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

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

San Francisco Office—R. J. Bidwell Co., 742 Market street.

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

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, DEC. 21, 1912.


### PEOPLE'S INTEREST IN MONETARY REFORM.

There are many men so steeped in prejudice against bankers that support of the bankers for any public measure is a signal for their opposition. Such men assume that public advocacy of a financial measure by the bankers is inspired by an opinion that bankers alone are interested and that the rest of the people should have nothing to say on the subject. When a man has incurred popular hostility and has been branded as a servant of the interests, any measure bearing his name is straightway condemned without consideration of its inherent merits or demerits.

We maintain that such an attitude of mind is not only unjust to the men thus sweepingly condemned, but is injurious to the interests of the very men who assume it. Financial legislation affects the interests of the business man and the workingman far more vitally than the interests of the banker. The banker can adapt himself to any system, no matter how vicious, and still make money, in bad times as in good. But a vicious system keeps the business man in constant danger of ruin and produces panics which drive him into bankruptcy. A vicious system causes prices to rise faster than wages in good times, but in bad times it deprives many workingmen of employment and causes want and privation. The mass of the people not only have the deepest interest in sound finance, but they must decide by their votes how it shall be secured.

In considering which monetary and banking system is best, the people should give ear to what bankers say as experts on the subject, making due allowance for the degree to which personal or class interest influences opinion. They should consider the effect of proposed financial measures on their own interests and should bear in mind that bankers have interests largely identical with theirs, for general prosperity redounds to the interest of the banker, enhances the value of his investments and improves the security for his loans.

Prejudice against ex-Senator Aldrich is so strong and with such good cause on account of his manipulation of the tariff that the National reserve scheme proposed by the National Monetary Commission was no sooner named the Aldrich scheme than it was condemned by most of the men who have come into political collision with Aldrich and by many who never even read the scheme. But it is not the Aldrich scheme, save from the fact that Aldrich is chairman of the commission which devised it. It has the unanimous support of a commission composed of both Republicans and Democrats. One of the latter is Representative Pujo, chairman of the committee which is conducting the money trust inquiry. No man who has read what the financial journals say of Mr. Pujo would suspect that gentleman of excessive love for the bankers. The mere fact that Aldrich is chairman of the commission and had a hand in drawing up the National reserve scheme should not of itself condemn that scheme, though it should justify rigid scrutiny.

The Monetary Commission does not propose a central bank. It proposes a federation of banks, in which the small, country banks would have a voice greater in proportion than their capital; in which the West and South would have control, though the preponderance of banking capital is in New York and New England; in which the business and agricultural interests would have a voice; of which the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the Controller of the Currency would be ex officio directors. The bill provides that no member of any National or state legislative body shall be a director of the National Reserve Association or of any of its branches.

The National reserve plan proposes to do the very things President-elect Wilson has pronounced just and necessary, namely, to provide a means by which "any man anywhere and at any time should have a loan in 'legal tender,' if he can produce good indestructible security therefor on a thoroughly safe basis for the accommodation."

The country banks are required by law to carry a certain proportion of their reserve in a reserve or central reserve city. New York is the principal reserve city and is usually preferred for several reasons. One is that the amount of business all banks have in New York as the financial center requires them to carry a deposit in some New York bank. Another is that New York, being the speculative center where money can be lent on call at high interest with stocks and bonds as collateral, pays the country banks nigh interest. Although the panic of 1907 locked up the money of the country in New York, desire for profit causes continuance of this practice.

The National reserve scheme would remove the motive for lending money on call by forbidding the association to rediscount notes secured by stock and bond collateral, by rendering our currency elastic and by allowing reduction of reserves below the legal limit in emergencies.

The Oregonian is no admirer of Aldrich, but is not so blindly prejudiced as to be unable to see any good in any work in which he has a hand. The prejudice against the National reserve plan is so strong and so general on account of his part in it that there is no probability of its adoption, but any other scheme which accomplishes the same general purposes will have the approval of The Oregonian.

### EXCUSING ABUSES.

Two or three Oregon newspapers are, in the face of established facts, still repeating the nonsensical contention that inefficiency of the Legislature is shown by the large number of bills submitted to vote of the people and that each bill is the outgrowth of some legislative folly discerned by the people. Therefore, it is argued, the initiative and referendum system in Oregon has no faults that need correcting and the Legislature is wholly to blame for overuse of the people's power.

