

The Oregonian

Portland, Oregon. Entered at Portland (Oregon) Postoffice as second-class mail matter. Subscription rates: Invariably in advance. (By Mail.) Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$8.00. Daily, Sunday included, one month, \$1.25. Daily, Sunday included, three months, \$3.75. Daily, Sunday included, six months, \$7.00. Daily, without Sunday, one year, \$6.00. Daily, without Sunday, one month, \$1.00. Daily, without Sunday, three months, \$2.75. Daily, without Sunday, six months, \$5.00. Weekly, without Sunday, one month, \$1.00. Sunday, one year, \$3.00. Sunday, one month, \$0.50. (By Carrier.) Daily, Sunday included, one year, \$9.00. Daily, Sunday included, one month, \$1.50. How to Remit—Send postoffice money order, check, stamps, coin or currency on sender's risk. Add postage and insurance in full, including county and state. Postage Rates—12 to 16 pages, 1 cent; 17 to 24 pages, 2 cents; 25 to 32 pages, 3 cents; 33 to 50 pages, 4 cents; 51 to 75 pages, 5 cents; 76 to 100 pages, 6 cents. Eastern Business Office—Verres & Conklin, 100 Broadway, New York. Verres & Conklin, Steyer building, Chicago. San Francisco representative, 142 Market street.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 4, 1916.

HUGHES' LABOR DECISIONS.

An attempt has been made to show by Mr. Hughes' position as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court on labor decisions that he is biased against the cause of labor. Examination of decisions in which he participated or from which he dissented proves precisely the contrary. As a judge he was bound by oath to declare what the law is, not what he thinks it should be, yet it may be conceded that his conclusions on disputed points of law reveal to a certain degree his mental bent. So far as his sentiments may have influenced his judgment on questions of law, they are decidedly favorable to labor and to all that type of legislation which promotes social and industrial justice.

Mr. Hughes in December, 1913, delivered the opinion on the appeal of the Sturges & Burn Manufacturing Company against the Chicago ordinance relating to the child-labor law of Illinois. Beauchamp was a boy under 16, who used for damages suffered through injury, under a law prohibiting the employment of children under 16 in certain hazardous occupations. He was given a verdict, which the Illinois Supreme Court affirmed, and the employer appealed to the United States Supreme Court on the ground that the law was in violation of the fourteenth amendment, providing that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law" nor "deny to any person the equal protection of the laws." Mr. Hughes said: "It is not to be doubted that the state was entitled to prohibit the employment of persons of tender years in occupations which are hazardous to their health and safety. As it was competent for the state to secure the protection of children by prohibiting their employment in hazardous occupations, it was equally competent to select means appropriate to make its prohibition effective. It is not the duty of employers at their peril to ascertain whether those they employed were in fact under the age of 16, but to observe the absolute requirements of this sort is a familiar exercise of the protective power of government. The classification established was clearly within the legislative power."

California passed a law limiting the hours of labor for women in hotels to eight daily. F. A. Miller, a hotel proprietor, contested the validity of the law and, being defeated in the state courts, appealed to the United States Supreme Court. Justice Hughes delivered the opinion of the court, holding the law to be a reasonable restriction on freedom of contract in order to safeguard the public interest. In support of this opinion he noted that the law was similar to a Court decision in the case of Muller vs. Oregon, wherein the Oregon law forbidding employment of women in factories and laundries for more than ten hours a week was upheld. He quoted his opinion as saying in regard to woman:

"She is properly placed in a class by herself, and legislation designed for her protection may be more extensive than that for men. It is not necessary for men and women to be treated alike. Even though all protected rights were taken away and she stood as an absolutely equal citizen, it would still be true that she is so constituted that she needs special protection; that her physical structure and a proper discharge of her maternal functions—having her passion and her own health, but the wellbeing of the race—justify legislation to protect her from the greed as well as the passion of man. The limitations which this statute places upon the employer are not in violation of the right to agree with her employer as to the time she shall labor, are not imposed solely for her benefit, but for the larger benefit of all. Many words cannot make this plainer."

Mr. Hughes applied the same principle to the California law and sustained the authority of the state to recognize degrees of harm and to "confine its restrictions to those classes of cases where the need is deemed to be clearest."

