Letters From the People on Various Topics

River Fish Bills and the Oregon Initiative

Vote Both of Them Down and Then Pass a Law Which Shall Protect a Great Food Supply.

W. HAMPTON SMITH.

IN The Oregonian recently you have criticized the initiative and referendum quite sharply and refer to a number of measures as bad and charge them up to the weakness of the referendum, among these you refer to the rival fish bills.

Now, I ask The Oregonian to just patiently wait and watch the outcome of the measures referred to at the June election, and then I am sure it will be ready to give the people credit for more judgment and common sense than it does now. The fish bills will both be voted down, as they should be, because, while they both have merit, they are unjust to the people, to the fish and to the parties engaged in the business of taking fish. They are retaliatory instead of protective.

The Oregonian deplores such cross-lifting and charges it up, at least in part, to the initiative and referendum. I have been intimately familiar with the salmon industry on the Columbia River for over 40 years, and during all that time there has been a continuous running fight between the parties engaged in the business, one against the other, when different methods of fishing were employed, and in every session of the Legislature during all that time the fight has been waged within its halls with no results other than to destroy one of the most magnificent and useful industries in the great West or in any other country because the net result of the business is a food supply for the people. None of the parties interested have been willing to do anything or permit anything to be done to protect the fish whereby so much as a single fish would be taken from their own catches.

With all the energy at their command, and they have a good deal, they have filled the river with all conceivable gear that would take or entrap a fish, and they have put this gear at every point and place where it was possible for a fish to be. They have even gone out to sea and met them before they got into the river, even at the sacrifice of their own lives. Still more; they have not only done all those things, but they have fished out of season and in season. The traps and wheels and seins and gill-nets, etc., have run day and night without ceasing, ignoring all closed seasons, when it was possible for them to do so. The result of it all is a ruined industry, and all this time, mind you, your proud and splendid Legislature, the emblem of a purely representative government, has done absolutely nothing to mitigate the evil. What excuse can The Oregonian give for such results of Legislative action, or inaction? Indifference and a few dollars from this party or that party or the other party added, and everything goes on unmolested; as in Oregon, so it has been in Washington.

The Legislature has treated the whole question as a factional fight between rivals, when, in fact, it is a question in which every man, woman and child in the state, yea, much more than that, is vitally interested because it—the fishing industry—is a food supply and the people have a right to demand that this criminal war, this scrapping over gain, be brought to an end and that speedily. They remind one of a well-contested football game.

The Legislature has been weighed in the balance and found wanting for over 40 years in this matter. It is to be regretted that both these factions did not take more deliberation and call into their councils some of the rules of justice and right before delivering themselves in that manner. The only proper thing to do now is to overwhelmingly vote both propositions down in the interests of the fish and then for the people to come together and get up a measure that will do justice first to the fish, second to the people and third, to those engaged in the business.

The Oregonian, the initiative and referendum is all right. It is only through the whole people that such wrongs can be made right, and when they are made right none will be more pleased than the people engaged in the business.

It is too late now to do anything through initiative at this election to save this splendid food supply from the grasp of selfishness and greed on the part of all. The Legislative power will have to be called into requisition once more. Neither one of the bills that are now before the people if passed will change the present conditions, because the proposition in each is simply to trip the other fellow up.

Laws to be effective in preserving and augmenting the supply of fish in the Columbia River must have something of the following provisions to cover at least four years of time:

First—The cutting in two in the middle of all the fishing gear in the river. This means that the gillnets shall have only one-half their present length. The same to apply to all seines in the river. The seine as now managed is most destructive and deadly. If any gear should be weeded out it should be the seine.

The traps to be out of the water one-half the time.

The wheels to be also raised half the time, and all wheels, traps and seines to be so constructed as to not destroy the young salmon that have never yet been to sea. Many thousands of these every year are destroyed by these last-named instruments of destruction.

No fishing should be allowed below the head of Sand Island. Twenty-four hours out of every week it should be closed.

These are the heroic measures to be applied for four or five years to permit a restocking of the river; but the measure to save the Columbia River as a salmon supply river lies in the hatcheries and the housing and care of the fry in the nursery till they are able to scrap and take care of themselves whether that be two or eight months. The young salmon do not go to sea till they are a year old, at which time they are from 10 to 12 inches or over in length.

