

The Oregonian

Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as second-class matter. Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as second-class matter. Subscription Rates—Invariably in advance: (By Mail) Daily, Sunday included, six months, \$5.00; three months, \$3.00; one month, \$1.00.

Nor is it consistent with Count Okuma's definition of Japanese policy. Until Japan's professions conform to her acts we are justified in questioning her intentions and in regulating our own policy by the acts.

by these rules and must suffer under protest their violation by belligerents. The only alternative is to become a belligerent in defense of the broken law. We have accused both Britain and Germany, to say nothing of their belligerents, of violating international law. Then if we were to fight as the champions of law, we should be obliged, in order to be consistent, to fight both nations. If that were not so absurd as to be inconceivable, it would only add to the slaughter.

The President and Congress are sworn to uphold the rights and interests of the United States, not of all humanity, and they must uphold those rights even against those of humanity. If the United States were to act on the principle that neutrals may not sell war material to either belligerent in war, that principle would be likely to react against us.

ACT IN INTEREST OF HUMANITY. Writer Urges Embargo on Arms, Regardless of Neutrality. BAKER, Or., April 25.—(To the Editor.)—Referring to your editorial of recent date, "Exporting Arms to the Storekeeper," this article and others preceding it seem to be meant to explain in plainest possible English to such German sympathizers as are not familiar with international law relating to neutrality just what this Government permits its citizens to furnish war materials to Germany's enemies and calls for a change in that policy.

HONOR TO HIGHWAY BUILDERS. Civic Worker Says Tablet Should Be Raised to Mr. Lancaster and Alder. PORTLAND, April 25.—(To the Editor.)—On reading in the Oregonian the beautiful avian song of Samuel C. Lancaster, upon the completion of the Columbia River Highway, it occurred to me that it would be but proper to commemorate the sentiments expressed and chiseled them on the dressed face of one of those giant buttresses that overhang the road and cut the name "Samuel C. Lancaster, Highway Engineer" (not robber), underneath where the words may be read for all generations.

Twenty-Five Years Ago. From The Oregonian, April 28, 1890. Washington, D. C.—The National League of Women's Suffrage has introduced a bill to establish militia naval training ships at the principal water cities of the country. It is proposed one should be at Portland, O.

NOT EQUAL TO HIS JOB. The American note replying to Count Bernstorff's criticism of American neutrality calls forth unanimous commendation among the newspapers, but some lay stress on the fact that, while the note was signed by Secretary Bryan, it was written by President Wilson. The Associated Press, for instance, says that the note "was drafted by the State Department, but was finally penned by President Wilson himself."

INDUBITABLE BLESSINGS. Just now the East is sweltering under a burning April sun. Crops are threatened. Down in Texas serious floods are causing no end of damage in thickly habited districts. These are merely fore-runners of more distress to come. A hot year is being prophesied at Chicago, that the sun is intolerable in Kansas, that fearful suffering exists in New York.

A HALF OLD AGE. "Out of 2000 picked young men in New York only thirty could be given a clean bill of health." So says Professor Irving Fisher, professor of economics at Yale. He adds discouragingly that all the rest either had "impairments" of their physical frame or else followed habits that must lead to impairment. A house that is certain to topple over never falls as suddenly as we think.

HEALTH BULLETIN COMMENT HIT. Remark on Chiropractic Law Calls Forth Criticism of Editor. PORTLAND, April 26.—(To the Editor.)—In the March 5 issue of the Health Bulletin, published by the City of Portland, is the following paragraph: "The registrars of vital statistics will have their hands full in passing death certificates since the passage of the chiropractic law. This law established a high standard for the registrars. The legislators, representing the people of Oregon, and Governor Withycombe, would not have authorized the passage of this law had not the precautions been taken for safeguarding the interests of the people of Oregon and the needs of the registrars of vital statistics. Among the requirements, 370 hours' study of pathology and 240 hours' study of diagnosis, together with 127 hours' study of hygiene and sanitation, which is over three times greater than the requirements in the same subject according to the curriculum of the University of Oregon medical department."