But the initiated bills and those referred do not always or even generally spring from the people. They come from a minority of the voters. This has been indisputably proved by the defeat in the last two elections of a large majority of measures submitted. We might choose a Legislature from the flower of the land; it might work industriously and intelligently for ten hours each day of the forty in the session; yet, even so, a small minority of the people of the state, without a doubt, would think some worthy thing had been neglected or that something had been done improperly. How small this minority may be and yet harass the voters with unnecessary legislative duties may be realized when it is recalled that only 8 per cent of the voters may rebuke the fancied folly of omission and only 5 per cent resent the chimerical sin of commission.

If inefficiency of the Legislature can be measured at all by the volume of direct legislation, it cannot be done by counting the number of bills submitted, but only by counting the number of initiative bills adopted and the number of referred bills defeated. On these, and these alone, does public sentiment reflect indirectly against the assembly.

Of the eleven measures adopted last month, only five were within the authority of the Legislature to enact. One of those had already been passed and was approved by the people on referendum. To the other four may be added the two referred bills which were defeated, and thus by no stretch of imagination or sly turning of argument can more than six measures out of thirty-seven on the ballot be deemed protests by a majority of the people against legislative inefficiency.

As long as human nature remains unchanged and men are permitted to think for themselves, so long will there be dissatisfaction by a minority with the action of the Legislature, no matter how complete or how worthy. That this minority should be restrained from pernicious activity by some means that will not impair the proper use of the direct legislative power is so plain that only demagogues or hard-headed members of a purposeful minority will dispute it.

### PARDON OF JOHN H. HALL.

The people of the state will approve the action of the President in granting a pardon to John H. Hall, former United States Attorney for Oregon. Hall ought never to have been convicted; he ought never to have been tried; he ought never to have been indicted; he ought never to have been accused; he ought never to have been required to rest for eight years without a final adjudication of his case. He has been a much-wronged man.

The case against Mr. Hall was that as United States Attorney he obstructed public justice through his failure or refusal to prosecute criminally certain persons charged with fencing unlawfully Eastern Oregon lands. The law gives the District Attorney the option of bringing either criminal or civil action in such cases, and it seemed expedient to District Attorney Hall to do the latter. Special Prosecutor Heney caused his summary removal from office on the general ground that he (Hall) was not sufficiently zealous in the Government's prosecution of Senator Mitchell and Congressman Hermann; and later instituted the Hall prosecution on the specific charge of non-enforcement of law.

If Mr. Hall was in the way of the Government prosecution at the time, it ought to have been sufficient to remove him from office. That he was not in accord with the purposes of Mr. Heney, and could not be relied on to support the Heney methods, is doubtless true; that his attitude or previous actions justified measures so harsh there are few or none now to declare. The charge against Mr. Hall, if true, was fundamentally technical and essentially trivial; if not true, it was unwarranted from any standpoint. In the state of the public mind at that time and with the practices of Mr. Heney, it is not surprising that Mr. Hall was convicted.

The Hall pardon is the belated close of a painful incident in Oregon affairs. It is a tardy effort to right a wrong done eight years ago.

### WHERE RELIEF SHOULD GO.

Without a doubt the motive of the people in creating a public utilities commission was to obtain better service for the price paid public corporations, or a lower price for the service rendered or perhaps both. It was the impression that the companies were obtaining unduly large returns from their investments and it was believed those profits ought to be reduced for the benefit of their patrons.

But comes Mr. Kellaher, friend of the common people and friend of Kellaher—principally Kellaher—and proposes that the supposed excessive profits of the streetcar company be turned over to the city for the benefit of the taxpayers. In other words Mr. Kellaher seems to believe that if the company is getting an excessive income by compelling the workingman to stand up in traveling to and from Montavilla, the workingman should continue to stand, but Mr. Kellaher should be relieved by the company of some of the taxes on his East Side grocery.

It may be a matter of dispute as to whether the Portland Railway, Light & Power Company is deriving excessive profits from its business, but if it is those profits should be turned back for the benefit of the patrons, in the form of better service or lower rates, not in taxes. The largest patronage of the streetcar company comes from people in moderate circumstances and a large percentage is from those least able to pay taxes.