No river was ever made to produce salmon and black bass at one and the same time. That is in a state of nature. The black bass is perhaps the most voracious fish known. You can bait a hook with its own young and it will take it all the same. Young minnows of any kind are its delight. The haunts and delights of the black bass are the natural feeding grounds of the salmon fry, along the shores, in shallow water and the sloughs and side channels of the river where mud flats predominate. Their search for food brings them both to the same feeding grounds, and the young salmon leave these grounds inside of the black bass.

Some one in the past with more zeal for so-called "sport" than hard horse business sense planted the black bass in the Columbia River. From that date it was doomed as a salmon river. It is safe to say that there are now in the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries 1,000,000 grown matured black bass. This I deem to be a low estimate. This 1,000,000 will consume in a single season 50,000,000 or more young salmon fry. This I consider a conservative estimate. Is it any wonder that in the past few years no apparent results from the artificial spawning grounds have been witnessed?

If the cannerymen, if the fishermen, if the people expect to continue to eat salmon caught in the Columbia River they must not only artificially spawn, but keep, feed and protect the fry till they are at least six months old, or older if necessary. In this way it is not only feasible but possible to stock the great river with fish so that all may have plenty at a low cost and be practically unrestricted in the methods of taking them. This should be the chief provision of any law passed to protect the salmon industry of the great river.

A few days ago I had an interview with two of the leading cannerymen on the river. They were pessimistic as to the future of the river as a salmon producer. One of them remarked that civilization and settlement of a country always destroyed the productiveness of rivers, that had been the haunts of the salmon. This is true in part only. If the proper effort be not put forth to protect the salmon and propagate them, it is wholly true. The hog, the ox, the sheep, the every form of life, that is now a blessing to man, would have been extinct centuries ago had not efforts been put forth to save them by carefully guarding and protecting the young of these animals till they were large and old enough to care in the main for themselves.

In short, if we have them now we have got to raise them. The same is true of the salmon. They are not difficult to spawn and raise till large enough to shift for themselves against all enemies, and after that Nature has prepared great feeding grounds, somewhere off the mouth of the Columbia River, where a mud bottom exists, and where these young salmon may be matured and return to their place of birth in quantities to the satisfaction of all. This may be kept up indefinitely, and to almost any extent, through the hatchery and nursing process; but if the policy continues to kill the goose that lays the egg, without raising more geese, the end is near by.

A party largely interested in what is known as the up-river bill, made the statement to the writer that the up-river bill had the sanction of the United States Fish Commission. The number of long ears covered up under United States this and United States that and United States the other is great. The United States Fish Commission has lost its charm for most Northwesterners in the course it has taken in turning the little, helpless salmon fry loose among its enemies by the million, to be devoured in a month's time by them. All this time the Commission has stood by and watched this thing go on in the face of vigorous protests by the people, till the industry is wellnigh ruined. Not only has the Commission done this, but it has planted in the waters of the Columbia voracious game pan fish, that feed on salmon eggs, and the helpless small fry that have been abandoned to their fate among these imported destroyers and enemies.

They also consume the food most sought after by the young salmon fry.

Dr. David Starr Jordan gave wisdom on this proposition in the face of his survival of the fittest doctrine. Every law for the protection of the salmon has been violated by the Commission, and those who have been engaged in the taking of them. Now, let the people get in and vote the two cock-pit laws down and elect a Legislature that will work in the interests of the fish and the people, and retrieve its lost reputation.

Lease of Public Lands for Grazing Purposes

Views of a Practical Cattleman Who Holds Thirty Years of Feeding Have Not Injured Range.

PHILIP I. MOULE.

I NOTE the letter of K. O. Kohler, of Ellensburg, Wash., in a recent issue wherein he expresses surprise at the action of a "number of intelligent men at the National woolgrowers' convention, at Helena, opposing the Government policy of leasing the public domain."

It is my belief that the sentiments of this gentleman are the voicing of the opinions of a large part of the people of the country; not only the stockgrowers, but others wideawake to economic subjects—even including Government officials, not to exclude our honored executive of the Nation. And I am just as firm in the belief that these opinions obtain to the extent they do from a lack of understanding and even consideration of all the elements the question involves.

In the first place, let us be fair and not say, it was "a number of men at the National convention of woolgrowers that opposed the Government policy," but let us allow the fact to remain that it was the whole body of the convention. Let us allow the truth to stand that of the hundreds of delegates and representative woolgrowers of the west there present not one, in that large assemblage, arose and gave expression to anything akin to objection to the voice of the convention—which was most vehement in its enunciation against the unqualified and unrestricted application of the policy of the representatives of the Government as to the holdings of the public range.