ST. HELENS STONE PAVING BLOCK. Rock Used on Front Street Urged for Multinotch Highways. ST. HELENS, Or., April 26.—(To the Editor.)—I have noticed with great interest the agitation going on in Portland to have the paving blocks made of the lava rock of St. Helens. I have also noticed the frequent mention of this material in the papers of Oregon and in the Oregonian. I wish to state that during the year 1914 I was master of the Astoria route, a child was born one night on the up trip between Cathlamet and the summit. The mother came on board at Cathlamet and soon afterwards was taken seriously ill. We had no physician on board, but when the vessel was discovered Ham Winterbottom, the chief engineer, volunteered his services, and before arriving at the Portland dock he reported mother and child doing well. I do not remember the sex of the child, but Mr. Winterbottom certainly could tell an interesting story of his experience that night. J. W. EXON, Captain Steamer Woodland.

Bees "O. K." Nehalem Beeswax. PORTLAND, Or., April 26.—(To the Editor.)—I was interested in reading in the Oregonian of the Nehalem Beeswax article on the Nehalem beehives. To the many authorities quoted by him as believing in the beeswax remedy might be added another one, probably the best one of all—the bees themselves. We have shipped hundreds of pounds of this stuff to the States and it has been accepted by the best authorities. I have had no one who has done anything but praise the beeswax article. E. C. JOHNSON, Judge.

Application for a Job. Judge. Boss—No; we have all the men we need. Why do you seem like you could take one more, the little bit of work I'd do. Misunderstood at Sea. Ship's officer—Do you see that eight bell; excuse me, it's my watch below. Old lady—Gracious! Fancy your watch striking as loud as that! Pushing the Season. Before the snow is off the ground the stores are showing the Spring styles, and while the snow is still climbing they start to unpack the new goods. Style is crowding the seasons harder each year. Why do one seem to know, it just does. But these changes come so rapidly that it is necessary to have a new value of newspaper advertising. The advertising man is not a man of leisure, he is a man of business, and his time is the most important change of the season.

JAPAN AND THE OPEN DOOR. American opposition to Japan's demands on China is not based on objections to the legitimate expansion of Japanese commerce and emigration. Americans frankly recognize the proximity of the United States to China a natural and proper field for expansion of Japanese enterprise. Indirectly American interests are served by Japanese migration to China, for the stream of immigrants is thus turned away from the United States and the friction between this country and Japan is thereby avoided.

THE STATE HOLDS THE BAG. After all the furor of prejudice directed against the Michigan compensation law in the Oregonian, it is interesting to learn that the assumed weakness of the Michigan act exists under the operations of the Oregon law as amended. The Michigan law recognizes the right of the private company to sell compensation insurance. The difference between the straight liability or legal defense insurance and compensation insurance should not be overestimated. The former is an employer against damages obtained by injured employes in a suit at law. Compensation insurance, whether written under authority of the state or by a casualty company, provides for the payment of a specified amount for any one of a list of enumerated injuries and the payment is automatic. That is, the injured employe receives the sum indicated in the policy for his injury without recourse to law, and regardless of fault on his part or that of a fellow servant.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.

Another interesting feature of the Oregonian's defense of the Government's view of neutrality, practically admits that international law permits the United States to continue the sale of war material to belligerents, but questions whether our own records with the laws of humanity or the precepts of Christianity. He proposes that, in order to save hundreds of thousands of lives, we throw neutrality to the winds and stop the sale of war supplies. But it is necessary to consider whether we have a right to abandon our neutrality to this extent and what would be the consequences of our so doing. Violation of treaties by other nations constitute no excuse for our doing likewise. Rather it becomes us, as the greatest neutral power, to uphold the sanctity of treaties the more firmly, in the hope that, when the conditions are equal, the belligerents will the more readily renew allegiance to that principle as the best safeguard against war. Violation of treaties by neutrals would be a policy of despair and would be a frank confession that by war alone can the relation of nations be regulated. By that policy bloodshed would not be diminished, but would be vastly increased.