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, 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	3.50
Sunday and Weekly	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 sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

Postage Rates—12 to 16 pages, 1 cent; 18 to 32 pages, 2 cents; 34 to 48 pages, 3 cents; 50 to 60 pages, 4 cents; 62 to 76 pages, 5 cents; 78 to 92 pages, 6 cents. Foreign postage, double rates.

Eastern Business Office—Verree & Conklin, Brunswick building, New York; Verree & Conklin, Steger building, Chicago. San Francisco representative, R. J. Bidwell, 742 Market street.

PORTLAND, WEDNESDAY, OCT. 25, 1916.

WHO WANTS WAR?

The Democratic party is for peace and the Republican party is for war. The President says so, and all the cuckoo orators and mocking-bird newspapers are echoing his words down the line.

Undoubtedly, the slogan "He kept us out of war" makes a strong appeal. For, despite the bald Democratic assertion that the Republicans want war, nobody wants war. Everybody knows that.

But may war always be avoided by unwillingness to wage war, or a humble display of a spirit "too proud to fight"?

When it is said that President Wilson "kept us out of war," it is pertinent to ask what war?

Not with Mexico, of course, for we have been in a state of war with Mexico for months and have twice advanced upon Mexico with the armed forces of war.

But Mexico doesn't count. What our pacifist friends who wish at any cost to keep out of war mean doubtless is that Wilson kept us out of the European war.

How? By his "strict-accountability" note? By the provocative message threatening to "omit no word nor act"? By the threat to sever diplomatic relations? By repeated declarations, or implications, that the "act" would be suited to the "word"?

Clearly, a belligerent attitude on the part of Germany toward us or a hostile reception of our repeated warnings and occasional menacing words, would have made war inevitable.

Germany doesn't want war with us; nor Great Britain, nor any foreign power, now engaged in the European conflict.

There was no chance to get into war, and is not now, except by an act of inexcusable aggression on our part.

We don't want war. We have not been "kept out of war." We have stayed out of war because everybody—every party—wanted no war and nobody chose to fight us.

But it is different as to Mexico. Just what particular phase of the whole sorry Mexican episode for three and one-half years are the supporters of President Wilson most proud of?

Are they proud of his assertion that Mexico is none of our business and cannot be deprived of the right of revolution? Or of the fact that we made Mexico our business after saying that it was not our business?

If Mexico is not our business, let us withdraw our troops and bring our boys home.

But we cannot withdraw, we hear, without precipitating chaos and provoking renewed border troubles.

Ah, yes. Then Mexico is our business. We know it is. We cannot help it. We merely shut our eyes to the facts and hope for the impossible to happen—a sort of automatic restoration of peace there without any effort on our part. But we know better. We know that the Mexican problem presses for solution—solution with our aid—and we know that a futile policy of procrastination and opportunism for over three years has but served to postpone the day of final accounting.

A problem avoided is not a problem solved. Duty ignored is not conscience salved, nor difficulty met and overcome.

WARDEN OSBORNE'S VIEWS.

The resignation of Thomas Mott Osborne as warden of Sing Sing prison illustrates once more the danger that highly specialized reformers are in. They are likely to close their eyes to the fact that there are other points of view than their own. Like the frequently occurring type of medical specialist whose professional zeal leads him to see his pet ailment in a large proportion of cases, the reformer is apt, if he is not careful, to come to believe that his diagnosis and his remedy for social ills are the only ones. Mr. Osborne was loyally sustained by Governor Whitman when base political attacks were made upon him; when he was under indictment the Governor named a successor conditionally upon the ultimate restoration of the warden to his post when he should be acquitted; and later Mr. Osborne was without question reinstated in his office. This should have demonstrated that Governor Whitman was in sympathy with the warden in a broad sense; yet Mr. Osborne now conceives that the powers above are arraigned against him because upon a question of what particular dangerous criminals shall be chosen for the bestowal of special liberties the Governor does not feel justified in giving him his own unrestricted way.

Sidelights often are valuable in showing real character. One of these, Mr. Osborne's declared views upon the case of Dr. Arthur Warren Waite, is particularly illuminating. Dr. Waite murdered his wife's parents; Mrs. Waite is convinced that he intended also to murder her. The essential facts of the case are admitted; even Mr. Osborne does not dispute them. But the reforming warden finds that Dr. Waite is not a "bad man"; he is only "excessively abnormal." So, being only "excessively abnormal," Dr. Waite would not be put to death, under the Osborne idea. Restraint, for the protection of society, is not objected to; Mr. Osborne does not go so far as that. But it does not seem to have occurred to him that there might be further protection to society in demonstrating to other "excessively abnormal" individuals that for them it is not a good thing to let their excessive abnormality run to extreme bounds.

