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 stret, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1913.

WHAT WILSON FIGHTS FOR.

There breathes all through President-elect Wilson's speech at Staunton a purpose to place himself at the head of the progressive forces of the people and to make the Democratic party the progressive party. There is a close resemblance between his declaration that "mere finely conserved institutions do not constitute the body of liberty; that the body of liberty can be had only in the use of institutions to serve the permanent needs of the rank and file of men"—there is a close resemblance between this declaration and the Bull Moose slogan of an easily-amended Constitution and of social and industrial justice. He adopts the golden rule as the guide in the policies of government. He announces his readiness to put on his war paint in order to master those men who have not his conception of the functions of the Government, those men whom he would not allow "to make any money except for a quid pro quo," whom he would teach that "they must render a service or get nothing."

Who are the men whom Wilson proposes to master, the men "likely to be associated with the Government of the United States who have not yet had dawn upon their intelligence what it is that Government is set up to do," as he views it? They cannot be other than the conservative Democrats, many of whom are now entrenched in power as heads of the great committees of the House and would become heads of like committees of the Senate if precedent were followed. Classed with them must be those men who have been making money without a quid pro quo through the aid of excessive protection, through monopolies set up and maintained in defiance of law, through absorption of our natural resources. Application of the golden rule in Government policies will be resisted by the men who employ women and children for long hours in unsanitary factories at less than a living wage, or who employ men for twelve hours a day, seven days a week, in the iron and steel mills.

Wilson's new definition of the functions of government causes the conservative newspapers of both old parties to gasp with dismay. The New York Tribune admits it to be a high ideal, but is skeptical of the possibility of its realization. The New York Times says it would make Jefferson "first gasp, then rage." The New York Herald calls it a fantastic idea, akin to parlor Socialism. The New York Sun ironically forecasts "the indispensable transition from the apostolic and transcendental spirit to that of the practical administrator at the threshold of a tremendous task" as having to be made in the nineteen days which will elapse between the formal declaration in Congress of Wilson's election and his inauguration. The New York World, Wilson's steadfast champion before as after his nomination, tells us that the voters demanded he should put on his war paint when they elected him and that his Administration will be terrible to wrongdoers.

Wilson evidently believes that the people demand progressive rule as he understands it and that, if they cannot get it from his party, they will turn to some other. Bryan saw that the only hope of Democratic victory lay in Wilson's nomination as a bait to progressive votes of whatever party, and events proved him to have truly read the tendency of public opinion. Bryan believes that Wilson's success as President depends on control of Congress by the progressive Democracy. Wilson's Staunton speech is in tune with what Bryan has said, though more general in its terms. Wilson plainly intimates that he expects to find foes within his own party, but he as plainly says that he will put on his war paint and fight them. He will fight with a smile on his face, but his sword thrusts will not lose vigor from that fact, nor will he flinch even though his visage be marred in the combat. He has shown in his political battles in New Jersey that he can thrust home to a vital spot. Jim Smith can testify to that fact.

Wilson sees that he has good cause to engage in the combat he has foretold. If he should parley and compromise with the conservatives, his rival for progressive leadership, sagacious and ever vigilant, would not delay one moment to brand him as a reactionary and to gather into the Bull Moose ranks the progressive Democrats who will give no quarter to the interests. Each of these two leaders—Wilson and Roosevelt—seeks to consolidate in his own ranks all the progressives of all parties and to fasten upon the other what he considers the ignominy of being the reactionary leader. There is a close parallel between the chief aims of the two men, though the mode of expression differs as their characters differ. Each professes a readiness to remold the Constitution in conformity with present needs and ideas. Each sets up the golden rule as his guide.

The remolding of parties into conservative and radical, though they may adopt other names, was only begun in the late campaign and will continue and perhaps be completed in the course of the next four years. Wilson and Roosevelt are jockeying for position. It remains to be seen what part the Republican party will play, for it has within its ranks leaders equally astute, equally combative and equally progressive in the present acceptation of that term. Stranger things might happen than that the Republican party should come out of the process as the popularly recognized party of progress and that one of the other two parties should disappear entirely. Wilson seeks to avert this fate from his party and also to capture the progressive banner.

CHANGED BY ITS FRIENDS?

If the Oregon system is to be amended by its friends, they are to be given the chance at the next State Legislature. Judge Lowell and other strong champions of the initiative and referendum and the primary law are preparing measures to submit to the Legislature, for the purpose of making desirable and practicable changes. We suppose it will be agreed that Judge Lowell, for example, has no ulterior motives. The Lowell bills are, briefly:

(1) Providing that any citizen may become a candidate for office by paying a fee and making his announcement.