It would be profitable for the automobile owner who pays nothing to the company, for the business block owner, for the investor in lands and for the wealthy in general, to have the great mass of ordinary citizens continue to pay excessive profits to the streetcar company if the same wealthier class could divert those profits in the form of taxes. If we had no public utilities commission the tax method might be the only way to get back even a portion of the supposed extortion for the benefit of the public.

But we have the commission. If rates are excessive or service not in accord with rates, or both, the commission can compel correction. The people voted for relief to the patrons, not to the taxpayers, and that is where relief ought to go.

### JURIES AND THE DEATH SENTENCE.

The penalty for first-degree murder in Oregon—murder with malice and premeditation and without provocation or the excuse of sudden impulse or temporary passion—is death on the gallows. The opponents of capital punishment contend that juries are frequently loath to convict because they are reluctant to hang; and therefore justice is as likely as not to be defeated by the very severity of the law.

It is doubtless true that no jury which has what Dogberry described to be a "convicting look," otherwise a convicting mind, will hesitate to bring in a verdict for manslaughter when a first-degree result is impossible; yet the inelastic mandates of the law afford an excuse for disagreements; and disagreements occur, and man-slayers who richly deserve punishment escape.

A correspondent today calls attention to the fact that a large number of states have statutes that place with the jury the discretion of capital punishment or life imprisonment for murder; and other states leave the option with the judge.

The Oregonian has repeatedly suggested that the laws of Oregon should be amended so as to accord with the enlightened statutes of other states, reposing with a jury the right to determine whether a murderer should be executed or imprisoned for life. It prefers to lodge the responsibility with jury rather than with judge, so as to give full opportunity for discussion and agreement, and to remove any possibility of a split caused by doubt or apprehension as to the subsequent act of the judge. We have never insisted that all persons convicted of murder should die; we have protested against tying the hands of justice and the law so that none could be made to suffer death.

### AN ASSAULT ON GRAMMAR.

Professor Lounsbury, of Yale, has occasioned a terrible rumpus among the lovers of grammar in its purity by his heresies. He is quoted in favor of the tabooed expression "It is me." If that were the worst of his sins he might possibly be forgiven. But in fact it is the lightest. What shall we say of a college professor who sanctions "Between you and I" and teaches that it is proper to say "Who do you mean?" Surely nothing but black ruin awaits the English language if he is permitted to go his direful way unchecked. "It is me" is perhaps not so bad as it might be. As The Oregonian has frequently pointed out, this usage accords with the analogy of other languages. The French say it habitually and so do the Norwegians. The latter people are entitled to great consideration nowadays, inasmuch as they stand with their kinsmen, the Swedes, at the very front of modern literature. But Professor Lounsbury makes the point that neither "It is I" nor "It is me" has much etymological standing if we care anything for the history of speech. The genuinely correct expression is "It am I." Chaucer uses it in "The Knight's Tale," where any reader can find it for himself. The passage runs, "I am thy mortal foe and it am I," and so on.

This strictly logical usage has dropped out of English, but it is retained in German. No countryman of Goethe would dream of saying "Es ist ich." On the contrary he always says "Ich bin es," just as Chaucer did in his day. Even in English, the most illogical of tongues, this excellent idiom persisted until the end of the fourteenth century, when it began to drop away. Professor Lounsbury, for all his gallant defense of "It is me," concedes that the rival phrase, "It is I," will probably prevail in the long run, but we do not feel quite convinced of it. The deep analogies of spoken language have a way of gaining victories over the literary precisions and they may do it in this case. "It is me" is preferred by the common people because of its sonority. It is actually easier to utter than "It is I," which follows a hiss with a diphthong and presents serious difficulties to every tongue but a pedant's. It may turn out that the law of least resistance will be obeyed in this instance as it is in almost every other. In a century or two the grammarians may find themselves rebuking careless speakers for saying "It is I."

There is not so much to be said for "Between you and I." "Between" is a preposition and it is the invariable usage of English to follow prepositions with the objective case, or what passes in our chaotic grammar for an objective. If we say "Between you and I" we may with equal propriety say "Between I and she," which, we suppose, would shock the most indurated despiser of grammar. To be sure, there is a famous verse of poetry which runs, "Let thou and I the battle try," where a transitive verb is followed with a double nominative, but we must not forget that poetry is privileged to take liberties in English and this particular liberty has not received unanimous approbation even from the poetic guild. We doubt if it can be matched in the language. In one instance at least Shakespeare uses the very expression, "Between you and I," which Professor Lounsbury has been reproved for favoring. Antonio says to Bassanio, "All debts are cleared between you and I." It seems then, if Shakespeare's authority is good for anything, that the culprit phrase must be allowable. The trouble is that Shakespeare's authority is worthless when it comes to modern usage. We are apt to forget that he lived a long time ago, much nearer to Chaucer than to us, both in language and sentiment. Neither Shakespeare nor the King James Bible is a suitable guide as far as current usage goes. They are full of expressions which the pedants stigmatize as ungrammatical, a term which usually means nothing worse than that a particular form of speech has dropped out of common use.

