to a great disadvantage, because his own following would not likely adopt the extreme method of upsetting precedent, humiliating the National committee and at once converting a great party gathering into a mere factional convention without ample justification.

PENALIZING THE SALOON.

Governor West's proposal that the saloons of the state should be required to take care of the wrecks they make has the merit of exact justice. The saloons should be penalized for the minds they blight, bodies they ruin and homes they devastate. But the difficulty will be to lodge the responsibility for specific cases in any saloon or all the saloons.

Where does individual accountability for the mischief wrought by liquor end and the accountability of the saloon begin? We hardly think the Governor means to say that the saloons are to blame for it all. Nor do we think that any measure, however justly inspired and however wisely designed, could be made effective in bringing the saloon alone to bar for the evils caused by liquor. For all liquor drinking is not in the saloons; nor is all drunkenness caused there; nor are all vicious habits formed nor bad companions found there. Enough are, God knows.

Probably the Governor means to tax the saloons for support of inebriate asylums, or for inebriates in the general insane asylum. We favor taxing the saloons all the traffic will bear—every cent, every farthing. But taxing the saloon more than the traffic will bear means fewer saloons and more speak-easies, deadfalls, kitchen bars and the whole lot of secret and illicit hellholes. That means not less liquor drunk, but more, or as much; and more drunkenness, or as much.

We tax the saloon heavily now as a salve to conscience and as a contribution to the public funds as a sort of offset to the harm liquor does. If the Governor can find a way to put the whole compensatory burden on the saloon, in the same way that other industries must care for their wounded and maimed, The Oregonian will be with him.

THE UNITED STATES VERSUS BRAZIL.

The Government's suit against the coffee trust is unique in being the first suit against a trust in which a foreign government is directly interested. The valorization scheme was adopted by the State of Sao Paulo and aided by the Brazilian government by the guaranty of the loan which made its success possible, and by the imposition of a surtax on coffee exports in excess of a certain figure. The United States is therefore attacking in our courts the government of Brazil and one of the states of that federation. The controversy is not only legal, but political.

That the valorization scheme was designed to raise the price of coffee arbitrarily is admitted by its authors, and that it has had that effect cannot be denied, though other causes may have contributed to the advance of nearly 100 per cent since 1905. Even the financial journals, which are ordinarily the most stalwart defenders of the trusts, admit this, one of them, the Chronicle of New York, saying:

> Our own opinion has been from the start that the valorization plan was economically unsound, representing, as it does, an arbitrary and unnatural interference with the course of industry.

It also adds that the Government has made out a plausible case of restraint of trade.

But the suit must inevitably have a serious effect on our relations not only with Brazil but with other Latin-American countries. The Brazilian government is in effect a defendant in the suit and may regard it as an unfriendly act calling for diplomatic protest and perhaps for fiscal retaliation. Such a complication would be particularly unfortunate at a time when we are exerting ourselves to expand our commerce with Latin America and are looking to the Panama Canal to aid us towards that most desirable end.

It is by no means certain that Brazil cannot avoid all complications, place all parties to the valorization plan outside the jurisdiction of our courts and defeat the purpose of the suit. The valorization syndicate has four or five times as much coffee stored in Europe as in the United States. It could easily store its whole supply in Europe and sell there to American buyers, who would be "innocent third parties." There would then be no person or property in the United States over which our courts could take jurisdiction.

The only course, other than forcing dissolution of the syndicate, by which we can restore the price of coffee to a normal level is by stimulating competition with Brazilian growers. The coffee industry flourishes in Central America and the product could be much increased in that region if, by such treaties as those with Nicaragua and Honduras, we could promote tranquillity and just government. By the same means we might increase the production of Santo Domingo and other West India Islands. Hawaii also is capable of greatly increasing her output. In the course of a few years Brazil's supremacy as the great source of the world's coffee supply might be destroyed, and Brazil might be compelled either to throw her surplus stock on the market or to destroy it, as has already been proposed.

MR. WATKINS CLEARS IT UP.

The Oregonian has today a letter from George Watkins, at Marshfield, explaining the Roosevelt phenomenon. We have not the pleasure of Mr. Watkins' acquaintance, but we wish we had. He is somebody worth knowing. He understands perfectly the psychology of the Roosevelt movement and expounds powerfully the philosophy of the Roosevelt cult. Mr. Roosevelt gets there with both feet, though occasionally minus an ear or so, and a trifle bunged up otherwise. But he gets there; therefore the people are for him.