(2) Providing for rotation of names on the general election ballot, where three or more persons are candidates for the same office.

(3) Limiting campaign expenses more strictly and effectively.

(4) Second choice ballot law, preferably the Rusk bill, vetoed by the Governor.

(5) Limiting the number of measures on the state ballot for each biennium to two constitutional amendments and five general laws.

The Oregonian deems it sufficient for the present to state what the Lowell proposals are, and to say that it approves them, in principle, except the last named. Obviously the plan of first come first served in initiative measures is fraught with danger of grave abuses, and would be likely to result in the presence on the ballot of bills which few desired to have there and to the exclusion of others which the public might generally wish to vote on. A better plan would be to fix a time—say ten years—within which a measure might not be resubmitted.

THE UNDER COVER MOTIVE.

Attention has been so fastened on the protest of Great Britain against the toll-exemption clause of the Panama Canal that the other grounds of protest have been largely overlooked. Yet there is good cause for the belief that, had the exemption clause been the only ground of protest, the British contention would not have received such general support among our Eastern newspapers and statesmen. The real cause of agitation among these high-minded gentlemen is the provisions of the law excluding from the canal ships owned by trusts or owned or controlled by railroads, whether American or foreign. Great Britain has protested against these as well as against the exemption clause of the canal law.

When the canal bill was under discussion loud protest was made in the East against exclusion of trust-owned and railroad-owned ships from the canal. It was at first assumed that this exclusion was to apply only to American ships, and the point was made that Canadian ships in particular would be favored at the expense of American ships. Now that the exclusion has been made general, that objection has been removed, but the big financiers still view with dread the prospect of genuine water competition with the railroads. The British protest furnishes them an opportunity to use British diplomacy and The Hague tribunal as means of throttling promised water competition. The interests of American railroads and trusts are identical with those of foreign nations as against those of the great mass of the American people.

The canal has been built for the purpose of cheapening transportation between our coasts. If we allow railroads to control water lines this purpose will be defeated. Having been put out of court by the extension of the exclusion clause to foreign railroad-owned and trust-owned ships, our amphibious railroad men make common cause with foreign nations against their own Nation and trust to foreign diplomacy for extinction of real water competition. If the Panama Canal dispute should be referred to arbitration and if the decision should be against us, there would be great joy in Wall street.

THE ALLIES AND EUROPE.

The ancient Turkish policy of procrastination is not working so well as usual in the peace negotiations at London. The allies appear to be perfectly united in making demands from which they show no disposition to recede an inch. The outside powers could not possibly interfere actively in the struggle before Spring opens, even if any of them really wished to do so. For reasons which we shall specify in a moment there is grave doubt whether any of them will interfere at any time.

Turkey is so torn with internal factions that her power of effective resistance to the Balkan allies is probably insignificant, no matter how much time she may gain for renewed preparation, while the chances are that with antagonists so alert and so conversant with her dilatory methods, she will not gain very much. It seems likely that Turkey has at last come face to face with fate. There is no visible escape from compliance with whatever terms the victorious Balkan states and Greece may fix.

In an extremely able article on the Balkan situation which Roland G. Usher publishes in the January Atlantic a number of excellent grounds are set forth for believing that there will be no interference either from the triple alliance or from the triple entente. The former combination, we need not remind the reader, includes Germany, Austria and Italy; the latter, England, France and Russia. Some time ago England and France, to win over Italy to their entente, promised her a free hand in Tripoli, but the promise was so badly kept that she felt under no obligations to forsake her old friends, and the triple alliance is now firmer than ever. Its purpose in the Balkan region is to open the pathway to German colonization in Asia Minor and ultimately to India. Austria's part in the plot is to cut a swath through the middle of the peninsula and with her fleet command the Aegean.

Thus Austria on one flank and Italy in Tripoli on the other would control the entrance to the Suez Canal and England's fleet would be cut off from India, whither Germany hopes to make a triumphal progress through Mesopotamia. The success of the Balkan allies and the erection of a strong confederacy in the peninsula will block this game. Hence the triple entente cannot be expected to put any briars in their pathway.