A moment ago we said "Neither Shakespeare nor the King James Bible is a suitable guide." We might have said, had we possessed a little more courage, "Neither Shakespeare nor the King James Bible are suitable guides," with every confidence of successful defiance to grammarians. Hooted at as this locution is by all the textbooks, it is nevertheless in perfectly good usage, and, unless our current reading misleads us, it is gaining ground. The correlatives "neither, nor" are not always disjunctive. They very often are as truly connective as "and." An author who feels this sense and wishes to express it is perfectly justified in writing a plural verb after two singular subjects joined by "neither, nor." After all, the principal office of language is to express the writer's meaning, or the speaker's, and any rules of grammar which interfere with that primary duty are in danger of obliteration. Some of our purists trouble themselves a good deal over collective nouns.

Are these unhappy creatures singular or plural? They are both. They dwell in a debatable region where the ordinary rules of grammar exercise but a shadowy sway. Evidently the mind may regard a bunch of onions as a single object securely tied up with a string, or it may fix upon the separate vegetables, and "the devil of it is," if one may quote Sir Lucius O'Trigger, that the mind wavers from one point of view to the other as it proceeds in a train of thought. Our pedants naturally seek to compel us to choose one way or the other of looking at the bunch and stick to it through thick and thin, but it can't be done. The English, especially English orators, permit themselves the widest liberty in handling collective nouns. They would say "A bunch of onions are luscious" without a tremor. Habitually they say "The Government are a set of traitorous wretches," or "angelic patriots," as the case may be. We dare say grammar will never conquer the collective noun. It is a born rebel and will prove incorrigible to the end.

---

The New York suffragettes who set out to march to Albany for the good of the cause ought to have counted the cost before they started. Two out of every three wearied and fell from the ranks the first day. Talking agrees rather better than marching with a good many of the more belligerent suffragettes and perhaps, upon the whole, it serves their cause about as well. We do not see exactly how outlandish conduct can bring the day of votes for women any nearer. A cause is seldom helped by making it ridiculous.

---

The operation of Milwaukee trains into Portland was inevitable from the time construcion of the Western extenson was begun. The Milwaukee road could not avoid coming to the traffic center of the North Pacific Coast. Portland will gain as much by the arrangement made with the O.-W. R. & N. Co. as it would have gained by the construction of an entirely independent line into this city, for it will have direct traffic relations with the whole territory traversed by the Milwaukee road.

---

To the citizens of Prineville at their city election it looked odd to see women going to the polls "leading one or two children by the hand." It is so much more usual to see a ward boss going to the polls leading one or two voters by the nose. But in time we shall get accustomed to the changes resulting from suffrage. They will not be limited to the appearance of women and children at the voting places, but will penetrate to the depths of public life.

---

Miscegenation continues at Vancouver. A white man married a negress a day or two ago. This is not so bad as when the sexes are reversed, and, anyway, the groom may be color blind.

---

Greek and Turkish commanders exchanged jokes by wireless during the thick of "battle." It must be that even the active participants see the humor of their alleged warfare.

---

The wise sayings of J. P. Morgan will rank with the wisdom of Solomon in the opinion of the worshipers of Mammon, for they regard him as the high priest of that god.

---

People enjoying prosperity must remember their juvenile friends, who will expect something and otherwise get little. A desultory Christmas makes the world awry and gloomy.

---

If Boreas and Pluvius will do a little team work, many a boy and girl will get a proper gift at Christmas. The sled is the thing for the hilly streets of Portland.

---

The cause of suffrage is merely injured by the spectacular stunts of ill-balanced suffragettes who try to break the long-distance walking record in midwinter.

---

That French banker who got away with $30,000,000 must not be allowed to land in this country. He might own the hemisphere in a year.

---

Perhaps the native "Austrylian," knowing not otherwise, enjoys his Christmas in midsummer, with the mercury at 122.