The California law was later extended to women employed in public lodging-houses, apartment-houses, hospitals and places of amusement and was contested by the trustees of a hospital. It was again upheld by the Supreme Court. Justice Hughes, by Justice Hughes, who gave similar reasons to those quoted from the Oregon case for justifying the restrictions of student nurses' work to eight hours a week.

One of the most important decisions rendered by the Supreme Court while Mr. Hughes was on the bench related to the right of employers to exact from employees a contract that they would not be members of a labor union. Kansas in 1903 passed a law declaring it unlawful for employers "to coerce, require, demand or influence" any person to enter into such an agreement. The law was sustained by the state courts but was declared invalid by the United States Supreme Court in January, 1915, in the case of Coppage vs. State of Kansas, on the ground that it infringed upon the right of free contract, which does not come within the police power of the state. Justice Holmes and Justice Day gave dissenting opinions upholding the validity of the law, and Justice Hughes concurred in the opinion of Justice Day, in which he said:

"Nothing is better settled by the decisions of this court than that the right of contract is not absolute and unqualified, but is subject to limitation by the state in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare. The state may, therefore, in proper instances, the judge of what is necessary to the public welfare, and a judicial review of its judgment is not warranted. There is nothing in the statute now under consideration which prevents an employer from making a contract with an employee for future employment, requires an employee to agree to become a member of a labor union, or to refrain from joining another union. The right to join labor unions is undoubted, and has been the subject of frequent opinions. The right to join them as against coercive action to the contrary may be the legitimate subject of protection in the exercise of the police authority of the state. This statute, however, it is argued, purports to protect the ex-

ercise of a legal right, by preventing an employer from contracting with an employee as a condition of obtaining employment. Justice Day proceeded to argue that the state had as much right to prohibit employers to require that employees renounce their right to join labor unions as it has to prohibit a requirement that employees forego the right to resort to the courts, saying: "A man may not barter away his life or his freedom or his substantial rights. He cannot bind himself by advance by an agreement thus to forfeit his rights at all times and in all places."

The two dissenting judges drew a parallel with the case of an employer who might pledge an employee not to enlist in the National Guard, or "to forego affiliation with a particular political party, or to refrain from joining a particular candidate for office." Their opinion of such a contract was thus frankly expressed: "It is constantly emphasized that the case presented is not one of coercion. But in an employer's agreement with an employee, who is to deny that the contract is not one of coercion? The form of words can strip it of its true character."

Here are three cases involving the most important features of the labor programme—restriction of female labor and child labor and maintenance of labor's right to organize. On each of these subjects Mr. Hughes' sympathies are shown by his interpretation of the law to be with the cause of labor. He is as progressive on that subject as the most ardent champion of labor. He is fully abreast of the times. He has no more lip-service. He has served the cause of labor by his acts, both as Governor and as Judge. Those acts prove the sincerity of the pledges he has given to the people, and he is guided by like sentiments as President.

WAR STOPPER: WAR STARTER.

It is doubtless with confidence born of the success of his wholly original conception of the way to stop war that Henry Ford now points out the way to start war.

War is one of the easiest problems that Henry tackles. Recipes for stopping it or recipes for starting it come to him just like that. To stop one, first adopt a slogan, then send a shipload of munitions to the warring countries to shout it. To start a war fail to elect Woodrow Wilson. These are the famous Ford recipes. One of them, as everybody knows and has seen, is to start a war by not being ready to begin. How the Ford peace expedition—using "peace" to define its purpose, not its deliberations—plucked the soldiers out of the trenches by Christmas was recalled by even the first-grade pupils in the Government's Americanization school. Here were demonstrated hard-headed sense, sound thinking, keen logic and everything else that makes for political guidance. It is not to be wondered at that Mr. Ford's brain is running on too lean a mixture. Now we have his recipe for starting a war. It ought to be just as good as any one for stopping war. The only doubt that can be raised is traceable to the ingenuity of the Wilson mechanism. Anything that has as many reverses as it has forward speeds is likely to carry an auto maker off his feet.

PERDICARIS ALIVE.