This phase of the convention proceedings may reasonably surprise those who hold views of this subject obtained from the same common standpoint, above instanced.

I will at once acknowledge that there are on the face of the subject prominent features that first engage the attention, and make their impression, which from their inherent characteristics, on a straw ballot, get a large vote from people having at heart the adoption of measures whose righteousness they seem to prophecy.

And such I ween is the fact regarding many advocated public policies. They are popular, but when time is given for analysis and a fuller understanding of their relation to all parties affected it is found they are not well advised. In all questions affecting public interests this truth is so often repeated that it may be said to have become painfully true.

Therefore as one observant of conditions in the great West for over a quarter of a century, as relating to National resources in forestry and grazing interests, I would say that the action of the National convention of woolgrowers, at Helena, Mont., last January was not so contrary to reason nor adverse to public welfare as may on the surface appear.

This is a question of greater moment not alone to the stock interests of the West but to the higher, wider and more far reaching interests of the states and Nation. And I know some of the hard-headed and large-hearted men who represented that convention presented facts, and figures that should stand as gateway sentinels to make impossible the passage of the at present ill-considered and ill-advised leasing of the public domain in the form of any act by the present congress.

The reasons against the proposition are so many I shall not attempt to name them here but must confine myself to the main features of the letter I am giving consideration, which is a true exponent of the salient features of the case the writer represents.

I will accept the statement that there is a vast amount of range in the states of Idaho, Washington and Oregon that has been greatly injured by excessive grazing, and so far as the present grazing interests and other interests in the states would go I would not venture an objection to a leasing proposal sufficiently flexible to be adopted to the districts in which it may, on careful consideration, appear necessary. But because conditions are bad in one community or state, because one locality is unfortunately affected I do not see the wisdom of a quarantine for communities not affected.

First, prove to me that the ranges of, we will say, Montana and Wyoming, for instance, are to any appreciable degree injured by excessive grazing before you expect me to elect Government supervision. We are cited to the fact that tens and hundreds of thousands of sheep and cattle die in certain states from lack of feed in Winter, and the loss is declared to be from the effect of over-grazing of the range. If this is not openly declared to be the fact, the inference is always left for your adoption that this is the case. I say this is not in accord with the facts, and he who tries to make manifest the need of Government supervision of the range on such conclusions is not only uninformed, but misinformed. I will assert that the number of sheep that graze upon the public domain in the States of Montana and Wyoming at present from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000, is nearly 20 times as large as 20 to 30 years ago, and the ranges used even earlier than that are today carrying just as many sheep as they did then. Not only that, but I will fruther say that the Winter loss on the ranges first used is less, five to one, than it was then, and districts carrying large flocks of sheep have nowhere near the losses they sustained when the ranges were comparatively new.

The fact is that after 25 to 30 years of constant use the flockmasters of Montana find their ranges just as productive as they were when first used for sheep. They find it is the deep snow, together with at times intense cold, and not the shortage of grass, that is the chief factor against the safe Wintering of their flocks. They find that in a succession of dry years the grass crop is short, and with a year of average or abundant moisture it is as correspondingly luxuriant as they ever have known it.

So these people who voiced the sentiments of that convention reason: "Why do our states and communities require the same rule of measurement for their capabilities that govern other regions not having the same conditions?" For my part, I am of the belief that those people know what they are talking about. I am willing to concede that they have been in the business of stock-raising undoubtedly under different conditions from those affecting results in the Coast States. They should know what they want for themselves, and I am not in favor of forcing upon them rules and regulations (mind you, not laws) which, while they may be for the making of one community or commonwealth, are for the undoing or hindrance in the making of another. I am informed that that convention was largely composed of men from Idaho, Montana and Wyoming, and it voiced the sentiments of nine-tenths of those affected by the questions involved, as did the Denver convention voice the sentiments of nine-tenths of the territory of those chiefly represented, which territory I am informed is chiefly encompassed by the State of Texas, where special grazing privileges are sought by cattlemen, to the exclusion of the far broader consideration of the general subject as it bears on its effect upon the many not so pertinently and impertinently prominent.