---

With the thermometer at 122, Australia is having seasonable Christmas weather for the Antipodes.

---

The movement for a sane New Year's requires almost as much courage and optimism as a movement for a sane insane asylum.

---

The Tillamook squaw who died at the age of 109 might have lived to a ripe old age had she followed the rules of hygiene.

---

Again it snowed in Portland. All of which would never have been suspected but for the weather bureau reports.

---

We have warned Mexico again. Eventually the Mexicans may refuse even to receive our empty warnings.

---

President Taft is no "spug." As dispenser of Christmas pardons his gifts have real value.

---

When each power gets a seaport the waters over there will be cut up into lanes.

---

Shop early and be patient. Only three buying days to Christmas.

---

It would be mean to inquire as to the population of Warrenton.

---

All eyes will be on Multnomah to win today.

---

### CHILDHOOD.

O, you happy children,
Playing in the sun,
Ere the cares of Life and Men
Truly have begun.

Feet a-dangling, toes a-squirming,
Little legs a-stronger growing;
Chubby arms outstretched in play,
Nothing all of sorrow knowing.

Goes the milkboy on his round,
Goes the traffic, goes the pleasure,
Go the thousand ways of Life,
Still your joy is brimming measure.

Oh, that any time should come,
When you leave your happy home;
When you leave your happy play,
For the cruel strife of day.

W. J. HUGO.

### BRYAN AND HIS HURT FRIENDS

**Nebraskan Wants to Go Into Cabinet for Republic's Good.**

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—If The Oregonian is not conscious of having offended the friends of Bryan, we have but to refer you to your cartoons and editorials of the past month. If you wish us to be more specific your cartoon of November 30 will serve as one illustration, and one of December 8 another. Here Mr. Bryan is represented as a bigoted, selfish demagogue. Is this your "impartial and intelligible" interpretation of current events? Aren't these rather the imaginations of a very prejudiced mind? Space does not permit us to enumerate the many editorials and cartoons all in this vein.

The friends of Bryan ask nothing more of The Oregonian, but that it give Bryan time to justify its poor opinion of him before it anticipates his thoughts and plans.

Indeed the Bryan cult is a psychological curiosity inasmuch as it expects him to be as useful to Mr. Wilson as he shall need him to be, to step forward or backward as will help the most to further the Administration, not for his own glory or Wilson's, but for the advancement and glory of the Republic. We think of Bryan as a very disinterested person, one who sacrificed his own ambitions for another, and judging by past deeds and not by what is going to happen, we think he will sacrifice himself again if the country and party desire it.

STANLEY CHARETTE.

Such friends of Bryan as were offended by The Oregonian cartoons of Bryan wear their feelings on their sleeves. One represented Bryan as receiving with obvious consternation the news from Bermuda that Mr. Wilson would "rely on no single person's advice," and the other was of similar tenor. If Mr. Charette failed to see the humorous intent of the caricatures he ought to take treatment for his ponderous and excessive solemnity. The Oregonian has through about two decades had full opportunity to form its opinion of Bryan. It does not anticipate his thoughts and plans. It knows them. If the appeal to give Bryan a trial had been favorably heard in 1896, few doubt now that the result would have been overwhelming disaster. Why now if not in 1896? So far as he is the same Bryan, the country may well object; in sofar as he is another Bryan it regards him now with respect and a certain degree of confidence.

### GIVE THE JURY FULL DISCRETION

**Suggestion Tending to Make Conviction of Murder More Certain.**

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—It is asserted by all writers on the subject of criminal law that punishment should always be more certain than severe. It is well understood, and our daily observation teaches us that it is true, that the more severe the punishment the less likely juries will convict. They generally seek for some escape from finding a verdict in such cases; therefore, it would seem the part of wisdom on the part of our lawmakers not to make the punishment for crimes so severe and unbending as to deter a jury from meting out reasonable punishment.

The people of Oregon, at the recent election, by large majority, pronounced against the repeal of the death penalty for crime, but this does not seem to satisfy those people who are opposed to capital punishment; hence the question is still being agitated and will be continued until we have some change in our law upon that subject.

In many states of the Union, to-wit, Alabama, Arizona, California, Indiana, South Dakota, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, West Virginia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma and South Carolina, laws are in force imposing the death penalty in cases of murder, but giving to the jury discretion to add to their verdict, where one is found, that the person be confined in the Penitentiary, and it is made the duty of the court to sentence him to life imprisonment.