When the Colonel finds a head in his way he cracks it, though he often learns afterwards that he has bruised up a friend. But he has no time to ask or receive explanations. All he knows is that he has his eye focused on the goal, and, if there is an obstacle in the way, it must be removed. The quickest and simplest method is to eject it bodily, if he cannot hurdle it. Therefore the Colonel does one or the other, and pushes on.

We are not disposed to question Mr. Watkins' enthusiastic statement that Colonel Roosevelt has done more for the common uplift than any thousand living men. It would be hard to show that at the time of President Roosevelt's greatest activity for the square deal, when the doctrine was new, any thousand men had as much influence for that beneficent aim as the Colonel. There are a few persons, indeed, who might be mentioned as having done some things recently for the man underneath, some of them perhaps a trifle more than a thousandth as much as Roosevelt has done; but we will refrain. Let Mr. Watkins have it his way. And Colonel Roosevelt, too. The Colonel usually has it anyway.

We like Mr. Watkins' frank eulogy of the Colonel. He puts in graphic words the sentiments that are in the minds and hearts of many millions. There are many people who do not understand the Roosevelt furor and the stubborn loyalty of so many people to Roosevelt despite his known shortcomings. Mr. Watkins explains it all.

WHY GERMANY CONTINUES TO ARM.

Viscount Haldane's efforts to bring about an Anglo-German agreement for restriction of armaments are being seconded by leading men of both nations, who are not discouraged by the increase of the German army and navy authorized by the Reichstag. Professor Stein has published a number of articles in favor of an agreement by prominent Britons and Germans in the magazine "Nord und Sud." One of these, by ex-Premier Balfour, disavows the belief that the bulk of the German people desire to attack Britain. He explains, however, that the co-existence of Germany's military and naval armament with her policy of development, which can only be carried out through territorial expansion, constitutes a threat of war to those nations which hinder that policy. He says of Germany:

> She can teach Europe that organized military power can be used as effectually in the interests of peace as in those of war; that the appetite of domination belongs to an outworn phase of patriotism; that the forbearance of civilization must be the joint work of many peoples, and that the task is not lightened by the tremendous burden of modern armaments. If she is prepared to lead on these lines, she will find the world prepared to follow; but if there are signs that her desires point to other objects, can it be surprising that other countries will watch the steady growth of her powers of aggression with undisguised alarm and anxiously consider schemes for meeting what they have been driven to regard as a common danger?

In substance Mr. Balfour asks Germany to forego her ambition for expansion in exchange for the leadership of the world in the ways of peace. Is it probable that Germany will exchange what she considers the solid advantages of territorial, and consequent commercial expansion, for such sentimental advantage?

The Germans are an eminently practical people. They have awakened to the necessity of an outlet abroad for their overflowing population, where the emigrants will not be permanently lost to Germany, at a time when they find all the available colonies in Asia, Africa and Australia already in the possession of other nations. Germany is excluded from South America, the only other field open for exploitation, by the Monroe doctrine. Germany has seen millions of her people emigrate to the United States, hundreds of thousands to England and other countries, to lose their German nationality. Her population is crowding the capacity of the empire to sustain it. Could the surplus be transplanted to German colonies, they would continue to contribute to the greatness of the empire.

Then why should Germany restrict her armaments and forego her ambition? By the threat of war she induced France to surrender a large slice of the Congo. By the same means she might force Britain to give up a part of her world-wide dominions to become German colonies. By the same means she may force the United States to recede from the Monroe doctrine, if the Democrats force us to sink to fifth rank among naval powers by their "Little American" policy. If she can force Britain to give her another slice of Africa and a sphere of influence in Persia, and the United States to countenance the seizure of part of Brazil by the mere spectacle of her powerful army and navy, why should she not arm?

Mr. Balfour's appeal reads much like the cry of peace of one who has already gathered in all the spoils. It also resembles a cry of distress from one who cannot keep up the pace in armament set by Germany. There is, therefore, every reason why Germany, from the standpoint of self-interest, should persist in her present policy.

ROOSEVELT'S WONDERFUL FIGHT.