An incident occurred in Theodore Roosevelt's first Administration which a subscriber asks The Oregonian again to relate:

On the evening of May 18, 1904, Ion Perdicaris, a citizen of the United States, and his stepson, Cromwell Varley, a British subject, were kidnapped and taken to Tangier, Morocco, by Raisuli, a noted bandit. For their return he demanded a ransom of \$70,000, the surrender of all his followers who were in prison, the removal of the Governor of Tangier to the Sultan, and the Sultan's troops in Raisuli's district. An American fleet, under Admiral Chadwick, was sent to Tangier to back up the efforts of the American Consul to secure the release of Perdicaris. The British government took similar action, but the bandit made fresh demands and negotiations dragged until June 22, the Sultan making only indifferent efforts to satisfy this government. On June 22, Secretary of State Hay, under instructions from President Roosevelt, cabled to the Sultan of Morocco: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

The captives were returned in safety to Tangier three days later. One American citizen's life was then more precious than 500 now. National honor was maintained, American lives and property were made safe and an offending bandit but by three of our prison against the country that harbored him. And still President Roosevelt "kept us out of war."

NOTHING MUCH THE MATTER.

The habit is growing—to ask "What's the matter with Oregon?" and then to find an individual to blame for it. The answers. Better service would be done to the state by telling what is not the matter with Oregon and by dwelling on that feature of the case. It is not enough for the state, as an individual to blame for it, to examine in order to discover and correct faults. But that practice should not be permitted to degenerate into morbid self-inspection, which magnifies faults instead of curing them.

We are informed by the Portland Association of Credit Men that Oregon is under-populated, is top heavy with cities, has only 3 per cent of its area under cultivation and that our lumber industry, though more active, is not profitable. That diagnosis has been made before in varying terms; the present question is the treatment. It is not enough for the state, as an individual to blame for it, to examine in order to discover and correct faults. But that practice should not be permitted to degenerate into morbid self-inspection, which magnifies faults instead of curing them.

Portland. The steel trade is overflowing its present homes and is spreading to the Pacific Coast, and other industries will come to Oregon. We are getting the smokestacks and the ships, and they will bring the farmers to feed their employees as surely as the magnet attracts steel. The main thing that is troubling Oregon is that too many people are asking, "What's the matter with Oregon?" In nearly every other respect Oregon is all right.

AUTUMN LEAVES.

In October the smoke of many bonfires rises all over the land as the householder disposes of the Autumn leaves that have fallen in his lawn and garden. "Rake and burn" is the motto of this second clean-up time of year. It is quite natural that it should be so, for however beautiful the Autumn leaf may be in its place on the tree, just after the frost has nipped it and its bright colors have faded, the sap and turn the leaf to its varied and beautiful shades of red and yellow and golden brown, once it has fallen it becomes only rubbish. The leaves that have fallen in the garden are a slovenly affair, not to be tolerated by the dweller who has suitable regard for good appearances.

Yet Nature did not intend that they should be removed from the ground where they fell, for the primitive forests she made her annual attempt to restore to the soil at least a portion of the elements of which it had been divested by the growth of trees. Leaves furnish not only humus, which contributed largely to the physical texture and enhanced moisture-retaining properties, but they contained fertilizer needed for plant growth. A scientist who enjoys compiling statistics has estimated that in the country 19,000,000 pounds of fertilizer are destroyed annually by the burning of leaves. This is 5000 tons, for which the growers of gardens receive an average of \$100,000 if they bought it in its commercial form. But the destruction is so widely scattered that it falls on no one heavily; its loss is to the people as a whole. The garden rake is a highly necessary implement in the city, and should be used freely. There is no simple way of avoiding the waste thus indicated, but the gardener should remember that when he does his annual fall cleaning he is disturbing the balance of the soil. If he is to get results, a little more fertilizer as is removed by burning the leaves should be applied, and a little more for good measure will do no harm.

LETTING GEORGE PAY IT.

The trouble with Mr. U'Ren's letter, which he writes for the comfort and reassurance of the farmer and which The Oregonian publishes today, is that it does not tell the whole story concerning the operations of the proposed single tax or Confiscate and Divvy measure. It is Mr. U'Ren's theory that the land tax does not mean more taxes than it does now and that "land" speculator's land and valuable land in cities and towns will make up the deficit in tax revenues. But one must start with the premise that the amendment proposes to increase tax revenues at least 50 per cent. That is to say, only two-thirds of the revenues from the land-rent tax will be available for Government operation; the other third is to be used to persons of limited means.