In Minnesota, New Mexico, North Dakota and Texas, the same discretion given to the juries in the states mentioned is conferred upon the court, and it seems to be the same in Utah.

This provision of law in states mentioned seems to have given reasonable satisfaction to the people thereof.

In cases of horrid, cruel, brutal murder the jury may impose the death penalty, but in cases of premeditated and deliberate murder there may appear to the jury extenuating or apparently extenuating circumstances which in their opinion, and out of their tenderness for human life, and considering its weakness and frailities, are unwilling to impose the death penalty, yet are willing to impose a life sentence in the Penitentiary.

It is not probable our Legislature, soon to assemble, will at all consider the repeal of the present statute imposing the death penalty for murder, but it might be induced so to amend or modify the law as to vest discretion in the jury as above indicated, and to lower the penalties prescribed for second degree murder and manslaughter.

LAWYER.

### MARIE TAKE NOTICE.

My dreams Marie are all for you,
And I am dreaming most the time,
It seems no matter what I do—
Out shooting ducks or writing rhyme,
My thoughts are sure to find a way
To your sweet face and eyes of blue
And while at work or while at play
My dreams Marie are all for you.

My dreams Marie are all for you,
And Oh I dearly love to dream,
It makes a cloudy sky turn blue
And worldly woes not what they seem.
My motor boat that chugs along
With gaso-cough, the waters through,
I rhapsodize to perfect song,
My dreams Marie are all for you.

My dreams Marie are all for you,
The mundane earth is poor indeed,
The pork chops that I one day slew
Are now a mediocre feed
To warm this new celestial sense,
I come to know they will not do
For fear the vision may get dense,
My dreams Marie are all for you.

My dreams Marie are all for you
I bubble o'er in chaste delight
I hear your sweet lips bill and coo,
I feel your arms about me, tight,
And so I barter off my sins—
Tobacco I'll no longer chew—
For baby cabs and rolling pins,
My dreams Marie are all for you.

GLENN NORBREY PLEASANTS.

### "Stung," But Not Pessimist.

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—I have been keeping tab on the letters in The Oregonian for some time, and enjoy them very much. But was more than usually interested in one who was stung. He is not the only one stung. He said in his letter that if there is one thing that will make an unhappy home a drinking woman. I think a drinking man ditto, as I have had a good hard trial myself.

After giving the best years of my life to my husband, helping in every way to make a nice home, and after getting it to see it all go in dissipation and drink. Oh, the horror of it! I often stop to think, after all the years, what a lottery marriage is, after all. It seems one or the other so often gets stung. I was surely stung, but it does not make me believe there are no good men, for I am sure there must be a few. So, one who got stung, must, deep down in his heart, have just a faint belief that there are some good, honorable women left in this city.

WIDOW.

### DIVORCE PERMANENT INSTITUTION

**Its Over Activity Curable by Proper Instruction of the Young.**

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—The letters signed "Old Maid," "Grouch" and others, upon matrimonial matters, are growing intensely interesting and have prompted the writer to a few reflections.

In the minds of all these writers divorce is a great evil. I do not agree with them, as a careful analysis of the question shows that both the marriage and divorce ceremonies are creatures of law. Marriage is a contract, divorce its legal annulment. In the administration of the affairs of all well regulated communities, the one is as important as the other. Marriage, however, is such a contract that the state becomes interested when children and property are involved. Nevertheless, the state is equally interestd and affected when the parties to the contract make themselves, their children and the community wretched, unhappy and miserable, and asserts and protects itself by providing the divorce tribunal.

The marriage contract is entered into by people presumably of sound mind, and its annulment is arrived at when these same people have had a chance to think over their grievances, and a dispassionate and disinterested judge assists in reaching a conclusion as to what is best for all concerned, including society. Therefore, there is a likelihood of fewer mistakes in the divorce proceeding than in the marriage ceremony. One is no more sacred than the other. To err, is human, and as it is no reflection upon a business man's moral makeup when he makes a misjudgment, neither should it be if a man or woman makes one or even several mistakes in the important matter of selecting a life associate. It is very easy for the clergy and the church to sit behind closed doors and theoretically pass upon the question, but as a matter of fact it is a difficult thing to know all the evidence in any case and suspend judgment upon another's troubles.