Dr. Waite's chief abnormality appears to have been his abnormal selfishness. With even higher mentality, he might be called a "superman," or something like that; as it is, he is simply a man who proposes to extract certain comforts out of living, regardless of the rights of others. He scorns the painful steps by which others have climbed to affluence. His parents-in-law have money and his wife is their heir. He wants the money; why should a middle-aged couple stand in his way? So, as he himself has confessed, he plotted to remove the obstacles to his own desires. If he had been of a different type and had lived in another place, he might have used a club and had it over with quickly. Being more "refined," he made a nicer job of it.

Nevertheless, his victims are dead, and from the extremely modern point of view they are to be forgotten. Why worry about them, when we cannot bring them back to life? We have before us the living, breathing and only excessively abnormal Dr. Waite to grow sentimental over. To be sure, extreme selfishness is a crime comparatively easy to make unpopular, in the very nature of it; but we are so tender-hearted just now as to the present that both the past and the future are ignored.

Mr. Osborne has done a work of great importance in his chosen field. He has in fact opened a door of hope to many a convict who under the former system would only have gone from bad to worse. But, like so many reformers, he has to a very considerable extent lost the power to differentiate. The ideal will not be attained by extremists working alone; it probably will result from co-operation of such enthusiasts as Mr. Osborne and such practical men of affairs, not blind to ideals but calmly sensible about them, as Governor Whitman.

WORK, NOT WAR.

The ghastly doctrine of the late Lord Roberts that civilization may be saved only through blood-letting and man-killing wars is an echo of the dark ages. It may be true that nations have lived only because they were physically fit to live, as individuals have survived the inexorable application of nature's laws; but if that is so today, the intellectual progress and moral development of two thousand years leave us no better off than the nations of the pagan era.

No doubt nations become soft and enervated through over-civilization, or what is miscalled civilization. There is too much leisure and too much education—education that teaches the subject to despise labor that must be done with the hands and to devise ways to make someone else do it. Education ought not to mean exclusive employment of the mind and the tongue. It ought to mean also not only skill at physical labor, but a willingness to do it.

Work is the salvation of a nation or a people, and not war. We rear our boys to despise the occupations of their fathers and our girls to scorn household service. It is a sorrowful mistake. Our boys and our girls are no better than the young and ambitious farmer boy of a generation ago, who rose with the sun, fed the stock, chopped the wood, ploughed the fields and passed a long day out of doors in hard toil to earn enough for a few months' schooling in Winter. Nor are our daughters better than the woman who a few years ago helped her mother in the kitchen and did her own household work long after her marriage to the industrious fellow who had his own way to make. We would spare our children the hard knocks we had. That is the beginning of individual and National decline.

When the time comes that every boy able to work must work and every girl able to work must work—whether for money or for discipline or humility—the Nation will be safe.

MERELY A WARNING.

The Oregonian is fighting the election of George Tazwell for County Judge and supporting George M. McBride. In answering a criticism of its course, it says: "It does not bow to the verdict of a primary of 40,000 or any other number of voters in its selection of a nominee for an important office who is not fit." This stand shows admirable backbone, but the question still remains: "Is the Oregonian correct in its estimate of the nominee or are the voters who named him the better judges?" If it has the facts to justify its stand then it is correct, for a newspaper has a duty to perform for the public and this sometimes when the public objects to the duty being performed. No paper is worthy of the name that will indorse a candidate whom it knows to be unfit just because the party it is affiliated with sees fit to nominate him. There are times when blind loyalty to party is treachery to the community.—Salem Capital-Journal.

The Oregonian begs to say to the Capital Journal, and to any others, that the records of Tazwell's administration of the Police Court afford all needed evidence as to his unfitness to be Probate Judge. They are available and voluminous. They are indisputable and damning. Every Portland newspaper at the time had surprising disclosures of the Tazwell operations, and every newspaper ought now to concern itself about his possible, and even probable, election to a responsible office, calling for conscientious and judicious discharge of onerous, delicate and important duties.

The Oregonian has no concern about Taxwell that is not the public concern—none whatever. It is not doing much in the way of "fighting" him. It is a disagreeable task. But it could not in conscience permit his candidacy to be approved without a note of warning to the public.

CITIES BEAUTIFUL.