There is in the amendment no intelligible method of assessing the vast timber resources of Oregon which now are heavily taxed. The most reasonable construction is that they will be assessed on the basis of their value as timber. There is no certain method of taxing the intangible values of railway property which now contribute largely to the cost of government. They, too, under a reasonable construction are to be assessed on the basis of their value.

Can any sensible person imagine it possible that improved farm lands, timber land and railroad property will pay materially smaller taxes, that tax revenues will be boosted 50 per cent in the bargain, and that vacant lands and town lots will assume these several burdens? It is preposterous. They could not do it. They would not do it, either if retained by the state or leased to others by the state. And there are other losses to be considered which must be made up somehow by imposition of rent tax on lands. In every city there is a large amount of business and residential property around the wholesale district, one around the factory district, one around the shipping district, one around the railway terminal district, that have a high potential value—a speculative value, if you please, which is taxed year in and year out. But that potential or speculative value would not be taxed under the proposed amendment.

Many lots on the West Side in Portland are vacated or covered by old buildings that produce a return but nominal when the price at which the lots are held as suitable apartment-house sites or the value placed upon them by the Assessor is considered. They are not covered by apartments, because apartment building only keeps pace with demand. This property would be taxed under the proposed amendment on the basis of its value as land, and would be sold in a year in the County Jail. He might have gone to the morgue.

The movement starting at Kansas City for an earlier Thanksgiving day must not be encouraged. Oregon had two Thanksgiving days in the same year. Why fool with a time-honored custom? The fitness whose propensity for girls under age was brought to a stop the kind of day gets off to a start in the County Jail. He might have gone to the morgue.

If it costs a man \$75.00 to put his arm around a girl in San Francisco, how much will it cost him to bite the little brown freckle under the left ear? To the average man all Chinese look alike unless seen in a bunch, but this did not prevent our detectives in assisting one wanted in Boise for forgery.

Seating a Japanese delegate in a labor convention in California may be the beginning of the solution of a vexing problem. Concerning the disruption in the local Civil Service Board, Mr. Caldwell is silent and the Mayor is dumb.

The school lunch at a nominal price is of benefit in teaching children properly to eat. The man who keeps up his membership for seventy years is a real odd fellow.

Bishop Hughes brought the dove of peace, trimmed its claws and turned it loose. More Democrats than get into print will support Hughes.

Time is short for paying that last half of the tax.

PLAYGROUND IS REAL NECESSITY.

South Portland Needs It for Safety, Sanitation and Business Reasons. PORTLAND, Oct. 3.—(To the Editor.)—The excellent article in The Oregonian relative to Commissioner Baker's commendable effort to secure the much-needed playground for South Portland, is deserving of further elucidation. No one, familiar with the conditions existing in the one really congested district of Portland, can fail to gain a keen appreciation of the necessity of a playground for the children in this locality. All drivers of vehicles realize the necessity of exercising special caution when driving through the streets of this district, owing to the large number of children who play in the streets for want of a safer place. The large number of accidents, and in some cases deaths, resulting from this condition has caused numerous and emphatic protests from societies, associations and prominent men and women of this city who have the safety and welfare of our children at heart.

The South Portland Improvement Club, with a membership of more than 300, is an ever increasing organization. Others endorsing the playground project are the People's Institute, by Mrs. Helen Sawyer Higer, president; Mrs. A. J. Stephens, of the Parent-Teacher Association; Judge M. G. Munly, late president of the Board of Health; the Kindergarten Association, the Council of Jewish Women, the Laurelhurst Club, the Neighborhood House, the Mayor's Advisory Council, the Woman-Speaking Societies of South Portland, the Fulton Park and Failing School Parent-Teacher associations and the Parkways and other business and professional men of this city.

Although the arguments along the "land rent" basis are strong in favor of the playground project are sufficient and unanswerable, there are other points worthy of serious consideration which would like to bring to the attention of The Oregonian's readers, namely, the aesthetic and business point of view. It is now generally conceded that one of the best investments ever made by this city was the money (\$200,000) expended for the beautification of the city. The only man ever heard regarding it being that obstacles were permitted to remain at the very entrance to the boulevard and that the view of the city from this highway and give the impression that the head of Sixth street cannot be the entrance to it. Perhaps the most unsightly and unsanitary row of buildings of the foreign quarter, which fringe the east side of the entrance to the parkway, is the one which has attracted adverse criticism as being offensive to aesthetic taste and marred and disfigured the otherwise beautiful scenic road.

