The Oregonian

PORTLAND, OREGON.

Entered at Portland, Oregon, Postoffice as Second-Class Matter.
Subscription Rates—Invariably in Advance.

(BY MAIL.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	$8.00
Daily, Sunday included, six months	4.25
Daily, Sunday included, three months	2.25
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75
Daily, without Sunday, one year	6.00
Daily, without Sunday, six months	3.25
Daily, without Sunday, three months	1.75
Daily, without Sunday, one month	.60
Weekly, one year	1.50
Sunday, one year	2.50
Sunday and Weekly, one year	3.50

(BY CARRIER.)

Daily, Sunday included, one year	9.00
Daily, Sunday included, one month	.75

How to Remit—Send Postoffice money order, express order or personal check on your local bank. Stamps, coin or currency are at the sender's risk. Give postoffice address in full, including county and state.

Postage Rates—10 to 14 pages, 1 cent; 16 to 28 pages, 2 cents; 30 to 40 pages, 3 cents; 40 to 60 pages, 4 cents. Foreign postage, double rate.

Eastern Business Offices—Veere & Conklin—New York, Brunswick building. Chicago, Steger building.

San Francisco Office—R. J. Bidwell Co., 742 Market street.

European Office—No. 3 Regent street, S. W., London.

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1912.

RIVAL POLICIES TOWARDS TRUSTS.

Governor Wilson's declaration that "the history of liberty is the history of limitation of Governmental power, not the increase of it," has provided an interesting revival of the old controversy between individualism and socialism. The individualist theory is that the state which governs least governs best. Roosevelt has replied that this applies to despotic, not to democratic government, but the theory was first propounded by an advocate of absolutism and has found some of its most distinguished supporters among men who believed in that form of government. That Roosevelt is in error is proved by the fact that individualism had as its most notable champion in the United States Thomas Jefferson, who was also the most stalwart champion of democracy.

The practical individualist, as distinguished from the one who pursues the theory to the extreme of anarchy, believes that the true end of all government is the welfare of society as an organic whole, but that this welfare can best be served by allowing every individual to pursue his own ends. It therefore holds that competition is the best means of promoting the public good through the stimulus it gives to individual initiative, industry and efficiency. Yet it holds that certain functions can best be performed by the Government, National, state or city, and should be retained as publicly-owned monopolies or as private monopolies under strict public control. Such are the postal service, water supply, fire protection, the sewerage system, road-building. In some countries railroads, street railways, telegraphs, telephones, electric light and power, gas, are public monopolies; in others they are private monopolies under public control.

The contention of Roosevelt and others who incline to the socialist, as opposed to the individualist, theory is that modern invention has compelled the conduct of all branches of industry on so large a scale that it has become impracticable to adhere to the old theory of open competition. They maintain that the great corporations which entirely or partially monopolize whole branches of industry are a natural outgrowth of modern conditions and that to attempt to destroy them would be reactionary folly; that we should legalize them, and, in order to insure their being instruments of public good, not of public injury, we should place them under strict public control, similar to that which our Government, general or local, exercises over the other lines of business which it has recognized as necessarily monopolies.

The individualist replies that many, if not all, of the monopolies which we call trusts are the artificial product of artificial conditions created by law or by neglect of its enforcement, and that we cannot tell to what extent big business is the natural outgrowth of modern invention until we have removed the artificial conditions and compelled big business to stand without such aid. We shall then learn what degree of bigness modern invention justifies.

Among the artificial conditions to which they refer are our corporation laws, which are so liberal that they confer the broadest power with little or no control over its exercise; the protective tariff, which has been raised to such a point that it fosters monopoly; our shipping laws, which have excluded from American register foreign-built ships; our railroad laws, which until recently have allowed competing roads to combine and have permitted railroads by various devices to aid monopoly in throttling competition.