Recent cable dispatches told briefly of adoption of measures for the reconstruction, along lines of combined beauty and efficiency, of the city of Dublin, the capital of Ireland, and it is of especial interest that not only the money to finance the enterprise but the plans upon which the entire work will be based will be provided by the United States. The winning group of plans placed emphasis upon the need for new and more adequate housing facilities, a new city center and an extensive scheme for reclamation of the flat lands of the bay. It is quite obvious that in undertaking an extensive work of this nature, for which the $2,000,000 suggested is probably only the beginning, it is the height of wisdom to adopt in advance a well-co-ordinated system. Thus the mistakes that characterize the hurriedly built and unbeautiful cities with which so many are familiar are most likely to be avoided.

New York, the metropolis of our country and destined to be in some respects the most important city in the world, is a fair example of neglect in this respect. The residence districts of Manhattan Island are of relatively modern development, so the early settlement with its narrow, crooked streets and the defensive wall that has given its name to a famous street, can well be left out of account. But the city always has grown in haphazard fashion, without forethought, until ground values have become so high that extensive making over is as good as out of the question. People now see too late what might have been done a few years ago by a city-planning commission. But the movement toward city planning has extended, and such cities as Fort Wayne, Indiana and Indianapolis are already laying a foundation by preparing municipal exhibitions as the forerunner, it is believed, of definite action.

Modern city planning takes account not only of the arrangement of streets and parks and public buildings, but the education of people in the harmonies of architecture. There has recently been a revival in this direction in New England, which has suffered, but perhaps not more than the West, from the intrusion of the hodge-podge into the style of its dwellings. These have borrowed a feature here and another there until there is neither beauty nor consistency about them. The mock-Colonial is doomed under the new dispensation, along with much else that is undesirable, and systematic efforts to cultivate the tastes of prospective builders have proved successful in a marked degree. There still remain certain difficulties of a practical nature, however, due to the growing demand for apartment buildings and houses for two and four families. It is in these that utility exacts the most from art. Where each family demands its own windows and its exits and its entrances and its modern conveniences, all under a single roof, the problem of the architect is truly difficult. There is hope for its solution, designers say, and if this is achieved there is compensation for the cities that have waited until now to make their plans for future systematic beautification.

We in the United States are in a position to set an example in this regard. It is doubtful that Europe, as a whole, will furnish much inspiration after the war, judging from past experience. Periods immediately following destructive wars have as a rule been marked by absence of the finer sense of beauty. It has been smothered by the pressing need for speed and utility in repairing waste. Concrete and steel have not yet lent themselves to artistic treatment to the extent that we might hope, and it is certain that these materials will be extensively employed in rebuilding operations. But where new cities are continually springing up and old ones expanding rapidly, the situation from the point of view of city planning is nearly ideal. There is a broad field for the combined efforts of the architect, the engineer and the public-spirited citizen.

WHERE LIES HOPE?

If the painstaking reader will glance over another column on this page he will discover that Mr. R. M. Ross has fired a whole broadside of questions at us regarding the Susan B. Anthony amendment. It is our painful necessity to remark that Mr. Ross has trained his gun in the wrong direction. It was Dr. Pohl-Lovejoy who asserted that the best chance for the National suffrage amendment was election of Woodrow Wilson. We quite humbly disputed the assertion. Mr. Ross agrees with us in a way and yet he does not. He seems to convey the thought that there is no chance for a National suffrage amendment if Mr. Wilson be elected, or Mr. Hughes, either. Clearly, he has a more formidable dispute with Dr. Pohl-Lovejoy than with The Oregonian.

Still we have not the slightest objection to answering Mr. Ross' interesting and important queries as best we can. Here they are:

Is it not a fact that a constitutional amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of all the states before it becomes operative?

It is.

Is it likely that the members of Congress from any given state could be induced to support the Susan B. Anthony amendment if a majority of the people of that state were opposed to it?

Why not? Did not Oregon's Senators vote for the Underwood bill? No Northern state has such violent antipathy to woman's suffrage that it would hold a Congressman to "strict accountability" for voting his honest convictions in support of it.

Is it not a well-established principle that each state should determine the qualifications of its own voters? And if that be true, is not the President consistent when he says the woman suffrage question is one to be determined first by the several states?

It is an established principle that the states shall determine the qualifications of their own voters subject to the limitations in the Federal Constitution. The Federal Constitution provides that the right of suffrage shall not be denied because of race, color or previous condition of servitude. We think there is no more reason for basing voting qualifications upon sex than upon color, and that means none at all. The bar to disfranchisement because of color was deemed of sufficient consequence to put into the Federal Constitution without waiting for individual state action. If the President approves the fifteenth amendment we think he is inconsistent in opposing the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

What evidence have you that the President has changed his mind on this subject?