One thing is unmistakably certain concerning the contract of marriage, and that is, as a pure matter of contract if nothing more, the sole consideration must be unquestioned, absolute love; otherwise the contract fails sooner or later, fails as the lawyers say, for a lack of mutuality and failure of consideration. History, poetry, sociology and every science and all experience recognize and confirm this statement. The futile attempts of ancient and modern knights to substitute a dominating lordship and control where love has been driven from the home, is an evidence of weakness of those employing such means.

Equality of woman in every sphere of life, including mental equality, is now recognized, and to maintain the marriage relation, his lordship man must know that sympathy, honesty, candor, reason and temperance in all things, alone find an audience with any self-respecting woman. Without these no man has a right to expect the splendid flower of love to bloom Emerson says, "Feeble souls do not desire to be lovely but to be loved." Men who do big things are not in bondage to their bodies. Right thinking men are gradually learning to control their tempers, desires and their imagination. Right thinking is also fast dissipating the two standards of conduct so long defended, and no real modern knight who can boast of being equal to woman now dares fix a higher conception for his wife's conduct than he finds in his own ideal code for himself.

Divorce is with us to stay, has become a part of the institution of society, and the tendency of the times as indicated by the reports of the Vice Commision, shows that the legally constituted authorities are more and more entering into the social questions, and the divorce tribunal will be guarded and protected by all thinking people. The clergy and courts should not dissipate their energy in denouncing divorce as an institution, but should constantly endeavor to point out to the young and ill-advised the true conditions making towards such manhood and womanhood as will make possible a calm and careful survey and analysis of the meaning and import of the ceremony at the altar. This will decrease the activity of divorce and firmly fix and establish the sacredness of the marriage tie.

FELIX.

### NOTICE TO READERS AND LETTER WRITERS.

The Oregonian welcomes letters from its readers commenting on matters of timely interest, but to receive favorable consideration they must be brief.

Letters should not contain more than 300 words. The Editor reserves the right to condense communications. Those who object should so state in their communications.

Addresses of correspondents will not be supplied to inquirers, nor will letters be forwarded to them, nor will this page be permitted to become in any way a medium for exchange of personal correspondence.

The Oregonian will not undertake by mail to supply statistics, addresses, information to settle wagers, references for debates, data of similar character. Questions that deal with subjects of general interest may be answered from time to time in its columns when space permits.

Letters are more likely to be published if signed by the true name of the writer. If, in the judgment of the editor, a nom-de-plume is used for an ulterior purpose, or when so signed the letter would be without weight or interest, the communication will not be published.

### Divorce and Marriage.

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—My observations of the divorce columns show that about as many divorces arise from friction caused by the relatives on both sides of the family as from the wife not being an old-fashioned girl.

It doesn't appear to me that it is as much the old-fashioned girl or the new style girl that men are looking for, as it is the girl of true devotion and considerable tact. Men as well as the public prefer the wife that is more than all domestic. Most men are better satisfied to have a little excess in the cost of living than a wife too economical and one that knows better how to save her husband's money than she does how to spend it.

All homes are not peopled by the wife's relations instead of little children; all wives are not humiliated by bringing a good-sized family among her husband's relations. There are still true homes, good men for husbands and enough for all the good girls prepared to claim them. Self sacrifice as often as frivolity is the girl's obstacle.

Both bachelor and maid will find generally they have made their own condition and deserve their titles, and until they remedy themselves needn't offer excuse or plead for sympathy in this broad, liberal land.

A WIFE AND MOTHER.

### Split Electoral Vote.

PORTLAND, Dec. 20.—(To the Editor.)—Please state if it is possible for two Presidential candidates to get electoral votes out of the same state. If so, how?

A READER.

The electoral vote may be split in the same manner that the Multnomah County delegation in the State Senate; for example, may be divided between two parties. Electors are voted for as individuals. The voter in Oregon, if he likes, may vote for two Republican, one Democrat, one Socialist and one Prohibition elector, or in any other combination.

## The Money Trust

By Dean Collins.

I.

Morgan tells us: "Why he fussed
'Bout a fancied Money Trust?
Why wax serious and hot
Over something that is not?
For though all the banks should be
After some monopoly,
Striving fiercely, with control
Of all money for their goal,
I insist to every one—
It can't be done; it can't be done."

II.