All that Russia wants out of the spoils is an unimpeded passage from the Black Sea. This England is now perfectly willing to grant, inasmuch as she expects to use the Panama Canal route to India, for one thing, while a Russian fleet in the Mediterranean will be useful as a counterpoise to the Triple Alliance. Between Russia and Germany, in spite of much specious confabulation on the part of the Kaiser and the Czar, there is an irreconcilable clash of interests, so that England feels safe in that quarter, at least for a long time to come.

On the other hand, the triple alliance cannot intervene in the Balkans. Austria is not only handicapped by dissensions at home, but she is vigilantly watched by Russia, who will see that her schemes are effectively thwarted. Germany can do nothing alone, since England stands ready to attack her in the Baltic if her fleet is sent elsewhere. This leaves Italy isolated. Evidently the allies can do about as they like with the Turk.

JAMES LAIDLAW.

In the death of James Laidlaw the British government suffers the loss of a loyal subject and a faithful and able representative, but Portland also loses a public-spirited resident.

As a British Consul Mr. Laidlaw contributed his share to the strengthening of those commercial bonds which aid powerfully in promoting friendship between nations, but he did more. Through his long residence in Portland he became in all essentials a citizen. He joined in all public movements for the progress of city and state. His interests were Portland's interests and he worked as earnestly for the development of the state and for civic well-being as though he had been an American citizen. He made his home here for many years, he brought up his family here and his public spirit made him in all respects one of us.

Mr. Laidlaw was such a man as any American city should delight to honor. He demonstrated by his life and activities among us how little difference there is between a good American and a good subject of King George. As Portland honored him living, it now sincerely mourns him dead.

THE GREEK TRADITION.

Tradition is the process by which things are handed down from one age to another. It may bring us stories, myths or books. It may bring coins and statues. In the Yale Review for January, 1913, Gilbert Murray undertakes to tell how much of the wreck of Greek civilization tradition has saved for us. Considering what a part Greece plays in our beliefs and conduct, one would imagine that pretty nearly everything it did of any consequence had been brought safely through the ages, but that is not true by any means. Comparatively little has escaped destruction. A few out of the many books that were written, here and there a statue, some coins, the skeleton of the Parthenon and a respectable army of ideas. No doubt Greek ideas have survived better than Greek marble or poetry. Professor Murray applies a canon or two of criticism to decide how trustworthy the fragments are that we have raked in from the waves of the stream of oblivion. The most dependable are the coins and such remains as inscriptions on tombstones. "Coins and inscriptions can be forged," Professor Murray admits, "but when you do get a contemporary inscription or coin the information it gives you is final." Even on questions of grammar monuments are better authority than books. He cites an instance where all the contemporary manuscripts give one form for a word while "the stones" give another and scholars have felt obliged to follow the stones rather than the books.

But literature "is fuller, more intelligible, more explanatory, than our other sources of knowledge." As a matter of fact about all we commonly know of antiquity has been derived from books. If we had more books we should know a great deal more. The minute points that are decided by inscriptions are usually meat for students, not for the man in the street. A still more decisive point is this, that literature is interesting while "the monuments" are intolerably dull. And finally the monuments do not mean much, as a rule, even to scholars, unless there is some literature to explain them. Since our knowledge of Greece depends so heavily upon the books that have survived, it is important to know whether we have them in their genuine form or not. How much have they been altered by copyists? And have we enough of the writings of the Greeks so that we can really understand their civilization? Are the ideas we call Greek what we think they are, or do we get them from some other sources? Professor Murray says that the manuscripts which have not been lost have come down from Alexandrian times without much alteration. In his own words, "they are astonishingly exact."

Flinders Petrie, the Egyptologist, made a discovery in 1891 which enables us to compare a manuscript dating from the year 895 A. D. with one written in the time of Plato. It is a fragment of the Phaedo written on papyrus, "very likely in the lifetime of people who had seen Plato." The 895 A. D. manuscript of the Phaedo was the oldest in the world up to the time of Petrie's find. A comparison of the two shows that they differ hardly at all. It is the same with other books. Since scholars began to copy them carefully at Alexandria they have not suffered much.