None at all. It is the one subject on which he seems to stand pat. That is what caused our puzzled inquiry as to how the amendment could best be secured by electing a President who is openly opposed to it.

How many states do you include in the South?

Eleven.

If, as you seem to think, the South can defeat the amendment in Congress, could not that same South defeat ratification of the amendment if passed by Congress?

We have not said that the South could defeat the amendment in Congress if Mr. Hughes is elected. Moreover, an amendment once submitted is pending until it is adopted. Nor is the South individually strong enough to defeat the amendment either in Congress or in the subsequent ratification. The point is this: No Republican Northern state not now having woman suffrage is likely to give the cause any aid if it shall happen that the women's vote puts normally Republican states like Oregon, California and Washington into the Democratic column. And the South is so hidebound that no Democratic victory due to women will now change its course of opposition.

Have not recent elections shown that certain Eastern states are strongly opposed to woman suffrage?

Yes. But so did elections not long since show Oregon to be hostile to woman's suffrage. Yet persistence and education carried the day.

If the South be solidly against it and also some of the Eastern states, would it be possible at this time to secure ratification by three-fourths of the states?

Perhaps not immediately. But the pendency of the amendment would not prevent individual state action. Not a thing in the world would be sacrificed by those states which desired to try woman suffrage on their own account. The movement would spread and ratification of the amendment, in course of time, would be inevitable.

If not, then why waste time and effort in trying to get the amendment through Congress?

The answer was not in the negative. Besides, why worry about Congress wasting time and effort? It wastes enough on other things that it can afford to devote some time and effort to this issue.

And what does Mr. Hughes' advocacy amount to practically?

It amounts to a great deal. It indicates that he intends to be a leader of his party if elected President, not a mere automatic register of changing public clamor. It means that he will try to guide the thought of the Nation; that he is outspoken for what he believes to be the right, whether the country has made up its mind on the matter or not. But perhaps more practically, it means that the weight of Presidential influence, which in the immediate past has, by working through the dominant party, overthrown in Congress that party's platform declaration of free tolls and has extorted from it a surrender of the established principle of arbitration in labor disputes—it means that this Presidential influence thus shown to be great will be back of the Anthony amendment.

And let it not be unnoticed, that if there had been no leaders, no workers, no educators undismayed by temporary adverseness of public opinion, we should not today have direct election of United States Senators, a Federal income tax, a prohibition or woman suffrage in Oregon.

What is herein said concerns the status of the movement for National woman's suffrage today. We do not aver that the South will always be opposed to the equal suffrage. But the South modifies its opinions slower than any other part of the country. It has maintained an unbroken Democratic record for more than half a century. The point ought to be clear that with the Solid South and President Wilson opposed to the National amendment, the only hope for its early adoption is success of the party which has its strength in states more yielding in convictions and whose candidate vigorously espouses the cause.

Another "lifelong Lincoln Republican" who is going to support Mr. Wilson is confronted by the record. Witness this little communication to a local newspaper which makes a specialty of anonymous letters from "Wilson Republicans." It is from Pilot Rock, Or., and is signed by E. B. Casteel:

Having read in today's Journal your editorial relative to G. S. Andrus, of Grant County, being a lifelong Lincoln Republican and going to vote for Wilson for President, I want to inform your readers that Mr. Andrus has never voted anything but the Democratic ticket. While it is his privilege to vote for Mr. Wilson for President, yet it is unfair for him to pose as a Lincoln Republican.

Let us have the names of other "Lincoln Democrats," that their neighbors may come forward and say a word or two.

If the building of ships at Portland continues at the present pace the railroads will soon be begging the shippers to join them in a movement for genuine competitive rates, while the shippers will be supremely indifferent whether they use cars or ships. The Interstate Commerce Commission, meanwhile, always a lap behind developments, will still be considering what rates should be made in consequence of elimination of water competition. It is impossible to beat Portland; it can always take to the water, for it is an amphibian in commerce.

The passing of Judge Thomas H. Brents at Walla Walla removes a figure long conspicuous in Oregon and Washington. He was a pioneer, who had the usual early-day experiences of the old settlers; he was a lawyer, who had in an exceptional degree the confidence of his clients; he was a Representative in Congress, who was twice re-elected (an unusual record in a territory like Washington); and he was a judge whom all classes trusted implicitly. He had a long life, and a busy and useful one. A good name is his principal heritage.

The Department of Agriculture again is telling housewives how to mix potatoes with flour to produce "excellent" bread. Potato bread is poverty food. What the housewives of the American Nation want is wheat bread of the best, and that is what they will have following the exodus of poverty stalkers from this Government in March and as soon as affairs can be put in shape for renewal of prosperous times.