Whether Theodore Roosevelt captures the Republican nomination or not, whether one favors his nomination or not, the fight he has made to secure it and the onward sweep of his success will go down as one of the most striking episodes in American history. The campaign he has made proves him one of the most wonderful fighters the world has known.

The Roosevelt boom was started in January, apparently for no other purpose than to kill off the La Follette boom, which was alone feared by the Taft men at that time. They thought so little of it that they did not dream of its becoming a serious factor in the campaign. But it grew in spite of them, in spite of his renunciation of a third term. It received a temporary check from his refusal to declare himself, but it revived when he announced his willingness to respond if the people called. Still the trend seemed to be against it. The letter of the seven Governors did not bring forth the expected popular demand, La Follette's Philadelphia speech failed to eliminate the Senator, the Columbus speech fell flat, one Southern delegation after another was instructed for Taft in March, Roosevelt was beaten in North Dakota, Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, and lost his own State of New York. He finished with only 40 delegates.

But the more things went against him the harder he fought. Illinois gave him his first real opportunity in a direct primary and he seized it. He began a series of assaults on his opponents in that State with a speech at Chicago, where the whole population seemed to have turned out to hear him. He tore through the State, indifferent to the opposition of the leaders and the officials and captured 58 of the 58 delegates by a plurality of 140,000.

That was the turning point and his victories have since been almost uninterrupted. New York and Vermont shrank from instructing their delegates against him. He went through Pennsylvania, dethroned Penrose and added 67 more delegates to his total. Oregon and Nebraska fell in line for him without hearing him. Iowa gave him a temporary check, but Missouri compensated for it. Massachusetts, proverbially conservative, became the hope of his opponents, but the best they could get there was a drawn battle. He won the direct primaries in Maryland and Colorado, the conventions in Idaho, Kansas, North Carolina, Minnesota and West Virginia. Nothing seemed able to stop the onward sweep of his columns.

Then came Ohio. Taft himself declared that the result there would be decisive and made superhuman exertions to win his own state, but state loyalty could not stop Roosevelt and he has five-sixths of the delegates. After that New Jersey was a foregone conclusion. He carried all except one of the eleven direct primary states, and in that one he scored a tie.

WORD FROM PROFESSOR JAMES.

Since the death of Professor William James, of Harvard, there has been a lively expectation abroad among the psychic researchers that his spirit would sooner or later communicate with some living person. He died on August 26, 1910, so that plenty of time seems to have elapsed for him to establish relations with those left behind if he desired to do so. That he should wish to send some message back to this world was highly probable, for Professor James always took an ardent interest in the occult. His attitude was that of a sympathetic critic rather than a convinced devotee, but still he was deep in the counsels of the psychic researchers and made with them many an experiment which just barely missed proving that the dead are alive and able to impart knowledge to the living. In the estimation of such men as Professor Hyslop, these experiments did really demonstrate the hypothesis of the future life, but on all hands it has been conceded that a message from Professor James would fortify the faith in a most gratifying degree. Now the longed-for communication has come, though perhaps it lacks something of that acute intellectuality which was so conspicuous in the philosopher while he walked this sphere.

In fact, there are two items of knowledge which he has imparted to illuminate our paths through this wilderness of woe. The first is that the Greek letter Omega is his newly adopted signature in the land beyond. This comes to us through two women whom Professor Hyslop calls Mrs. Smead and Mrs. Chenoweth. A modest reluctance on the part of these women to pose in the glare of fame moves Professor Hyslop to conceal their real names, but that makes very little difference. The messages would be almost as valuable if they had no names at all. It seems that both Mrs. Smead and Mrs. Chenoweth received impressions from Professor James' spirit which were of a somewhat rambling description. But at the end of each appeared an unmistakable Omega. This, of course, proved that the communications were authentic, no matter how silly they might be, inasmuch as the philosopher's spirit told Mrs. Chenoweth that he was going to adopt the Greek letter for his transmundane signature. We must not permit ourselves to view this matter too lightly. Granting that, as Professor Hyslop asserts, Mrs. Smead and Mrs. Chenoweth knew nothing of one another, we have one of them saying that Professor James was about to use Omega for his signature and the other actually receiving a message signed with an Omega. The coincidence seems at least to require explanation.