But before that time they were maltreated in every possible way. The ancients before Christ had no "literary conscience." Historians edited speeches to suit their own tastes. They modified quotations as they pleased. Owners of manuscripts felt free to alter them by addition and subtraction as well as by changes in the wording. The corruptions in ancient books are innumerable, but pretty nearly all of them date back to the pre-Alexandrian period. Professor Murray mentions one of Euripides' plays which "is a perfect mass of interpolation" fitted into it by actors and stage managers. It is a comfort to know that this wretched practice ended with the development of learning at Alexandria, and what was left of the various books at that time has descended without much impairment. It is interesting to contemplate the losses the world has suffered during the slow lapse of the ages from the Alexandrian period to the present. Aeschylus, the father of Greek tragedy, wrote ninety plays. Only seven are left. Sophocles wrote 123, and we have only seven of them. Euripides has been more fortunate. Out of his ninety-two plays nineteen survive. Not more than a fourth of Pindar's work has been saved. Menander and Sappho are almost a total loss. Of the philosophers, Heraclitus, Parmenides and the like, there is nothing left but scattered quotations in other writings.

It appears, then, that we have but the barest fragments of Greek literature and those fragments have been sifted by unpromising hands. Nothing would have survived had it not been for the schoolmasters who persisted in keeping Greek culture alive when the world was perfectly willing to let it die. Being pedants, they selected what best pleased their taste and suited their business of teaching. They preserved the orators, the grammarians and choice extracts from the poets. For the rest they cared nothing and it perished. These men delighted in volumes of edifying quotations which gave one an appearance of erudition without much labor. They abridged the great treatises, in order to make them easy to read. They chose "what was correct, obvious and sober." The consequence is that they have given us a badly distorted picture of the Greek intelligence. "Its statuesque quality, its love of proportion and order, its correct taste and rhetoric," of which we read so much, are probably due more to the pedantry of post-Alexandrian schoolmasters than to any reality that ever existed. The Greeks had all sorts of writers just as we have. If none of ours survived except those who flourish in school readers, would not the people of the next millennium think that we were statuesque and rhetorically correct? We may be perfectly sure that such writers as Bernard Shaw would be left to perish.

But for the long-exploded apex theory of mineral formation and the consequent absurd law of extra-lateral rights, Heinze would never have been able to carry on the war of litigation which he so long pursued in Montana and has just renewed in Idaho. A large part of his fortune has been acquired by this war. Almost every mining contest is based on a dispute as to extra-lateral rights. These contests are most long-drawn-out, costly and bitterly fought, frequently resulting in bloodshed. We hear no more of such contests in British Columbia, for that province long ago repealed the law of extra-lateral rights. Heinze formerly operated in British Columbia, but withdrew from that field about the time when it abandoned the apex theory. He found a more promising field in Montana, where the copper ore veins showing on the surface run together at some depth into what has been described as a great lake of copper. It being impossible to define where one vein ends and another begins, Butte seemed to be made purposely for the exercise of Heinze's litigous genius.

According to Arnold Bennett, Boston has more bookstores than any other town except Aberdeen, Scotland. The Scotch are notorious booklovers, but their taste runs to dry disquisitions on theology and metaphysics. It is strange that the land of oats and predestination should have produced Burns and Scott, but no stranger than New England's feat in producing Holmes. Dr. Johnson used to say that Scotland was a good country to get away from. Americans have thought much the same about New England. Millions of them came from there; very few stay there.

The system of land ownership in Roumania is interesting in these days, when we are all watching the Balkan states and studying their life. More than half the land, 9,500,000 acres, is owned by 4171 big landlords, while 1,015,302 peasant farmers own but 8,300,000 acres. The average size of the peasant holdings is eight acres. Besides these little farmers and the territorial magnates there are 38,699 proprietors who own from twenty-five to 250 acres each. The unfair distribution of the land is causing discontent and may lead to social revolution.

With nations as with men, when the struggle is for material gain, for territorial aggrandizement, they are always ready to bargain, dicker and compromise. They always count the cost and deliberate whether the gain is worth it. Thus nations which have fought for mere material things are drawn by common interest into alliance, as Germany with Austria, Austria with Italy, England with France and Russia. But a conflict like that between the Balkan nations and the Turks can never end until one has completely triumphed over the other.

With coal at $10 a ton in the East, the coal-carrying roads are going to distribute some comfortable dividends. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western's melon figures up to $12,000,000, and the other coal roads are doing quite as well. The Supreme Court has found that there is no combination among them. Their concert of action comes purely from subconscious telepathy, but since it makes fat dividends at the consumer's cost it works just as well as a genuine trust would.

Now that Major Sylvester has been forced to rescind his veto of the suffragette parade at Washington, he knows that woman is boss and that no mere Chief of Police should have the temerity to oppose her.

George Ade fell on the ice and bumped his head slightly. It's almost too much to hope that the propensity for slang was jarred out of his system.