A good substitute for the spelling bee would be a contest among the mathematical sharps in the schools to decide who can count the most broken Democratic promises or who can count the President's numerous Mexican policies.

By the same rule which made Bill O'Hara, the ballplayer, a great bomb-thrower, baseball should become popular among European soldiers and the war should develop some great ballplayers.

The Southern Pacific might take a hint from the Union Pacific as to the best means of relieving the car shortage—build cars in Portland and load them as fast as they are finished.

Railroad men not under the benefit of the Adamson law are wasting time in petitioning the President. To give in was plain bunk, but to respond to an encore is absurd.

After two weeks on a test diet of alligator pears, a Berkeley student admitted he was very hungry. So, too, did the horse trained to eat sawdust, just before he died.

To counteract a high cost of living, eat plainer food and less of it. Come to think of it, that always is the way toward the end of a Democratic Administration.

Does Samuel Gompers take the stump for Wilson as an ordinary Democratic speaker or as president of the American Federation of Labor?

This thing of being kept out of war, but with all the disadvantages and discomforts of actual warfare, is not the benefit some profess it to be.

The Portland Commission has qualified for honors in a Democratic Administration. The chief requisite is ability as a spender.

For a one-legged bandit, Villa covers a surprising amount of ground and keeps Carranza's two-legged soldiers on the jump.

How to Keep Well

By Dr. W. A. Evans.

Questions pertinent to hygiene, sanitation and prevention of disease, if matters of general interest, will be answered in this column. Where space will not permit or the subject is not suitable, letter will be personally answered, subject to proper limitations and where stamped addressed envelope is inclosed. Dr. Evans will not make diagnosis or prescribe for individual diseases. Requests for such services cannot be answered. (Copyright, 1916, by Dr. W. A. Evans. Published by arrangement with the Chicago Tribune.)

CEREBRO-SPINAL MENINGITIS.

THE great epidemic of infantile paralysis is coming to an end. The reports from all parts of the United States except Holyoke, Mass., show the disease to be rapidly declining. In the history of epidemics in the United States there has never been any outbreak after the middle of October. On the other hand, cerebro-spinal meningitis is a disease of the Winter months. The disease can be expected to begin to increase in October, to gradually mount during Autumn and Winter, and to reach its maximum during April. England had a rather severe epidemic of it last Winter and Spring.

Cerebro-spinal meningitis is due to infection with a coccus similar to the pneumoccus. This coccus enters the body through the nose and, in some instances, reaches the membranes covering the brain and cord. If it reaches these coverings it causes cerebro-spinal meningitis. If it remains on the membranes of the nose it causes a cold.

Cerebro-spinal meningitis starts with a soreness in the muscles of the neck. A day or two later, usually in the afternoon, the real onset of the disease comes with a fever, headache, vomiting, and, in some instances, convulsions. The fever continues. The patient becomes delirious. His head, neck and back bow backward. Fever blisters develop on the skin of the face, rarely on the red line of the lips. There is no paralysis of legs or arms, as in infantile paralysis.

The death rate ranges from 30 to 80. Some people who recover lose the use of one or both eyes and some lose their hearing. There is no wasting of the muscles of the legs and arms subsequent to recovery.

There is a serum antitoxin for this disease. The reports are that it is very effective.

Cerebro-spinal meningitis is spread by the nose secretions. The cocci get into the nose and may remain there for a long time. It is like infantile paralysis in that it carries and contacts are more potent in spreading the disease than are cases.

Nicholls tells us, in the Public Health Journal, that there are three classes of carriers—first, those who have recovered from cerebro-spinal fever, but still harbor the cocci; tests have shown that the cocci may persist in the noses of such for more than three months. Second, those who have been in contact with cases of the disease and have acquired the germ. Third, those who appear to be in good health, who presumably have not been in contact with known cases, and yet who harbor the germ.

The disease is very much more prevalent among children than among adults, but the disproportion is not so great as in the case of infantile paralysis.

Food for Baby.

Mrs. M. H. S. writes: "My baby is now 11 months old and weighs about 19 pounds, having weighed only six and one-half pounds at birth. He is breast fed every four hours, and all he gets in the meantime is a graham cracker or plain cookie. But now I think he needs more besides the breast, and I would like to have your advice through the 'column.'"

REPLY.