Speaking of the Texas cowman's interest in this subject reminds me that I am told Mr. Potter, who is chief under Mr. Pinchot for the regulation of fees in Forest Service, is a Texas man—having failed in the cow business in the Lone Star State. I am further brought to a comparison of the fees this same Mr. Potter establishes to be collected in the various parts of the forestry reservations of the country. For example, the fee charged for grazing 1000 pounds of beef, the approximate weight of a cow, is 25 cents for a period of five months or more. The fee charged for grazing 1000 pounds of mutton, approximate weight of 10 sheep, is from 80 to 90 cents for a less period, and with the added injunctions that the sheep must not camp in the same place more than four days at a time. Now, as it is a well-known fact that sheep will first use the weeds, rubbish and undergrowth in our forests, which the cattle leave, preferring the grass, I fail to appreciate the equity in the regulation, and dispensation of Mr. Potter. Verily, we sheepmen are "as clay in the hands of the Potter," or of anyone who shall be in a position to exercise such dictatorial sovereignty over us.

I am a Roosevelt man, but, "When thine eye offend thee, pluck it out."

Portland, Or.

Those Ten Commandments Are Enough

Modern View Does Not Accept the Theory of God Writing on Stones in Hebrew With His Finger.

BY D. PRIESTLY.

GENERALLY what Mr. J. L. Jones writes is interesting, but his spiel in The Sunday Oregonian of February 2 does not seem to me to be very luminous. He says that "God gave only ten commandments." That is probably counting ten or perhaps eleven too many. The "modern view" does not accept the story of God's writing on stones with his fingers, in Hebrew. Those commandments do not purport to be issued to the world, but to a selected tribe of savages; and if they contained an available code of ethics for mankind it would be a wonder. Just as the Federal Constitution is issued in the name of the people of the United States, so the preamble to the commandments is, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage."

This God instructed his chosen tribes not to induce or compel other tribes to worship him, but to kill all the other tribes they could get in reach of, and he promised them that if they would stick by him and not worship the gods of other tribes and nations he would stick by them and help them fight and murder and rob.

It is worth noticing that the death penalty is attached to the violation of each commandment and yet one of the commandments is "Thou shalt not kill." None but the utterest savages have the death penalty for all offenses alike. What a country that would have been for a prosecuting attorney like Mr. Heney!

Let us look at the commandments with God's own penalties attached:

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Here is the penalty:

"If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or the friend which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers before thee; namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee or far off from thee, from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor harken unto him, neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thy hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterward the hand of all the people." Deut. xiii:6-9.

"Thou shalt not kill." They were commanded to kill all the other tribes and all their own folks who worshiped the wrong gods or picked up sticks on the Sabbath day or did anything wicked.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery."

"When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God shall deliver them into thine hand, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife; then thou shalt take her home to thy house and she shall shave her head and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house and bewail her father and her mother a full month; and after that thou shalt go in unto her and be her husband and she shall be thy wife. and it shall be, if thou hast no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will, but thou shalt not sell her at all for money; thou shalt not make merchandize of her because thou hast humbled her." Deut. xxi:10-14.

I will not venture to comment on the above, only to observe reverently what an act of loving kindness and tender mercy our Heavenly Father manifested in not permitting one of his chosen people to make merchandise of a captive woman under those circumstances. If God had not restrained his chosen people sometimes they might have been wicked like "the heathen round about."

Jesus said they were permitted to do these things on account of the hardness of their hearts. Would it not have been nice if Ingersoll had arrived in time to put in his suggestion that such cussedness as that be stopped and they be allowed to pick up sticks on the Sabbath on account of the hardness of their hearts?

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass nor any thing that is thy neighbor's."

That commandment classifies the wife as a thing, a chattel, of a little less account than the house and little more than the other slaves.

"A little better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse," Brother Jones says, "God only gave Ten Commandments." Ten are plenty.

Argument Against the "Fish Wheel" Bill

Lower Columbia Fishermen Insist That Fishing Must Be Stopped Over the Head of the Tide.

BY H. M. LORNTSEN, SECRETARY COLUMBIA RIVER SALMON PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

THIS bill, while pretending to be for the protection of the salmon of the Columbia, is a bill which the few wealthy fishwheel owners of the Upper Columbia are presenting to the voters in an endeavor to retain the unfair and destructive monopoly of catching salmon with fishwheels in the narrows and at the falls of the Upper Columbia.

The initiative petitions for this bill were started after the Columbia River Salmon Protective Association was organized for the purpose of stopping fishing for salmon in the Columbia at head of tide, that is, where the river becomes so narrow that the fishwheels catch nearly every salmon that reaches these narrows and falls.

The fishwheel owners, realizing that throughout the state the sentiment for bona fide salmon protective legislation was growing, got up this trick bill for the simple purpose of confusing the voters.