The Fourth Estate is adding tone to the Senate with the accessions from Texas and Arkansas. It has long been needed.

The loss to California orange-growers is deplorable, but there are lots of apples, just as good, in the country.

Icicles dangle from California fruit trees. Which causes apprehension that the crops may prove something of a frost.

Woman has all the right in the world to aspire to a seat in the City Council, and, to go farther, to be Mayor.

Californians will not be so disposed to scoff at the Oregon climate as they were before their oranges were frozen.

George Ade can say the Sinner Stands in a Slippery Place, but the Good Man Goeth to Destruction.

Nature seems to have been deliberating for some time on the question of whether or not to snow.

The bathtub trust has secured a delay of trial. Probably after an immunity bath.

When their sins bid fair to find them out, many quake.

O, Gentle South Wind, come with thy ever-welcome rain!

Taft is keeping right after that Nobel prize.

HOW TO IMPROVE DIRECT PRIMARY

Advertising of Life History of Candidates Is Suggested.

PORTLAND, Jan. 5.—(To the Editor.)—I was much interested in a communication in The Oregonian on "Defects Seen in the Primary Law." Now, I am a strong believer in our primary law and feel that were it possible to return to the old convention methods of nominating candidates, it would prove a most regrettable mistake to do so, especially since we have extended our suffrage to women. But we will not return, and speculation thereon is idle. We must go forward. If the men and women of Oregon are hereafter to be permitted to cast an intelligent ballot at our nominating primaries with a reasonable hope of electing honest and competent officials, it is imperative that the primary nominating law be greatly amended, and our coming Legislature should feel it a bounden duty, not as so many politicians sparring for political advantages, but as honest, earnest and competent representatives of the people, to give the voters of Oregon a more satisfactory law on this very important subject.

In one day we doubled the votes in Oregon in practically every precinct in the state; many new precincts will have to be formed soon, voting places be made more comfortable, and in some instances more respectable in appearance; but what does that amount to so far as giving us a better government is concerned if the primary laws are so defective that the voters cannot know for whom they are voting or voting against? How can the voter know for whom he is voting? How can he make an intelligent choice among scores of candidates? John Mollycoddle wants to run for office. Dinklespiel circulates a petition, and John Doe and Richard Roe sign it—all unknown to the public. These men may all the honest enough, or they may be conscious or unconscious tools in the hands of the intriguing enemy. Mollycoddle is generous with his campaign cards and also adorns the stumps and trees of vacant lots, telephone poles, old barns and other ramshackles profusely with his pictures, but the unfortunate voter can no more tell of Mollycoddle's qualifications for the office to which he aspires than the smoker can tell about the flavor of Bull Durham by looking at the advertising artist's most celebrated "paintings."

Having discarded the outgrown and often corrupt convention method of nominating candidates, we have taken a blundering, staggering step in the right direction—the direction, mind you, is the only thing for which we can be thankful as yet, for voters, to say nothing of parties, are practically disorganized. We have doubled our "striking force;" it may be for good and against evil, but we have lost in the intelligent direction of our increased energy. I said voters are disorganized—except the schemers, "the worst ever."

Is it possible that with greatly increased power for good we are going to continue right along nominating candidates for office blindly? If so, let us spare ourselves further trouble by requiring all who desire a certain office to drop their names on strips of paper in a box from which a court clerk or bailiff is to draw after a gentle, kindly shake. A few minutes' questioning by the court of each one offering his name to the fates as touching his qualifications would be more intelligent safer and far cheaper to the taxpayer. I am not, however, suggesting this as a remedial change in our primary law but submit the following as one change that would, I think, be found helpful to very many voters.

Let each candidate for nomination make and subscribe to a sworn statement which he is to keep continuously in the daily papers for 90 days just prior to the election, said deposition to cover date and place of birth, educational advantages; his profession, trade or business, the number of years' experience in each, and where; by what corporations, if any, and how long employed; to what political party or parties he has belonged, how long affiliated with each; time and place of residence in this state and district, and any other information which said deponent has a right to believe would be helpful to the people whose suffrage he is soliciting in making up their minds as touching his qualifications for the office to which he aspires, even to his bona fide intentions in running. No one but candidates of doubtful "antecedents" and the political tricksters seeking to defeat the opposition party can or will object to some such change. This information will not cost the candidate much more than cards and pictures, cigars and drinks, it may be, do now, and will be worth vastly more to the voter in making his choice. Let him or his friends pay for keeping his deposition before the public, stating who foots the bill, of course, till after the primary. In the event of his being nominated, then let the taxpayer, if need be, keep his deposition before the public till election. The trouble is, about all the information the voter has to guide his choices is the party name on the ballot, while he has practically tied the party hands that put him there—tied, of course, for fear they would do greater mischief, but tied nevertheless.