A baby 11 months old requires some food in addition to breast milk. Give him orange juice and prune juice, spinach chopped fine, clear vegetable soup, a little well-mashed vegetables from the soup, mashed potatoes, zwieback, graham crackers, cookies, well-toasted bread, butter, cereal, a little finely chopped meat, meat soup, a little egg. Begin giving him meat by letting him suck a bone, then give meat soup, finally a little chopped meat. Begin giving vegetables by giving a clear vegetable soup. Begin cereals with a thin cereal gruel. Nov. 1 begin giving cow's milk from a cup instead of letting him breast-feed. Begin with milk diluted with an equal part of water. Increase the strength later. Do not feed too often.

Whooping Cough Vaccine.

Subscriber writes: "I have several small children. The youngest has whooping cough without question; the other two are showing symptoms. What shall I do to relieve the whooping and strangling? Have been greasing chest with camphorated oil and administering a syrup of wild cherry bark, rock candy and lemon juice."

REPLY.

Whooping cough vaccine is sometimes of service. That is about all you can give with any advantage. Greasing the chest with camphorated oil does no good, neither does it do any harm. About the same can be said of wild cherry, rock candy and lemon juice.

Should Inquire Further.

Worried writes: "I have a very good friend who has been troubled with chronic bronchitis since she was a child. She takes cold very easily, and lately she had a severe one, and one day she spit blood. What treatment do you advise? One doctor told her she had strong lungs. None of her family had weak lungs. If you will kindly advise her, I know she will appreciate it. Is olive oil good for building up the system?"

REPLY.

Do not be satisfied with one opinion. A bronchitis accompanied by spitting of blood is suspicious, even though it is of long standing. Olive oil is a good food, about as good as butter, but not better.

Meaning of Provision in Bill.

MONMOUTH, Or., Oct. 23.—(To the Editor.)—Will establishing of a normal school at Pendleton re-establish the normals that have previously existed in the state? The last part of the bill says "and ratifying the location of certain state institutions heretofore located away from the State Capital."

E. E. SICKAFOOSE.

Not in the sense that those now closed would be reopened. The provision is incorporated to remove any question as to the legality of locating the several institutions in places other than the capital.

Not Compulsory.

LA GRANDE, Or., Oct. 22.—(To the Editor.)—To settle a dispute kindly state whether it is compulsory to give your party affiliations when registering.

J. R. BROWNE.

The County Clerk is authorized to register voters who refuse to state their party preference.

WHAT MR. WILSON SAID OF LABOR

Trades Unions Contemned on More Than One Occasion in Past.

RAYMOND, Wash., Oct. 21.—(To the Editor.)—(1) A says a boy born in the United States of foreign parents will have to be naturalized in order to vote unless the father was naturalized before the boy was 21. B says if the parents' home was in this country a boy born here can vote whether the father was naturalized or not.

(2) A says President Wilson never made a remark about the labor unions being a detriment to the country. B says he did, but cannot remember just when and where, as it was some time ago. If this is true, will you please state when and where?

W. D. FULLER.

(1) The boy is a citizen of the United States unless he prefers to choose the citizenship of his parents. He need not be naturalized in order to vote.

(2) Mr. Wilson, before becoming President, several times voiced unpleasant things about labor unions, among others that because of trades union policies the economic supremacy of this country may be lost.

In an address delivered at the Waldorf Hotel, New York, March 18, 1907, he said:

We speak too exclusively of the capitalistic class. There is another as formidable an enemy to equality and freedom of opportunity as it is, and that is the class formed by the labor organizations and leaders of the country.

Again Mr. Wilson, speaking to graduates of Princeton University, June 13, 1909, said, as published in the New York World (Dem.) June 14, 1909:

You know what the usual standard of the employe is in our day. It is to give as little as he may for his wages. Labor is standardized by the trades unions, and this is the standard to which he is made to conform. No one is suffered to do more than the average workman can do. In some trades and handicrafts no one is suffered to do more than the least skilled of his fellows can do within the hours allotted to a day's labor, and no one may work out of his hours at all or volunteer anything beyond the minimum.

I need not point out how economically disastrous such a regulation of labor is. It is so unprofitable to the employer that in some trades it will presently not be worth his while to attempt anything at all. He had better stop altogether than operate at an inevitable and invariable loss.

The labor of America is rapidly becoming unprofitable under its present regulation by those who have determined to reduce it to a minimum. Our economic supremacy may be lost because the country grows more and more full of unprofitable servants.

SALVO OF QUESTIONS IS FIRED

Mr. Ross Asks if President Is Not Consistent on Anthony Amendment.

PORTLAND, October, 26.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian there appears under the caption "Reading His Mind," an editorial dealing with Dr. Pohl-Lovejoy's statements regarding the position President Wilson has taken on the woman suffrage question, and a careful reading prompts me to ask a few questions.