The relatively small cost of the project, as estimated by Commissioner Baker, is amply justified by the results, which would not only give us the much-needed playground, but would also remove the obstacles and unsightly features which mar the sides making it possible to utilize the now useless surplus ground in Margum Gulch, donated to the city by the late George W. U'Ren, as a part of the playground and parking scheme advocated by Mr. Baker. Since this quarter has been so long a part of the city, every bell he had on hand to the railway station, covering all the available railway ground and extending far onto the green beyond. The effect of this has been far-reaching, and has benefited the city in many ways. The land have taken to giving their bells to the fatherland for a similar purpose. One bell about to go to the melting pot has a history that dates back to the time of the Terrible, in the sixteenth century. The bells have almost equally romantic associations.

To our other troubles must be added the growing cost of authorship. One struggling author complains that the New York Tribune that postage at letter rates is out of proportion to the returns received. He finds that it costs 20 cents, on the average, to get a manuscript, which may be accompanied by an equal amount of postage money. More frequently than not it comes back, and sometimes several efforts are required before a sale is made. If he gets \$20 for the work he has done, he is left with a net profit of 10 or 15 per cent of his remuneration. This, it is argued, is far out of proportion to the postage tax on other mail-order business, which is a mere pittance for relief in the form of a postal restriction classifying manuscripts as merchandise, which would prove a boon to a large and not wealthy class. This is an opportunity for vote-getting that his administration seems to have overlooked.

No, as a regiment we are not for war—simply for war's sake, but as individuals we are for peace and for the Americans we stand for principle. We believe in duty and in honor as against this weak and pusillanimous doctrine of "first aid" to the enemy.

Yes, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are giving their thousands for the British Empire. They are not forced. An incident will illustrate the spirit of those people. About a year ago I met a gentleman in a dining-car on the coast. He was spending his vacation here, but told me he intended enlisting on his return to British Columbia. I said to him, "I admire your spirit, but why do you want to go to the front?" He replied, "The mothers, the wives, the daughters, the sisters believe it. They believe that democracy and self-government are at stake. They believe that small governments have squandered with the great nations. They are fighting for a principle, and have counted the cost. As Lord George Gordon had said, 'I will not be a slave and do it without a whimper.'"

And what is more, after they get through you will find their work has not been in vain, and the mothers, the wives and sisters will not have been in vain, as have those who left their hearts in Vera Cruz, Panama and Carrizal, to say nothing of those who were murdered.

Yes, you kept the country out of war, but oh, the cost! That song might go for campaign material with babes, milkops, and mollycoddles and those who live in luxurious idleness, but not this kind of a war. It is a war for blood. The Third Oregon Regiment considered the cost when it left here in 1915, and preferred the ignominious retirement of our Government at every turn finds us at home whole in September. It is nothing for pride, or to our credit. A. HOWITZER.

New Process Valuable.

A new process for extracting ferro slag, hitherto considered practically worthless, has been discovered by two students of the Carnegie Institute of Technology. This discovery means a great saving to steel manufacturers as the prices of these two materials have just tripled since the beginning of the war.

Surveyors Use Adding Machines. Exchange. The United States coast geodetic survey announced that surveying parties are now using adding machines almost universally in making out reports and recording data. It was a surprising move to the old methods is shown by the statements recently made that enough time is saved in this way to pay for more than pay for the machines.

More Democrats than get into print will support Hughes.

Time is short for paying that last half of the tax.

WELL, MAKE A GUESS.

There is no calamity which a great nation can survive while equal rights follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consent of the majority is not a shield against a people's safety and greatness. The foregoing are the words of a distinguished American. Who was he? Under what circumstances were they uttered? What was the result of their utterance? How much do you know about American history? Can you answer the foregoing questions? The Oregonian has invited submission of essays on this question. It sounds like a puzzle. Let us now make it a guessing contest. Who said it? Whom does it sound like? It ought to be easy.

FARMERS' TROUBLES ARE SHIFTED.