Now, as to members of one party taking part in the primary nominations of any other party, I would allow no one to take part in a party nomination (he could vote as he pleased at the election) who was not known to be of said party, or had registered as such for a specified number of times, say through the last six elections, and had given other evidences of party fealty, at least nothing inconsistent therewith. If he believes in his party he certainly can trust its well-known adherents to do the nominating during his period of political adolescence and probation. If they make a mistake he still has his remedy. The law ought to be made strong on this point, even if drastic measures must be resorted to.

W. J. PEDDICORD.

Extension of Leap Year Privilege.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—As we are living in an age of precedents, and a leap year has just passed out, I would offer The Oregonian's bachelor maid and widow readers a suggestion.

Old custom has vouchsafed to the ladies the privilege of helping out Dan Cupid by proposing only in a leap year. Why not grant this consideration or privilege to the ladies the first month in each quarter of each year, or during each month of 30 days only or less? The suggestion might perhaps be more properly addressed to society in general.

This plan would relieve many a smitten and timid knight of a long wait until a quadrennial leap year came to help him out. Is there a second? If we hear no dissent shall we consider the idea an established precedent to begin with this year? C. A. M'LEMORE.

Tenderfoot.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—Kindly give me the definition of the word "Che-chahkos," which is used twice in the letter written by George H. Himes, January 3, 1913, and printed in The Oregonian January 5, in which he opposes the name "Webfoot Route" for the Harriman Electric Railway in Oregon. G. L. Richardson.

The word has the same meaning as "tenderfoot."

Collection of Spoons.

PORTLAND, Jan. 5.—(To the Editor.)—About six months since The Oregonian published an article about a woman who had a collection of spoons. Can you give me her address? H. N. WILMOT.

Dr. Ella K. Dearborn, 800 Union avenue, North, City.

WHERE MONEY FOR DRESS GOES

Working Girls Must Be Neat in Order to Hold Positions.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—I read with interest your editorial last Saturday on "Working Girls and Dress" in which you commented on the large percentage of her wages which the average working woman spends for clothing. It is, indeed, noteworthy that of the $32 a month which the average working woman receives she should feel called upon to spend fully one-third (over $11 a month) on clothing. The most obvious explanation, as you suggest, is extravagance in dress. But I think further consideration will indicate other reasons for most of the expenditure.

That the sum of $130 a year for clothing for working women may seem extravagant to some can be understood, but a glance at the table below will make clear how quickly that sum may be sensibly spent on necessaries. If the woman going out to work every day spends more than $130 or even $150 a year for clothing, the following are some of the reasons for it:

First—In order to secure or hold a position a woman must dress well. Women who do not go out to work every day do not give gloves, shoes nor suit the wear that a working girl does. A woman living at home can easily practice economies which would be disastrous on the part of a wage earner, who may live on two meals a day or lodge in an unlighted, unheated closet, as many do, but who dare not dress shabbily.

Second—Most working girls look forward to marriage. As long as men look to dress in selecting a wife, a girl who is working under the present wage scale (and consequently, can hardly hope to be self-supporting) may not unreasonably consider that it is "penny wise and pound foolish" to practice economies in dress.

Third—Girls could undoubtedly dress more economically if they spent their evenings making, mending, washing and laundering their clothes. And many are doing so, taking not only their evenings but Sundays for such work. Still it is a great deal to expect of a girl who puts in ten laborious hours in a hot, steam-filled laundry, in a noisy dusty workroom, at the nerve-straining work of telephone operating or standing behind a counter, to attempt at night the fine art of planning and putting together a dress or to descend to the wash tub for two or three more hours of back-breaking work.

Fourth—A great deal of expense in clothing is due rather to mismanagement than to extravagance. The blame for this is not to be borne by the girl; rather it is the grievous fault of her parents, her schooling and society in general that she is allowed to grow up ignorant of how to economize in buying. Most often in the very attempt to clothe cheaply, i. e. by purchasing cheap clothing, she is wasting money most prodigally. The selling of shoddy and unsubstantial clothing is as crying an abuse as the sale of adulterated foods.