Mr. Morgan, if you must
Say there is no Money Trust,
Lest your claim be held as phony,
Let me add my testimony.
Though I am a simple guy
And my balance is not high
In the bank; and vain you look
For my name in Bradstreet's book;
By experience I am won
To your view—it can't be done.

III.

Once, when payday came to me,
Did I bank my salary,
Thinking, in my youthful crust,
I would start a money trust?
That was years and years ago,
Did my little trustlet grow?
Nix! For as I put cash in,
I must check it out agin',
Shining shekels, bones and clinkers,
For my coffee, eggs and sinkers.
Now, the while I sadly look
At the figures in my book,
And I see the smoke and dust
Raised about a Money Trust,
Thus my deep reflections run—
"It can't be done; it can't be done!"

Portland, December 20.

## Half a Century Ago

Headquarters, Army of the Potomac, Dec. 13.—The battle, long anticipated, is now progressing. General French's division, which was supported by General Howard's troops, advanced to the enemy's works at 11:40 A. M. on a brisk run. The enemy's guns opened upon them with a rapid fire at the base of the ridge. The rebel infantry who were posted behind stone walls and some houses on the right of our men, and they fell to a small ravine. When our troops arrived at the first line of rebel defenses, they double-quicked and with fixed bayonets endeavored to dislodge the rebels from their hiding places, but the concentrated fire of the rebel artillery and infantry was too much for them. The center gave way in disorder, but was afterwards rallied and brought back. General Franklin, on our left, met with better success. He succeeded after a hard day's fight in driving the rebels about one mile. At one time they advanced to attack him, but were handsomely repulsed with terrible slaughter.

The Auburn correspondent of the Mountaineer speaks of much sickness prevailing at that place.

The citizens of Oregon City have held a preliminary meeting with a view to organize a company to engage in the manufacture of woolen goods. W. C. Dement, L. D. C. Latourette, D. P. Thompson, J. L. Barlow and A. Warner have been appointed a committee to ascertain the terms upon which the use of the waterpower at Willamette Falls and the necessary ground for the buildings could be obtained.

### No New Road Laws Wanted?

EOLA, Or., Dec. 18.—(To the Editor.)—According to the public press the indications are that the Legislative Assembly will bring forth many road bills to wrangle about. Why cannot the members represent the people and stand by the people's decision?

The vote cast upon road bonding and taxation bills seems to me should be conclusive proof that a vast majority are opposed to bonding and increased taxation in any form, and are satisfied with the present system of building roads. The only change voted for is in using convicts and other prisoners upon our roads, and such acts provide ample authority for the proper officials to act. Hence, there is no demand for road legislation at present, except by a minority.

Now should the Legislature represent the majority of people, or the minority because it happens to be composed generally of the wealthier class?

If the Legislature does not see fit to represent the wishes of the majority of the people, as expressed at the November election, then the people will use the referendum and possibly the recall later. The Legislative members as well as others should realize that laws do not create roads, and that roads can and are being made under present laws.

GEORGE C. MITTY.

### Loganberry Culture.

NEWBERG, Or., Dec. 19.—(To the Editor.)—Please publish in The Oregonian the views of some experienced loganberry grower as to the proper method of cultivating the same.

L. B. S.

Write to the Oregon Agricultural College experiment station, Corvallis.


## ROOSEVELT'S HUNTING TALES

**A Colorado Bear Hunt**—The second of Theodore Roosevelt's hunting stories deals with a thrilling bear hunt in Colorado, in which a number of fine specimens were bagged. It is told in Roosevelt's graphic style and occupies a full page, with illustrations.

**Our Fierce Little Pirates**—We have a large number of them and they cause us endless trouble in the Philippines. An illustrated page, which includes the stirring account of an exploit in which several brave soldiers won the medal of honor.

**The Winning of Oregon**—The second and concluding page in the outline history of the State of Oregon. The conquest by the white man and the establishment of the first Government are described.

**An Army Christmas**—A Christmas short story, profusely illustrated.

**Close to Death**—Second in the series of adventures of an American war correspondent. He is wounded by Mexican rebels and narrowly escapes with his life.

**"Rock Sand"**—A page account, in colors, of the departure of the great race horse for foreign shores, never to return.

**On the Beach at Dieppe**—A playlet from the French of Henri Lavedan. Complete Sunday.

**MANY OTHER FEATURES.**

**Order Today From Your Newsdealer.**