None of the fishwheel owners cared to openly associate their names with this intended imposition upon the people. They evidently could not get one man of note to father it. So they got as sponser H. A. Webster, ex-Deputy Fish Warden, who was recently discharged because Governor Chamberlain, Secretary of State Benson and State Treasurer Steel no doubt considered that the fisheries of our state could be better served by a better man.

We deem it necessary for a thorough understanding of this matter to plainly state who and what is behind this trick bill.

It is not difficult for a clever advocate of greed and wrong to so abbreviate quotations from the writings and sayings of authorities on any given subject, that the exact opposite apparently stands proven from what the quoted authorities desired to prove. There are unfortunately men who for consideration are as versatile as the fallen angel of whom Milton says: "He could make the worse appear the better reason."

On the other hand, who are the men behind the bill which the fishwheel owners' bill is intended to kill? (According to our law, if there are conflicting bills on any subject, and if such conflicting bills receive the majority vote necessary to carry them, then the bill receiving the highest majority vote becomes law).

The men who stand for abolition of salmon fishing at the head of tide in the Columbia as officer and executive committee of the Columbia River Salmon Protective Association are as follows: George M. Orton, of Portland, president. He is an ex-member of the Oregon Legislature and manager of the Multnomah Printing Company. The vice-president is Jay Tuttle, M. D., Astoria. He is an ex-State Senator. The treasurer is F. E. Beach, of Portland, wholesale and retail merchant. The secretary is H. M. Lorntsen, Astoria, secretary of the Columbia River Fishermen's Union and second vice-president of the Oregon State Federation of Labor. On the board of directors are: Thomas A. McBride, Oregon City, Circuit Judge; William I. Vawter, Medford, member of the Legislature; G. S. Wright, McMinnville, State Senator; Charles G. Roberts, Tanglewood, Hood River; D. H. Miller, Medford; T. B. Kay, Salem, State Senator; James Withycombe, Corvallis, director of the Oregon Experiment Station and candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket at the last election; James A. Lackey, Mayor of Ontario; C. G. Huntley, Oregon City, druggist, member of the Oregon Legislature; William Miller, of Burns, attorney-at-law; John H. Smith, Astoria, attorney at law and ex-State Senator; Frank Kankkonen, Astoria, manager Union Fishermen's Co-operative Packing Company.

James Withycombe, in accepting the position on the board of directors, wrote: "I shall be pleased to accept a place on the board of directors for the movement mentioned, namely, for the protection of the Columbia River salmon. I believe that every honorable means should be employed to protect this great natural source of wealth, not only for the present, but for the future generations."

Senator G. S. Wright wrote: "Will be glad to do anything for the fishing industry, by serving on the board or otherwise."

William I. Vawter, in accepting, wrote: "It seems to me in every way commendable, and that legislation that is protection along the lines indicated should have the support of every patriotic citizen."

Judge McBride, when asked to serve as president of the association, declined on account of press of business, but readily agreed to serve as a director, adding: "The only way to save our salmon is to stop fishing at head of tide, so as to give the fish a chance to reach our hatcheries and natural spawning grounds. For many years I have fought for the protection of our salmon, and am pleased to see this concerted action. My voice and pen will ever be ready to save one of Oregon's greatest industries. I am a poor man, but if necessary I shall contribute my mite towards defraying the expenses to fully present this question to the voters of the state."

Many, many other words of advice and cheer have been given the officers of the association in this task to save our salmon. Necessary limit of space forbids here to quote any more.

Judges, legislators, professional men, scientists, business men and fishermen are represented in this association. Leading citizen of the state, seeing that one of the leading industries of the state is threatened with extinction, have come forward to rescue it.

And opposed to the bill to stop fishing at head of tide, at the confluence of the Columbia River with the Sandy—a bill fathered by these public-spirited citizens—is opposed this sham bill of the fishwheel owners. The fishwheel owners were too cautious—though it is alleged the proper term is "too cowardly"—to father their bill, so they hired a discarded deputy of the state fishery bureau to champion a bill which is a trick bill from top to bottom.

Now, as to the tricks in that bill.

In the argument, supporting the wheel-owners' bill a desire is expressed to save our salmon.

But true to the methods of trickery, section 1—the main question—is not taken up first. Instead, sections 3 and 4 are defended and section 1—the biggest nigger in this legislative woodpile—is sandwiched in between sections 2 and 5.

That trick, however, is very clumsy and can be easily exposed.

Section 1 of the fishwheel owners' bill provides that no fishing at nights can be carried on in the channels used for commercial navigation.