Fifth—Finally, $130 a year spent for clothing does not leave much opportunity for extravagance. It is a large per centage of a girl's wages at the present time, but that only proves that the wages are miserably inadequate. In the 5-cent and 10-cent stores in Portland which are owned by immensely wealthy Eastern corporations the going wages are $4 and $4.50 a week. For a girl earning such a salary to "adjust herself to her lot" and provide room and board and clothing "within her means" would be a "fine art" more pleasing to admire than to exercise.

Cost of Clothing.

1 Winter coat	$ 20.00
1 suit	20.00
1 extra skirt	7.50
2 dark waists	8.00
4 white waists	8.00
2 dark underskirts	2.00
4 suits of Summer underwear	3.00
3 suits of Winter underwear	6.00
1 dozen pairs of stockings	3.00
2 pairs corsets	4.00
4 corset covers	1.40
1½ dozen handkerchiefs	1.80
4 pairs gloves	6.00
4 pairs shoes	16.00
1 pair rubbers	.75
2 hats	15.00
1 umbrella	.98
Miscellaneous articles—belts, collars, veils, hairpins, etc.	3.00
Total	127.43

This account makes no allowance for even one Summer dress nor for white underskirts nor anything in the shape of a party dress, an article of dress as necessary to the wage-earning woman as to her sister of leisure. The writer considers that some of the articles would be "poor buys" at the prices quoted here because of their cheapness and poor wearing qualities; the articles are so priced here because they are on the market.

CAROLINE J. GLEASON,
Director, Consumers' League Living Wage Investigation.

Workers Must Be Well Dressed.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—I refer to your editorial January 2, entitled "Working Girls and Dress." Men in fairly good circumstances will claim that their wives do not spend the average amount of $12 a month for dress. And in truth they do not. The wife has time to make changes in her dresses, do mending and cleaning and sewing that will save her half of this amount; and then, too, the fact must be taken into consideration that the working girl wears her clothes every day in the week, and the best and only ones she has as a rule. The wear on them is not to be compared with that on the clothes of the woman at home, who wears her best for a few hours occasionally.

A few days ago a woman (daughter works and helps to support her mother) said to me: "See the new waist material my daughter has bought to make, but goodness knows when she will get it made, as she is so tired at night that she is too nervous to sew and has to rip out everything she does." After one has worked for several years it becomes almost impossible to do certain kinds of work nights, such as ironing, sewing and mending.

I wish you would have a canvass made of the non-working girls and ascertain what their parents are spending on their clothes and especially the idle ones and not blame the working girls for what they spend to make themselves clean and well dressed, but the other class who spend lavishly and bring them to shame for wastefulness. Of the two classes the working girl deserves the best clothes. The employer expects his help to look well dressed or she will not hold her place, as it reflects on his business. We must educate some of our working girls to dress more tastefully and a great many of the well-to-do girls to spend less for show on the streets and thereby develop a more uniform feeling between them.

I am no Socialist, but I hope the time will come when it will be a disgrace to be rich and to dress extravagantly on the street, when there are those who from no fault of their own go hungry and in need of the necessities of life. I believe in the development of tender human sympathies beginning with both classes and working toward developing those feelings.

WORKING GIRL.

Pensions for Teachers.

DUFUR, Or., Jan. 2.—(To the Editor.)—Please inform me to whom a person should apply to get a pension through the Carnegie teachers' pension fund. AARON FRAZIER.

Write to Clyde Furst, secretary Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, 576 Fifth avenue, New York City.

Half a Century Ago

From The Oregonian of Jan. 7, 1863.

New York, Dec. 29.—The Tribune's Washington dispatch says that Stuart's cavalry marched entirely around Burnside's army on Saturday, having Dumphries in their possession in the morning. The Federals under Colonel Canby, having no pickets, were surprised in the night and captured. The Seventeenth Pennsylvania cavalry was roughly handled and withdrew in considerable haste.

Some soldiers connected with the Oregon cavalry complain that they have received no pay since their enlistment, now nearly one year.

The California cavalry, under command of Major McGarry, now stationed at Salt Lake, recently inflicted summary punishment on some marauding Indians by shooting them and throwing their bodies into Bear River.

George Francis Train has adopted the practice of leaving out allusions to the negro question in his lectures. After he is through with the ordinary discourse of the evening, he invites all to remain who want to hear that question discussed; those who do not can leave.

The heavy easterly winds prevalent yesterday prevented the bark Samuel Merritt from reaching her berth at Couch's wharf. At our last information she was at the mouth of the Willamette with the steamers Belle and Cowlitz towing her up, but making small headway.