The other information which has been received from the other world about Professor James relates to pink pajamas. Once while he was still alive a British medium, naturally a woman, had a vision of his form clad in all the splendor of a pair of pink pajamas. The wide waves of the Atlantic separated the philosopher and the seeress at that particular moment, but nevertheless her vision was strictly accurate. A comparison of times revealed that at the identical instant when the British medium was rapt into a glorious consciousness of pink pajamas Professor James was indubitably wearing a suit of that poetic tint. So far so good. Now comes a deeper mystery. After the philosopher's death a boy, the son of a clergyman and therefore above all suspicion of mendacity, under the inspiration of Professor James' spirit directed somebody to give Professor Hyslop a set of pink pajamas for a Christmas present. If the reader holds his breath in amazement we shall not be surprised. Marvels of this kind are enough to give one the creeps.

Seriously, why is it that men of the brightest intelligence, like Professor James, as soon as they get rid of their bodies, seemingly become gibbering imbeciles? Many reasons are assigned for the phenomenon. The most plausible is that the sage is obliged to send his remarks through a medium who is more than likely to be an ignorant simpleton. Coming through such a channel, it need not astonish us to find Shakespeare's observations sounding more like Touchstone than Hamlet, and to hear Professor William James talking drivel.

Still, it ought to be possible to find a medium honest and bright enough to report exactly what a spirit says to her. If he talks sense and his language is not too involved, it ought to retain some traces of intelligence when it is written down. Another explanation of the apparent idiocy of the sapient dead is that they are absorbed in the search for facts by which to identify themselves. For this use broad statements of truth are not available. Nothing can serve to identify a person but some circumstance which is peculiar to himself and which is unknown to the world at large. It must be a secret between the spirit and one or two living persons at most. When such a circumstance comes out in the speech of a medium, no matter how trivial it may be intrinsically, it acquires enormous evidential value. The reference to pink pajamas in Professor James' communication through the minister's son, looked at in this light, ceases to be ridiculous. Taken with other facts of like nature, it might conceivably lay a foundation for establishing the philosopher's identity in the other world. Tall oaks from little acorns grow. Future historians may relate with proud appreciation how a pair of pink pajamas opened up communications between the savants of the living and the unknown world.

A Pacific Coast pageant at the Panama-Pacific fair should prove fascinating to those who are interested in the story of the winning of the West. A country which in less than a century has become transformed from a wilderness to the abode of millions highly advanced in civilization must have a history crowded with striking characters and soul-stirring incidents which would delight those who avert their eyes from the printed page but who would travel far to see the living image of what it relates.

There will be panic among the American expatriates in Europe when they read of the severe measures taken to collect the inheritance tax on the estate of Duchess Consuelo of Manchester. What will happen to William Waldorf Astor, "Jimmy" Hyde and others of their class? They have fled from the personal property tax of the United States to become subject to the more onerous taxes of the Old World. Is there to be no rest for the weary, wandering millionaire?

The country will yawn wearily over the news that the beef trust is going to be investigated again. No doubt after a few years of this investigation there will be another interminable trial with the same old result. Perhaps the beef trust is not above the law, but it is just as well to sit down and calmly face the fact that up to this time all the apparatus of the law has been powerless to feaze it.

Seven American castaways on an islet near Cape Horn have sent a hurry call for help, fearing cannibals. Yet, if rescued and brought home, they would only be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire, if we may believe half the plaints of the chronic kickers.

It wasn't the pampered lad who sat with fond parent in the reserved seat section that got the most thrills out of the circus. Rather it was the bepatched urchin who earned his ticket carrying water for the elephants.

Ante-convention tranquillity has settled over the Democratic fold, it is reported. Probably too much interested in the great Chicago circus to experience marked emotions concerning their own little one-ring affair.

If the eugenic faddists want something to do, let them take up the influence of the influx of the maimed, the blind and the halt just now in evidence on all the streets.

Fashion has decreed that Chicago bathers must wear furs this season. Doubtless there already has been a rush to ascertain if the gnat is a fur-bearing animal.

Rendered confident by the verdict of acquittal, the beef barons may ask the House investigators of meat prices: "What are you going to do about it?"

Those who are inclined to be moved with sympathy for Lorimer by his sickness should recall how suddenly Morse recovered his health after liberation.

Dr. Yetta Silbermark-Reissig would better wait until she has seen a Western woman kill and dissect a chicken before declaiming on woman's lack of nerve.