That means that the 600 gillnet fishermen of the Columbia, with an investment of about $1,500,000 in boats and nets must quit the Columbia if the law passes. The fishwheel owners and Webster know this full well, hence they tried to hide this section in their argument, hoping to thus fool the voters of the state.

To explain. Fishwheels or fishtraps are located on the banks of the river, or in narrows or at falls, where they presumably do not interfere with navigation. Wheels and traps are stationary appliances and before they can be erected must secure a permit from the War Department, in charge of navigation of our rivers. Thus under this section traps and wheels could fish the entire 24 hours. Traps and wheels are built more or less upon the principle of a cattle corral, the fish striking fences or leads projecting into the river, follow them and are lead into the tunnel of the trap and then into the pot, from which they cannot escape. The fence or lead of the fishwheel leads the fish into the mouth of the wheel, when the wheel ceaselessly turning with the aid of the flowing stream, pumps the salmon into a box, for the owner to take away once in every 24 hours.

The gillnets, however, against which this section is directed, are drifting nets, on a submerged sandbar one moment, in the channel the next. They catch fish by gilling them, that is the salmon strike the net and got their heads into a mesh, when they cannot retreat, their gills preventing retreat and their bodies being too large to allow them to get through the mesh. Salmon only gill when the water is muddy in freshet time or at nights. When the salmon can see the gillnet they swim around it. A gillnet is only fished at slack tides, on an average six hours out of every 24. A gillnet further, to be worked properly must be tanned once a week and dried, which takes from one to two days. Thus a gillnet fishes only from 20 to 36 hours out of the 168 hours of every week, while the traps and wheels, stationary appliances, fish day and night the entire 168 hours in every week, as long as the fishing season lasts.

Thus this section would drive 4030 of our gillnet fishermen from their calling, destroy their property and make in a few years a dozen or so already very rich fishwheel owners manifold millionaires, without protecting our salmon, because the fishwheels in the narrows and at the falls do not permit fish to pass by.

Year by year these wheels have been so located and improved that where only four years ago the Washington and Oregon upriver hatcheries secured some 20,000 salmon for hatchery purposes, this year but a few hundred were caught. Washington has closed its four upriver hatcheries and Oregon is doing likewise.

The hatcheries below The Dalles, according to official data, are doing fairly well, considering that this was a poor salmon year.

Section 2, prohibiting fishing for salmon between the first day of October and the 31st day of December of each year, is absolutely valueless, as far as our Royal Chinook salmon are concerned, as this variety almost entirely ceases entering the Columbia the latter part of September or the middle of October during a late Chinook season. The blueback salmon, almost absolutely destroyed by the fishwheels, run in June and July. Our silver salmon enter the river in October, November and December, and if the fishwheels were allowed on the Oregon side, they, with their leads, would drive in the narrows of the Upper Columbia the fish from the Oregon shore to try to find easy ascent close to the Washington shore, where the wheels and seines owned by the same men who own wheels and seines on the Oregon shore would catch the fish. This section is rather a clever trick on the part of the fishwheel owners. Fishing for silver salmon on the Oregon side would be stopped, where the river is from four to six miles wide, and where the fish have a fair show to get by fishing appliances. Then where they get to the narrows and falls, the places of ascent on the Oregon side would be barred by the leads of the wheels and a rich harvest reaped on the Washington side by the wheelowners.

The most destructive fishwheels are on the Oregon side of the Upper Columbia. Stoppage of fishing from the mouth of the Sandy and up would abolish these wheels. Then Washington would follow with like legislation.

Section 3 provides that all fishing for salmon shall absolutely stop below a line drawn from Smith's Point across the Columbia. That is fishing with gill nets must stop from Astoria to the sea, about 12 miles from the Bar, where the river is from four to six miles wide; where fishing with these nets only averages from 20 to 36 hours out of the 168 hours in each week; where about 75 per cent of the gill net fishermen drift with their nets, because in the Columbia from Astoria and up the fishtraps have driven the gill nettera from their old-time drifting grounds. Another trick to give the salmon to the rich trapmen and wheelmen.

Some men, noting that yearly some fishermen were drowned at and outside the mouth of the Columbia, have declared out of misplaced sympathy with the fishermen that gill net fishing should stop at a line crossing the river at Cape Disappointment. The fishwheelmen have in Section 3 advanced this line nine miles up the river to Smith Point. The almost absurd trickery here again is plain.