The telegraph wire was down again at 4 o'clock P. M. on December 30. It was caused by a heavy fall of snow. For this reason we were not able to get any states news yesterday morning.

General Alvord, commanding this district, has received orders to call out six additional cavalry companies to fill out the Oregon cavalry regiment.

The route of the Central Pacific Railroad has been located for 18 miles out of Sacramento. Work was to commence on it after New Year's day, and 300 men were to be employed at once.

LEGISLATING BETWEEN SESSIONS

Plan Proposed to Submit Initiative Bills to Members at Home.

ESTACADA, Or., Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—I have received a suggestion which it seems to me would cure the overloading of the ballot with initiative measures. This overloading of the ballot is as distasteful to the friends of the initiative as it is to its opponents. The suggestion is each member of the House and Senate be permitted to go before the County Clerk of the county in which the legislator resides and there file in writing with the County Clerk his vote upon such bills as may have been properly initiated, one copy of such vote to remain on file in the office of the County Clerk, another to be certified to by the County Clerk with the seal of the county and sent to the Secretary of State by registered mail. Bills to be voted upon in this manner must be filed with the Secretary of State at least 30 days before the vote is taken and be accompanied by signatures of at least 1000 legal voters or be signed by five or more members of the Legislative Assembly and filed with the Secretary of State. I suggest that the vote be taken on the second Monday in January following the legislative session and again the second Monday of August of the same year. At the August election the legislators would vote upon all regularly initiated bills that were proposed to be put before the people in the next November. Those adopted by this vote would be declared law unless the referendum were applied within 30 days after the vote or they were vetoed by the Governor. All votes to be canvassed by Secretary of State. Governor to have veto power on all such bills.

Such in the rough is the suggestion. It may seem startling—revolutionary some will say—but it is the only possible solution of the overloading of the ballot that I have yet discovered. I offer it that people may give it thought and study. If it is not the best way, it may open the way to a better solution. We are looking for the best solution. F. M. GILL,
State Representative Clackamas Co.

Deeding Property to Self and Wife.

WILSONVILLE, Or., Jan. 4.—To the Editor.)—A married man, say named John Smith, buys real property, the deed reading to John Smith, as grantee. He afterwards wants the title to the property to be in his and his wife's names, as husband and wife, so that either one, as the survivor, would get title to the property without process of law.

Would a deed be legal and in order, drawn with the grantors being John Smith and Mary Smith, his wife, to John Smith and Mary Smith, husband and wife, grantees, and, of course, signed and executed by them? Attorneys have advised differently in regard to this point. J. W. THORNTON.

The Oregonian believes that such a deed would be valid, but inasmuch as lawyers do not agree on the question, it would be wise to make the transfer through a third party. The property may be conveyed to a trust company or individual and thence to the husband and wife jointly.

Chess vs. Billiards.

ASHLAND, Or., Jan. 4.—(To the Editor.)—To settle a dispute, will you please give us your opinion as to which is the more scientific game, billiards or chess? Have looked through five enclycopedias but cannot find anything definite. H. G. E.

If the correspondent in his question intends to use the word "scientific" in its specific meaning, the answer is that billiards is the more scientific game. That is to say, its results depend more largely on the application of accumulated knowledge formulated with reference to the operation of general laws. A play in billiards properly conceived and executed will accomplish a known result. Chess is a mental contest in which the force of a play may often be overcome by the strategy or mental skill of the adversary.

Price of the Annual.

SEATTLE, Jan. 5.—(To the Editor.)—Is it customary to charge 10 cents for the New Year's or any holiday number of The Oregonian? It is not so much the 10 cents charged by news agents, but just to satisfy myself and several friends. A SEATTLE READER.

The price of The Oregonian's New Year number is 5 cents, or 10 cents wrapped and stamped for mailing. The Annual will be sent to any address by this office upon receipt of 10 cents—5 cents for the paper and 5 cents for stamps (15 cents to foreign addresses). The charge to dealers should enable them to sell at the same price.

Course in Spelling.

PORTLAND, Jan. 6.—(To the Editor.)—We have a son who is very backward in spelling. Do you know of a school that gives a special course in that study? SUBSCRIBER.

We do not know of any school that makes a specialty of its spelling course. Spelling is taught by the public schools and business colleges.

Obstinacy by Any Other Name.

Judge.

Mary Mild—Cholly says he has great will power.

Carrie Caustique—All donkeys have.