It speaks well for Portland's complacency that Emma Goldman can come here and rant and the atmosphere remain unruffled.

If the girls supplant the striking waiters in New York, every striker may be expected to vote against woman suffrage.

Now watch the alarmists produce a Jap to blow up one of the German warships and start a world-wide war.

The Mazamas have learned that they must always respect a bull's esthetic taste in colors.

The perfect harmony among Democrats is like unto a circle of wolves watching a dying buffalo.

"Lady Betty" is thrifty as she journeys along the matrimonial highway.

Less hair and broader hips is the newest edict. Second counter front.

'Twas the same old calliope, but not the familiar tunes.

Use the torch on the caterpillar nests.

VALUE OF THE PUBLIC MARKET

Part of High Living Cost Due to Profits Taken by Middlemen.

PORTLAND, June 3.—(To the Editor.)—It was with great interest that I read The Oregonian's editorial May 31 "Why Life Is Difficult," pertaining to the high cost of living, and also the article in the Saturday Evening Post from which you received your inspiration. In the conclusion of your editorial you state: "What justifies complaint is the undeniable fact that every separate item of food and clothing, everything that life requires to make it tolerable, costs more money now than it formerly did." This is very true. I remember of reading a few days ago that meat prices are higher now than any time since the Civil War. Since other necessities of life are increasing in cost along with it, what will be the result if the cost of these articles continues to go higher? Who dares to predict? A certain writer has said, in writing on this subject: "The earth is like a bombshell. The high cost of living is the fuse. The fuse has burned nearly to the shell. Something is about to happen. Either the fire will be put out and all will be well, or the fire will not be put out and all will be hell." I cannot believe that such will be our fate, but it does seem that the time has arrived when something should be done to relieve the consuming mass from as many burdens as possible.

Of course, it is very true that a great deal of our high cost of living is due to what Mr. Hill terms "the cost of high living," and for this, as you state, we should not complain, since we are not willing to return to the old order of living, but there is one cause for these high prices for necessities that stands out so conspicuously, and which can be easily eliminated. At least hundreds of cities in Germany and England have actually proven that it can be done, and also several of our own cities have likewise done so.

For instance, not so very long ago the City of Des Moines, Ia., elected a Mayor who seemed to be conscious of the fact that the people's interests were his interests. He at once discovered that his people were paying $3 for 100 pounds of potatoes, while the people in Dubuque, his neighbor city, were paying only $1.50 for 100 pounds. Cucumbers were selling at 10 cents each in Des Moines, while in Dubuque the consumers were only paying 20 cents for a dozen of them. Other necessities of life were selling at the same ratio. Dubuque all this time had a public market system whereby the producer sold direct to the consumer. It was not long, of course, until Des Moines had the same system in vogue, and it is needless to say her people are now buying their produce just as cheap and fresh as the people of her neighboring city. According to statistics reduction was from 1 to 400 per cent. Of course, the middlemen of Des Moines banded together to fight the Mayor, but the people were on the side of the Mayor and his battle was easy. He soon relegated the middlemen to the producing line, where many of them belong.

I read in Current Literature Magazine for March that Secretary Wilson, of the United States Department of Agriculture, found, after a thorough investigation, that on the average the farmers throughout our country are only getting one-third of the selling price of their produce. Who gets the other two-thirds? We are sure it is not the consumer. In the face of Secretary Wilson's report, can we criticise our young men for leaving the farm?

As for our own beautiful city and surrounding country, I sincerely hope that our city administration will soon get busy and not allow this to be the last place on earth to harken to the crying needs of its people, to-wit, to establish an ideal public market.

IRA W. CARL,
523 Chamber of Commerce.

FEAR OF DICTATOR EXPRESSED

Roosevelt Likened to Diaz and Mexican History Recalled.

DESCHUTES, Or., June 1.—(To the Editor.)—Theodore Roosevelt, in a recent speech, belittling the fear of a third term for a President of the United States, stated that Alonzo Taft, father of President Taft, had supported the nomination of General Grant for a third term and had said that there would be no danger to the Republic on that account if the terms were not consecutive; the political organization being in the hands of another, the ex-President having no control of it, would have no more advantage in controlling elections to perpetuate himself in office than would his opponent.

It is unnecessary to attempt to refute this argument by reasoning, for an example in point is found in recent history.