Section 4, by limiting length of nets is another intended humbug on the voters. The fishwheels could continue serenely as they now are to catch every salmon getting to the Upper Columbia and the gill netters, the poor men, would be so regulated that they would have to quit the Columbia.

Section 5, providing for a weekly 24 closed season would be of value if the fishwheels were abolished. It is the nature of the salmon to travel, once they enter the Columbia, about eight miles in 24 hours in their effort to reach the spawning grounds, until they reach the narrows and falls. There they rest for several days in the pools below the narrows and falls and, after having overcome one set of obstructions, again rest for several days. With the fishwheels stretched out as they are, not one salmon in a thousand reaching the upper river would escape the uppermost wheels. A 24-hour weekly closing law would simply give more fish to the rich fishwheel owners.

It is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our salmon that fishing must stop where the river becomes narrow. Every nation and state-owning salmon streams had to adopt this policy, or see its salmon destroyed. Canada does not permit any stationary fishing appliances in its rivers and draws deadlines against all fishing away below head of tide. California, Oregon and Washington forbid stationary appliances in their rivers and draw deadlines against fishing where the rivers become narrow. The Federal Government, through a decision rendered December last by Secretary of Commerce and Labor Straus and confirmed by President Roosevelt, has adopted this principle for Alaska.

The only exception to this beneficial legislation is the Columbia River, where the fishwheel owners so far have succeeded in retaining their unfair monopoly.

But these men know this monopoly is doomed; they know that the vote of the people will tell them next June "Stop destroying our Columbia River salmon industry," and so they got up this so apparent sham bill. Verily "whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad."

Let the fishwheels be abolished by the passage of the bill presented by the Columbia River Salmon Protective Association, and the fishermen will be the first to urge our Legislature to enact a Sunday-closing law, fairer regulation of open and closed seasons and other laws really protective of the salmon fisheries of the Columbia.

The fishermen possess only their skill as fishermen and their boats and nets. With the destruction of our salmon, their means of earning a living for themselves and their families is destroyed. On the other hand, the dozen rich fishwheelowners own splendid farms and real estate in our cities. They and their children do not depend on the salmon for a living; all these men now care for is to have a few more years of absolute monopoly on that portion of our salmon crop which composes our seed fish.

We therefore ask the voters to vote "No" on the fishwheelowner's bill, and to vote "Yes" on the bill which stops fishing at head of tide, at the confluence of the Columbia with the Sandy.

One of the Little Women.

Chicago Post.

One of the Little Women, she came up to
heaven's gate;
And seeing the throng was pressing, she
sighed that she fain would wait.
"For I was not great nor noble," she said;
"I for poor and plain.
And should I go boldly forward I know it
would be in vain."

She sat near the shining portal, and looked
at the surging crowd
Of them that were kings and princes, of
them that were rich and proud;
And sudden she trembled greatly, for one
with a brow like flame
Came to her and hailed her gladly and
spoke unto her by name.

"Come, enter the jeweled gateway," he
said, "for the prize is thine;
The work that in life you rendered was
work that was fair and fine;
So come, while the rest stand waiting and
enter in here and now—
A crown of the life eternal is waiting to
press thy brow."

Then trembled the Little Woman and cried:
"It may not be!
Here wait they that wrought with greatness, so how may I pass them by?
I carved me no wondrous statues, I painted
no wondrous things,
I spake no tremendous sayings that rang
in the ears of kings.

"I toiled in my little cottage, I spun and
I baked and swept,
I sewed and I patched and mended—O,
lowly the house I kept!
I sang to my little children, I led them in
worthy ways,
And so I might not grow famous; I knew
none but care-bound days.

"So was it by night and morning, so was it
by week and year;
I worked with my weary fingers through
days that were bright and drear,
And I have grown old and wrinkled and I
have grown old and bent;
I ask not for chants of glory now that I
have found content."

"Arise!" cried the waiting angel. "Come
first of the ones that wait.
For you are the voices singing, for you do
we open the gate;
So great as has been thy labor, so great
shall be thy reward."
Then entered the Little Woman the glory
of the Lord.

Electricity Doing the Household Duties

THE wonderful electric house, the Villa Feria Electra, which has been built by M. Georgia Knap, at Troyes, France, clearly defines the part which electricity is destined to play in the home of the future. If not an exact type of what most houses will be in 50 or 100 years' time, it at any rate shows progress, says Electro-Notes.