Is it not a fact that a Constitutional amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of all the states before it becomes operative? Is it likely that the members of Congress from any given state could be induced to support the Susan B. Anthony amendment if a majority of the people of that state were opposed to it? Is it not a well established principle that each state should determine the qualifications of its own voters? And, if that be true, is not the President consistent when he says the woman suffrage question is one to be determined first by the several states? What evidence have you that the President has changed his mind on this subject? How many states do you include in the South? If, as you seem to think, the South can defeat the amendment in Congress, could not that same South defeat ratification of the amendment if passed by Congress? Have not recent elections shown that certain Eastern states are strongly opposed to woman suffrage? If the South be solidly against it, and also some of the Eastern states, would it be possible at this time to secure ratification by three-fourths of the states? If not, then why waste time and effort in trying to get the amendment through Congress? And what does Mr. Hughes' advocacy amount to, practically?

I have voted for woman suffrage at every opportunity, but it does appear that all this agitation for the passage of an amendment by Congress is like a proposal to build a house by erecting the superstructure first. If I am wrong, I would like to be put right.

As a matter of information to me and to your many other readers, I trust you will answer these questions through your columns.

R. M. ROSS.

825 Kenilworth avenue.

The questions are answered in another column.

WHAT A WOMAN SAW IN MEXICO

Mrs. O'Shaughnessy Tells Why She Has Declared for Hughes.

Mrs. Edith O'Shaughnessy, wife of Nelson O'Shaughnessy, who was United States Charge d'Affaires at Mexico City while President Wilson was eliminating Huerta, gives these reasons "Why I Am for Hughes":

I am for Hughes because with my own eyes:

I have seen the destruction of a nation; with my own ears I have heard the cries of that bleeding, agonized remnant of what three years ago was the Mexican people.

I have seen, under the auspices of the Democratic Administration, organized government destroyed in a sovereign state—whose greatest misfortune at this time is to be our neighbor.

I have seen authority destroyed as certainly as if we had taken the machinery of administration into our physical hands and broken it. And in regard to all this I have seen installed an organized campaign of misrepresentation where the wrongs of this sister nation are concerned—whereby the cries of the people have been stifled, their agonies concealed, their rights—their human rights—trampled to earth.

I have seen the house of God profaned, the ministers of Christ cast into ignominy, holy women felled. And last, but not least—

I have seen our citizens, whose rights to protection there is as indisputable as that of the sons of England, Germany, France, Spain, Japan, despoiled of the fruits of honest labor.

Our women have been outraged, our children tortured, our men left to lie in their blood. Now, with the help of God, and confiding in the underlying greatness of our Nation, I hope for the vindication of our honor where other nations are concerned, and the performance of our duty where our own people are concerned.

I am for Hughes, because I believe a man has arisen who, as our Chief Executive, will safeguard our most precious possession on land and sea, at home and abroad—our national honor.

Lumber Imports Large.

SKAMOKAWA, Wash., Oct. 23.—(To the Editor.)—1. Please let me know how many cars of lumber and shingles came into this country from Canada the last year. 2. Also when was the tariff commission passed. Respectfully.

SUBSCRIBER.

(1) We cannot give the car-load quantities. The last available statistics are for the eleven months ending May 31, 1916. Our imports of lumber from Canada totaled 1,080,360,000 feet valued at $20,107,172. Shingles imported from Canada in 1915 aggregated 1,487,116,000, as compared with 560,297,000 in 1913 under protection.

(2) The tariff commission provision is included in the new revenue law passed last August.

In Other Days

Twenty-Five Years Ago.

From The Oregonian of October 25, 1891.

Berlin, Oct. 24.—The Reichstag will reassemble on Tuesday, November 17. The leading feature of the speech from the throne will be congratulations upon the formation of a commercial union between Germany, Austria and Italy. It is now definitely determined that Bismarck will again make his appearance in Parliament.

San Francisco, Oct. 24.—The United States Fish Commission steamer Albatross, which has been employed in making soundings in connection with the proposed laying of a submarine cable between the United States and Hawaii, returned today, having accomplished the objects of the cruise.

Washington, Oct. 24. — Secretary Blaine returned to Washington today from his unexpectedly prolonged absence from the city since May last.

Honorable Solomon Hirsch, United States Minister to Turkey, is coming home via the Union Pacific and is due home tomorrow or Tuesday.

The case against Professor G. A. Adams, principal of the Stephens School, for assault on Tom Bloomer, alleged to have been committed in the schoolroom, was tried in Justice Bullock's court yesterday. The jury deliberated about three minutes and returned a verdict of not guilty.