The constitution of Mexico prohibited a President holding consecutive terms of office when Porfirio Diaz was first elected President of that country in 1876. After establishing the prefecture system of political organization, the most perfect imaginable and one that must have been for years the envy of our own political bosses, he gracefully surrendered the form of office to his colleague, General Gonzales, who held it for one term, after which Diaz was again elected. Before his second (non-consecutive) term expired the Mexican constitution was amended and the prohibition removed.

The results were disastrous to self-government, elections were controlled by Diaz absolutely and the evils of a dictatorship grew unchecked until civil war came.

Such conditions could occur in this country. The temperaments and characters of Diaz and Roosevelt are not unlike, differing only in those modifications inherent to or caused by a Latin or an Anglo-Saxon heredity and environment.

ROSCOE HOWARD.

Naturalization Laws.

HOLLEY, Or., June 2.—(To the Editor.)—If a foreigner comes to our country and is naturalized, does it make his foreign-born male children citizens at 21? If the father goes back to his former home (and leaves male children in this country) and becomes by law subject to his former country before the male children here become of age will it affect their citizenship here? If a person of this description should apply to a registration officer to register, where none of the facts in the case are known to any but the applicants, is there no corroborative evidence required? If not, are not our citizenship and registration laws pretty cheap? If a person makes declaration of his intention to become a citizen how long does he have to complete it? Is there no limit?

J. R. SPRINGER.

Naturalization of the father of alien born minors makes them citizens upon attaining their majority. If the father is not a citizen of the United States at the time foreign-born children become of age they are not citizens. Naturalized citizens when registering are not required to supply evidence that they have not renounced allegiance to this country. The law rightly places as much value on the oath of the foreign-born citizen as upon that of the native-born in this regard. An alien may file his petition for citizenship not less than two years after filing his declaration and after not less than five years' continuous residence in the United States. The maximum period that may elapse is not specified.

WHY THEY ARE FOR ROOSEVELT

Illuminative Explanation From a Coos Bay Admirer.

MARSHFIELD, Or., June 1.—(To the Editor.)—Mr. Roosevelt has done more for the uplift of good citizenship, common honesty and common decency than any thousand men alive. That he has made many mistakes we do not deny. It is human to err. There is only one class of men who don't make mistakes—they are found in the cemetery. Live people, people who do things, all make mistakes. Mr. Roosevelt does things, therefore he is sometimes in error, but he gets there, Eli. That is what we like. We have the best Government on earth by all odds, but there are some things that seem badly to need fixing. We want someone to look into the matter. We want somebody to do something. When the house is afire we can't wait to philosophize. We are obliged to get busy at once. It is better to make a stab at it and do the wrong thing than do nothing. We want less of the "judicial temperament," particularly if it is typified by inaction and sleeps.

We want less talk and more wool and that is what we are going after, if it takes the last button off Gabe's coat. We believe we know what is the matter with us; anyway, it is not worth while for the bell bucks to back up. We would like to have them go along for old acquaintance sake, but if they will not, we are going anyway.

We don't claim our candidate to be a star at pink teas, nor that he is a "bully good fellow" in the general acceptation of the term; but T. R. is the boy that knocks the persimmons. Things are always doing in the vicinity of that lad, from the rise of the curtain to the last encore. He is always goin' some. As long as we are busy on the job we are safe. As long as we are earnestly trying to get there, never mind about the roundabout way, the mishaps and the trouble; we will surely arrive in due time. The danger lies with the satisfied folks, the let-well-enough-alone folks, the folks with the "judicial temperament," who believe in never doing today that which may be put off until tomorrow. They are the people to fear, and not those who are earnestly and sincerely striving for better things. Insurgency is not dead—in fact it is very much alive. The doctors were mistaken in their diagnosis. The anti-vaccine didn't take; they had the wrong dope. It would seem the scientists didn't figure that the ballot of a hodcarrier occupies as much space in the ballot box as one of the Lord's anointed.

Let us not worry about these political rows. They are the finest things that have happened lately. In our anger we are telling things. We are opening wide the stinkpots. We now know who stole the jam and who struck Billy Patterson. We see ourselves as others see us. In the end we won't be quite so handsome, but we will know more. Wrongdoing is a fungus that speedily withers when brought to light. By all means turn on the calcium and let the band play on.

GEO. WATKINS.

VILE HABITS AGAIN CENSURED.