From the exterior there is nothing unusual about the house, unless it is the total absence of a chimney. The gates cannot be opened from the outside, but as soon as the electric bell is touched, the portal swings slowly open and a mysterious voice, which seems to emanate from a small iron box near the gate, bids you enter. Stranger than anything else, the voice has apparently recognized you and calls you by name, if you are a friend of the family. If a visitor arrives after dark the same push button that rings the bell will light up the way. The gate swings in place as soon as you start toward the house. M. Knap, apprised electrically of your coming, will be found in the vestibule awaiting you.

With the first step inside the house a small device automatically cleans the soles of the visitor's shoes.

Although the house is a museum of electrical inventions and conveniences, the dining table is the greatest wonder. No servants wait upon the diners. At the touch of a hidden switch the table is flooded in many colored lights. Beside each plate is a little glass and metal cylinder, which become small electric radiators at the touch of a button. Foot-warmers are also located under the table opposite each chair.

At the head of the table is a circular desk, its center traversed by a curious metal strip, with a groove like a miniature tramway. At the touch of a button the disk in front of M. Knap disappears as if by magic, and in its place appears a steaming tureen of soup, which rapidly travels to the seat occupied by Mme. Knap, while the sections close quickly and noiselessly. If the ladle happens to be rather awkwardly placed the tureen swings around and places the spoon almost in her hand. All this is done by the press of a finger on two buttons under the husband's control.

After waiting for Mme. Knap to take what soup she wants the tureen passes of its own accord around the groove in the table in front of each guest until all have been served. After it has completed the journey it disappears as magically as it came. In a few minutes a receptacle for dirty dishes appears and waits patiently for its load. There is no rattle of crockery, no danger from careless servants, no noise and confusion of waiters. In this wonderful way all the food, from the delicious julienne to the coffee and cigars, is served. If the room becomes slightly overheated the investor presses another button, and a cool, sweet-scented breeze fans the guests. The air is scented and cooled by passing over perfumed water.

After the dinner the visitors are invited to inspect the wonderful house. The first place visited is always the kitchen. Here everything is done by electricity. Fixed to the walls are switches, meters, etc., for controlling the apparatus. The electric heat is applied direct, and it only takes a few minutes to prepare the food. The dishes are all of aluminum, easy to clean, and each designed especially for its work. On the kitchen table are a number of electrical utensils, including a mincing machine, a miniature churn for producing fresh butter, a coffee grinder, a buffer and pollsher, and even an electric dish washer. There was also shown the motor-driven apparatus which waited on the table so nicely.

In the laundry the clothing is washed, dried and ironed by electricity. The guest chambers are heated and lighted and ventilated by the current. Electric bells, telephones, and cigar-lighters abound. A simple electrical device notifies the servants in the basement of a visitor at the front gate. By a series of mirrors, the owner of the house can see his guest standing in the street. With the telephonic apparatus he can talk with him from the den, and at the press of a finger the gates swing open or shut.

Sheet iron is rolled so thin at the iron mills that 15,000 sheets are required to make a single inch in thickness. Light shines as readily through one of these sheets as through ordinary tissue paper.

$36,000 Carriage for King Edward

WHEN the King of England opened parliament recently he rode from Buckingham palace to Westminster in one of the most costly and splendid carriages in the world. It was built in 1761 at a cost of $36,000 on the occasion of the marriage of George III., and has ever since carried the English kings and queens on all high state occasions. Sir William Chambers designed the vehicle, which weighs four tons.

Despite its 147 years' service its great wheels, gear and body are said to be as sound as when built, and it looks as if it would go on forever. Steel springs were unknown when the coach was built, and its ponderous yet daintily luxurious body is suspended on leather brace, not unlike those of the old Concord stage coaches of America. Its balance is so perfect that a touch of the finger is enough to set the body swinging on the big creaking straps which brace the carved and gilded tritons supporting the driver's seat and hammer cloth. The length of the vehicle is 24 feet and it is 12 feet high.

The elaborate carvings cost more than the carriage proper, the coach-builder's bill having been less than $9000, while that of the carver was more than $10,000. Something of the character of the ornamentation may be guessed from the fact that the artist Cipriani received $1500 for painting the panels, and that the lace maker's charge was about $4000, the crimson satin interior of the carriage being most elaborately upholstered.

The preparation of the royal equipage for state occasions is a real sight. Six pairs of milk white horses from the royal stud are always used, and all wear false tails. The coachman, in powder and curls, mounts his seat with the aid of a ladder, but does not really drive, postillions on the horses and state grooms who walk beside them being in command of the team.