Mr. U'Ren Says Single Tax Law Puts Burden on Others. PORTLAND, Oct. 3.—(To the Editor.)—From the illustration used by your correspondent, Melvin Fenwick, and his fear that the old couple who worked all their lives improving a farm would lose it under the People's Land and Loan Law, it is quite clear that he has not read that law.

He supposes a case of a tenant farmer raising 5000 bushels of wheat and paying 10¢ a bushel. The farmer would pay on which the owner has made all the improvements. Ninety cents a bushel would be a good average price for that wheat. The buildings, clearings, fences and other improvements on such a farm would be valued at \$100,000. The farmer would have to pay an investment of not less than \$10,000; 5 per cent interest on this is \$500; maintaining the buildings and improvements will cost \$200 a year, and the farmer would have to pay \$700 under the proposed law, because the improvements in this case are his, and the \$500 per year in rent and upkeep of the land.

That leaves only \$100 for land rent, which will be the greatest possible amount that can be paid for the full rental land value tax bill. This is less than he pays under the present system for taxes on his land and improvements, livestock and machinery. It is clear that the old farmer who has worked all his life will have more net income from the rent for his improvements than he will have to pay for the bill, than he has now, paying taxes on everything. The farmer who has improved and cultivated farm the full land rental value tax will be exactly the same, acre for acre, that raw land, equal in fertility, location, soil and other conditions, in the same vicinity. The second and third sentences of paragraph (f) of the law expressly provide that "land rent" shall be applied to any charge for land and improvements and shall not be increased because of any additional improvements that may be made on, in or under the land. For every cultivated farm there is in the same vicinity enough vacant and unimproved land to make one acre of land for each acre of cultivated land that in cultivation, but held out of use by speculators. Under this law the speculator must pay the same amount for the land that he keeps as the farmer pays for what he uses, and the farmer's buildings, clearings and other improvements will all be free from tax. This law will reduce the farmer's tax and increase the speculator's tax entirely out of business. It will not take from any farmer the rental value of his land, because from 75 to 90 per cent of the rental value of his farm is for improvements, and not more than 10 to 25 per cent of the total rent is for the land. Every farmer can get the rest from his own experience and accounts. Where will the revenue come from? It will come from the tax on the cities and towns. There are single lots in Portland which the landowner is collecting \$15,000 a year for the use of the land, and the owner is not owning the buildings. The lot is 50 by 100 feet, and the \$15,000 rent per annum for such a lot is equivalent to the rental value of 150 such farms. Mr. Fenwick supposes for his example of the poor old people who have worked hard at their lives, and now we have to think the People's Land and Loan Law will rob of their savings. He never was more mistaken.

OREGON TROOPS NOT MILKOPS.

They Remember Fallen Men at Carrizal, Vera Cruz. PORTLAND, Oct. 2.—(To the Editor.)—Permit me as a Spanish-American War veteran, and lately with the Third Oregon at the Mexican border, to say a few words in regard to the article in your issue of the 29th, entitled, "There and Here."

The editorial for a welcome home song for the boys who came back from their mothers' breasts, of milkops and mollycoddles, and of men who were fighting for the sake of the honor of their country was at stake. Yes, we are back safe. But how many of the boys who followed Captain Boyd and Lieutenant Adair and fell with them at Carrizal, attacked on the orders from the Carrizal government? How many of the boys who fell at Carrizal, and how about the brave lads who fell in the streets of Vera Cruz? And fell in the streets of Vera Cruz? And fell in the streets of Vera Cruz?

The answer can only be that they have died in vain. They have been an absolute loss and all to no purpose. The cause of their death was a senseless and senseless war, and its lack of courage to enforce them. If justice demanded our intervention in that fratricidal war, it certainly demanded our sticking until we obtained what we demanded, especially when the lives of our own people were in the balance.

No, as a regiment we are not for war—simply for war's sake, but as individuals we are for peace and for the Americans we stand for principle. We believe in duty and in honor as against this weak and pusillanimous doctrine of "first aid" to the enemy.