Woman Cites Disasters Caused By Habit of Expectoration.

PORTLAND, June 3.—(To the Editor.)—The letter in The Oregonian by John Charles Wright ought to call forth a deluge of similar ones, for surely examples unnumbered can be added to the few he cited, and surely it is time to do something to curb such nuisances.

A few weeks ago, on my way to a social affair, I was hurrying to transfer at Third and Washington when my heel suddenly slipped and I found myself sprawled on the pavement, wiping it up with a broadcloth cloak, my one and only afternoon gown and best white kid gloves. After a man had picked me up and I had straightened my hat and brushed off some of the street dirt—to the further detriment of my gloves—I turned to look for the cause of my downfall and discovered merely that some "gentleman" had "expectorated" on the pavement.

Last week a fine-looking, well-dressed man, smoking a good cigar, boarded a car on which I was riding, and turning quickly without looking—they never do stop to look—spit out of the door. A postman who was just entering received the discharge on the front of his coat. Of course the man was horrified, apologized, pulled out his handkerchief, and did his best to atone. But I've been wondering ever since what he would have done had his victim been a woman, and had she received his superfluous tobacco full in the face—which might easily have been the case.

I don't suppose I could count the times, just this Winter, that I have barely escaped serving as a spittoon for some man on the street. We've all raged at Dickens for the things he said of us, but if he were to come among us today, I wonder if he would find any great reason to change his ideas on the "American habit of expectoration."

If we have an ordinance against spitting why isn't it enforced?

CLARA M. FRANK.

WHO OWNED EUGENE TOWNSITE?

Historian Asserts Absalom Manning Came Too Late to Be Original Holder

PORTLAND, June 3.—(To the Editor.)—The letter in The Oregonian May 27th, date at Vancouver, Wash., May 26, referring to the death of E. L. Manning, and stating that his "father, Absalom Manning, once owned the townsite of Eugene, Or.," is incorrect. In the same letter it is stated that when E. L. Manning died he was 85 years old, and that he "was born in Sacramento, Cal., but his parents removed to Oregon when he was a child." This would indicate that he was born in 1857, and that his parents did not remove to Oregon until some time after that year.

Eugene F. Skinner, a pioneer of 1846, was born in Essex County, New York, September 13, 1809, and was a brother to St. John Skinner, Assistant Postmaster-General during President Andrew Johnson's Administration. He came to California in 1845, and Wintered at Sutter's Fort. In the Spring of 1846 he removed with his family to Oregon, and in June of that year located on a donation land claim upon which a large part of the present city of Eugene, named for him, now stands. It was in his log cabin that his daughter Leonora, the first white child in Lane County, was born on September 2, 1848.

Mr. Absalom Manning may have owned property in or near Eugene at some time, possibly before 1860; but he could not have been an original claimant because all the land upon which the city of Eugene as it now stands was taken up as donation claims long before 1857.

GEORGE H. HIMES.

Question in Grammar.

REDMOND, Or., June 1.—(To the Editor.)—Will you kindly enlighten a seeker after knowledge in the line of English, why it is that "you are" and "you were" are the correct forms to use in addressing a single person. I understand that those are the forms used by educated people and that makes them the correct forms, but this does not give the why of it.

E. C. PARK.

The pronoun "you" was originally the objective plural form of "ye." The psychological explanation of its original use in place of "thou," which it finally superseded in the early part of the 18th century, is that implied numbers give dignity to the person addressed. Naturally the plural form of the accompanying verb was also adopted and this use finally became a custom and therefore grammatical. Similar usage is found in all modern language.

Vacillation

By Dean Collins.

Say, Sunday was not groundhog day,
Nor groundhogs were the Beavers, nor
Was any shadow to be seen
Making a threat against the score;
And yet I saw the Portland team
That had stood fourth upon the roll,
Duck for the basement den, just like
A groundhog ducking for its hole.

Scarce had I giggled loud, to see
Our team a-climbing, when it fell—
And now, as I lament its fall,
It may be climbing from its well;
Flopping resilient up and down,
Mocking the sainted Finnegan,
Who stepped to intermittent fame
With "off again and on again."

I've chortled when the Beavers climbed,
And sung with glee, "That's going some";
But, woe the day, although they climb,
They seem unwilling to stay "climb";
And so from joy to gloom I hob,
And sprain my neck perniciously,
Watching the cellar and the roof,
Uncertain where the Beavers be.