Chaplain C. C. Bateman, United States Army, closed his work with a farewell sermon at Vancouver Barracks last Sunday afternoon. The chapel hall was packed with soldiers and their friends.

Half a Century Ago.

From The Oregonian of October 25, 1866.

WALLA WALLA, Oct. 19.—The building hereafter to be known as the Whitman Seminary was dedicated last Saturday with appropriate ceremonies. The building is two stories, with a cupola on top, and is possibly the most imposing structure east of the mountains.

The subscription list for the balloon ascension is now being circulated and good success has been found. A large number have already subscribed.

There was a large crowd at the circus last night. The Hook and Ladder Company had a "bumper" sure enough. Good for the boys—we are glad of your success.

The dredger will begin operations at Swan Island bar on Friday. The committee on river improvements will visit the mouth of the river today for the purpose of making a thorough examination of the work.

The Marquis de Larochejaquelin has published in pamphlet form in Paris what would have been pronounced in the form of a speech in the French legislature but for his ill health. The substance of his argument is that Europe is on the verge of a general war.

LAW FOR CLASS WITHIN CLASS

Adamson Act Helps 400,000 and Ignores 1,600,000 Railway Workers.

PENDLETON, Or., Oct. 23.—(To the Editor.)—The writer has for a generation been a soldier in the warfare for social justice, a supporter of the propaganda of union labor, and an advocate of a universal eight-hour day.

Therefore he claims the right at this time to protest on behalf of the average workingman, in behalf of the common weal, against the injustice of the class legislation, for the enactment of which the President is appealing for the support of labor.

The Adamson bill is in fact a Wilson bill. It became a law because of the insistence of the President, and not otherwise. As usual with Mr. Wilson, he followed the line of least resistance and played the game of personal politics. The public supposed, until after the bill had been signed by the President, that it covered all the employes of interstate commerce railroads, and therefore for a season the law was approved.

When the text was given out to the public, analysis demonstrated that its benefits were limited to engineers, firemen, conductors and brakemen. Thereafter no fair-minded man of any party could support or approve it. American citizens believe in justice. There are 2,000,000 people in the employ of interstate railroads. Of these 400,000 are by this statute selected for special privilege, and 1,600,000 are denied the benefits accorded their fellows.

While the bill was before Congress a Pennsylvania Congressman offered the following amendment: "Add to section 1 the following language, 'Provided further, that this section shall also include and apply to station agents, train dispatchers, trackmen, office employes, workers in railway shops and all other employes of a railroad carrier engaged in interstate carriage of passengers and freight.'"

This amendment was voted down. Could there be anything clearer than the purpose of Mr. Wilson to deny equal and just laws to the working people of the land? He dominated the Democratic majority of Congress absolutely. A word from him would have secured the adoption of that amendment.

STEPHEN A. LOWELL.

DEFECTS IN RURAL CREDIT BILL

Chance for Sharp Practice Offered. Cost to State Large.

WARRENTON, Or., Oct. 23.—(To the Editor.)—The rural credits amendment to be voted on November 7 is nearly as bad as the single tax amendment, though it does not evoke as much criticism.

It is clearly class legislation and I see no reason why the prosperous farmer of Oregon should be made a preferred class.

It is proposed to issue 4 per cent bonds and loan the money to farmers only at 5 per cent. I am not a financier, but it seems to me the margin of 1 per cent allowed the state for handling this money is altogether too small.

Section 5 provides that the money shall be loaned (a) for the payment of lands purchased; (b) the purchase of livestock and other equipment, etc.; (c) for the satisfaction of incumbrances, etc., but section 6 says:

"No failure to apply such funds to the purposes stated shall invalidate a loan; but if he shall violate his contract by applying the moneys borrowed to purposes other than those stated in his application" the loan becomes payable upon six months' notice.

A borrower could, then, secure money from the state and reloan it at a greater rate and he would be getting the money at 2½ per cent for six months.

The money is to be lent for 36 years and the state will have to keep track of all changes in title.

The borrower is to pay 1 per cent of the loan granted for appraisal and examination of title, including, I assume, the making of abstract and an attorney's opinion. One per cent of $1000 is $10, and, as small loans are to be given the preference, we may assume that this $1000 will be the average loan. Will it pay for appraisal and abstract, and, if not, will not this item be a big expense to the state?

I notice it has the indorsement of the State Federation of Labor, which also indorses the single tax amendment.

E. H. FLAGG.

January 27, 1859.

PORTLAND, Or., Oct. 24.—(To the Editor.) — When was Kaiser Wilhelm born?

AMERICAN.