Yes, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are giving their thousands for the British Empire. They are not forced. An incident will illustrate the spirit of those people. About a year ago I met a gentleman in a dining-car on the coast. He was spending his vacation here, but told me he intended enlisting on his return to British Columbia. I said to him, "I admire your spirit, but why do you want to go to the front?" He replied, "The mothers, the wives, the daughters, the sisters believe it. They believe that democracy and self-government are at stake. They believe that small governments have squandered with the great nations. They are fighting for a principle, and have counted the cost. As Lord George Gordon had said, 'I will not be a slave and do it without a whimper.'"

And what is more, after they get through you will find their work has not been in vain, and the mothers, the wives and sisters will not have been in vain, as have those who left their hearts in Vera Cruz, Panama and Carrizal, to say nothing of those who were murdered.

Yes, you kept the country out of war, but oh, the cost! That song might go for campaign material with babes, milkops, and mollycoddles and those who live in luxurious idleness, but not this kind of a war. It is a war for blood. The Third Oregon Regiment considered the cost when it left here in 1915, and preferred the ignominious retirement of our Government at every turn finds us at home whole in September. It is nothing for pride, or to our credit. A. HOWITZER.

Like Many Others.

Edwin Booth, the actor, although an incessant smoker, could drink very little, and was promptly affected by the smallest draft of liquor, a fact which once led a friend in a wasteful mood to present him a cup in the bottom of which was a compass. The gift came, said Booth, in all referring to the incident, "from some one who knew me."

In Other Days.

Half a Century Ago. From The Oregonian of October 4, 1866. San Francisco, Oct. 2.—Queen Emma, of Hawaii, visited several public schools of this city yesterday. Subsequently she visited the Mission Wagon Mills. She visited the fortifications in the harbor on the steamer Shubrick. Her Majesty was more than pleased with what she saw and the attentions paid her.

Washington, Oct. 2.—Santa Ana's recent visit to Washington and efforts in favor of Mexican independence did not appear to meet with any sympathy from the American Legation.

Dr. Giltner, of this city, has received from Governor Woods the appointment of visiting physician at the Insane Asylum.

The \$50,000 shipped yesterday on the steamer Oriflamme for San Francisco by Messrs. J. H. Tilton and associates, 23 in number, from the Portman mine. This is certainly substantial evidence of the richness of that celebrated mine, of which so much has been said and written.

Washington, Oct. 2.—The household effects left at the Arlington mansion by General Lee were recently delivered to the parties authorized by General Lee to receive them. This was done under an order from the President.

Twenty-Five Years Ago.

From The Oregonian of October 4, 1891. Berlin, Oct. 3.—Charles Murphy, a resident of this city, is here for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the authorities the value of Indian corn as an article of food for the country. Officers from the medical and commissary departments of the Army has been appointed to investigate the matter.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Washington, Oct. 3.—Senator Mitchell was interviewed today on the matter of Oregon's choice for President. He said that he would probably be chosen under an order from the President.

Whence Came "Cooa Bay"?

PORTLAND, Oct. 2.—(To the Editor.)—Apropos of the historical discussions as to where Oregon points derived their names, the latest development in this line is the Cooa Bay derivative. A perusal of the treatise of "35 recalls" in that time, the bay was commonly called Cooa Bay. Another treaty between the Indians and the Government has it Cooa Bay, and now we have that much more rhythmic gem, Cooa Bay. Some would assert that some canny Scot who had the United States flag in the Bay district and gave us the new name, but an investigation of the Marshfield district shows that the Irish predominated even in that time, and we have today a plentiful progeny of O'Brien, Maloney, Flanagan, Bennett.

The change of the original name is due, doubtless, to the desire of the younger generations—as elsewhere in Oregon—to soften the outlandish and uncouth names of the past, and to give them some euphonious designations. J. B. COTTINGHAM.

N. Nitts on Fearlessness

By Dean Collins. Nescius Nitts, sage of Punkindorf Station, emerged from a posture of deep cogitation. And halted his rhythmic, swift mastication. To check with his quid a black and white condition, and then upon fearlessness made an oration.

To check with his quid a black and white condition, and then upon fearlessness made an oration. I see by the papers that Wilson allies Indians' sin stand in the late railway crisis. And pining with pride how he firmly withstood. By yieldin' with haste while the yieldin' was good. Which same parallels, in affairs of the Nation. A crisis had here in Punkindorf Station.

And Higgins delivery wagon was dr