I've gloated when the Beavers rose
From out the depths within the well,
And in mid-gloat, have paused to groan
Seeing, the next day, how they fell.
Therefore, until they've firmly climbed
At least five notches from the moat,
Cautious in future will I be,
And sparing in the gloats I gloat.

Portland, June 3.

Half a Century Ago

From The Oregonian of June 4, 1862.

The election returns have come in, but slowly as yet, but in every instance so far heard from the Union state ticket has carried from 10 to 300 majority. Enough has been heard from to place beyond doubt the entire success of the whole Union state ticket, as has also the election of nearly all the county tickets. In fact, it is doubtful whether the self-styled Democracy have carried a single county in the state.

Andrew J. Pate, convicted of the murder of George Lamb, committed last December in Linn County, near Albany, Or., suffered the extreme penalty of the law by hanging at Albany on Tuesday, May 27. The confession of Pate, which had been published in pamphlet form, was circulated on the day of his execution.

The Carrie Ladd, on her trip to the Cascades yesterday morning, struck on a rock at Cape Horn and commenced filling so rapidly that she was immediately run ashore on the Washington side. Her passengers had barely time to get ashore before she filled, and she now lies with one side under water. It is thought she cannot be saved.

St. Louis, April 25.—There is every reason to fear that the new Senator from Oregon is a traitor, after all. The select committee, appointed at the instance of Senator Stark to investigate the charges against his loyalty, consisting of Senators Clark, Sherman, Willey, Wright and Howard, made their report last Tuesday. It embraces the following conclusions: First—That for many months prior to November 21, 1861, and up to that time the said Stark was an ardent advocate of the cause of the rebellious states. Second—That after the formation of the constitution of the Confederate States he openly declared his admiration of it and advocated the absorption of the loyal states of the Union into the Southern Confederacy under that constitution as the only means of peace, warmly avowing his sympathies with the South. Third—That the Senator from Oregon is disloyal to the Government of the United States.

We notice that a portion of Front street, in front of the Metropolis Hotel, is being planked with heavy new plank, thus covering up one of the many unsightly mudholes which adorn our streets. Keep doing so.

A large amount of railroad iron for the tracks is being shipped upon the Rival for the Cascades and Dalles portage.

We learn that Mrs. W. C. Forbes, the eminent American actress, is in the city, and we would recommend the propriety of tendering her a benefit.

The steam piledriver is again at work on the corner of Washington and Front streets, driving piles into the bank, preparatory for the foundation of another large building to be put up by Mr. Chapman.

Dr. Loryea requests us to announce that he has upon the farm of Mr. J. R. Stevens a cow that has been regularly inoculated with the smallpox, and that he is now prepared to furnish genuine vaccine matter to all who may call upon him at the hospital on Front street.

The Los Angeles papers of May 31 say that the excitement about the Colorado gold mines was increasing. Considerable quantities of gold had been received. Water was sold at 25 cents per drink in the mines.

As "Ed" Howe Sees Life

Half the time a man wants appreciation; the other half he wants to be let alone.

Coffee is rarely good away from home.

An expression probably used more than any other: "I see by the papers," etc.

Your private thinking is as near the truth as you can get. Be guided by what you have thought out in private, and not by what some selfish leader has thought out for you.

Your world is not the world of literature or oratory.

The men who succeed are, as a rule, better than their critics, who do not.

Every man who speaks in public, or writes for print, puts an unnatural polish on the truth.

People are lately not only more liberal in religion; they are more liberal in their social relations. If Hester Pryne lived now, she wouldn't be compelled to wear a scarlet letter on her breast.

People are always saying that they are not jealous, and have no reason to be; but the fact is, all of us are jealous, and most of us have reason to be.

Someone seems to have whipped the devil; haven't you noticed that he is much more modest here lately?

Value of Old Books.

PORTLAND, June 2.—(To the Editor.)—Will you kindly inform me if there is a premium on the book called "The Rose of Sharon" or "Gems of Sacred Poetry," fourth edditION, Auburn (Derby, Miller & Co., 1848)?

CONSTANT READER.

The values on old books are not standardized. Nine out of ten are of no value. The only way to dispose of them is to offer them to a reliable dealer in second-hand publications.