A corporation being an artificial person created by the state, the individualist holds that its powers should be carefully limited by its creator. Wilson goes further and proposes to deprive American producers of all tariff protection except that which comes incidentally from the raising of necessary revenue. Congress has already taken a long step to end shipping monopoly by admitting foreign-built ships engaged in foreign trade to American register and by forbidding railroad companies to operate steamships on competing routes. The interstate commerce laws are depriving the trusts of many of the advantages they have enjoyed through railroad favoritism and the tendency is to restore complete equality of opportunity on the National steel highways.

By continuing and expanding this policy, Wilson would prevent the creation of more monopolies. He would also invoke existing law and pass additional laws to dissolve existing monopolies which might, through the strength they have already attained, survive the withdrawal of artificial aid. That done, capital would remain free to combine on a large scale, so far as natural modern conditions justify, but not on so large a scale that corporations would overshadow the power which created them.

Roosevelt would ignore the fact that trusts are to a large extent the product of unhealthy, artificial conditions which the Government has power to remove. He would recognize, legalize and control those which conform to his conception of good conduct and would dissolve only those which he considers guilty of bad conduct. His plan for amendment of corporation laws does not contemplate such restriction of a corporation's power that it cannot become a monopoly, without exposing itself to the law's penalties. He would deal tenderly with the tariff and would interest himself more in conducting some of its profits from the employer's treasury into the workman's pocket than in cutting it down to a point where monopoly could find no shelter behind it. He would attempt to avert some of the oppressive consequences which naturally flow from monopoly by Government regulation of wages and Government fixing of prices.

Under Roosevelt the principal wires which rule all lines of industry would lead to a Government bureau at Washington, which would possess immense power, capable of being used as effectively for evil as for good and in the hands of men as human as any of us. Under Wilson all would be given a fair start and those which have acquired a handicap would be deprived of it. Then he would prove by an impartial test whether and to what extent the competitive system is outdated.

BULL MOOSE PROVERBS.

Before the election of 1904, Mr. Roosevelt undoubtedly depended very largely on Mr. Harriman's advice as to political conditions in New York. It is also made plain that Mr. Harriman did contribute $50,000 to the National committee, and the presumption, therefore, is that the money was to be used for Mr. Roosevelt's benefit.

But what has all this to do with the present campaign? There may be those who will take the view that the Colonel's veracity has been impeached, or that, having dealt with Mr. Harriman before the election, he was ungrateful in turning cold after the election, but the admirers of the Colonel will shout joyfully: "Teddy put one over that time."

The personality of Mr. Roosevelt is such that his friends cannot be won from him by any such disclosures, while his enemies need no such impetus to make them anxious to defeat him. The people formed their judgment of the Colonel long ago and the decision on November 5 will hardly be affected by the testimony before the Clapp committee.

The foregoing is from the Washington Post. It has been sent to the other newspapers of the country with the endorsement of the Progressive National committee. From it we derive this interesting information:

It is a good joke to double cross a railroad magnate.

Veracity is not an essential of agreeable personality.

Promises for the future count more in politics than past records.

Preconceived judgment by the people cannot be altered by disclosures of misplaced faith.

The new axioms of the Bull Moosers go well with the recent revelations as to what is meant by the "square deal" and "Thou shalt not steal." Is it not about time again to sing "Onward, Christian Soldiers"?

OREGON PAYS THE PENALTY.

Senator Bourne says that the sum realized to the United States reclamation fund from sale of Oregon arid and semi-arid lands is $9,700,000, and he makes a very nice calculation designed to show that the state was under the law entitled to get back therefrom $4,850,000 and that the allotment to Oregon was in fact $4,178,990.27 (Umatilla and Klamath projects); so that the loss to Oregon, in the Senator's opinion, was not serious. Nothing is serious with him about this business, except the great clamor raised, and its probable effect on his candidacy.

We have the testimony of Governor West that Oregon has given to the reclamation fund through sale of its lands $13,332,066. It would thus appear that there is a trifling discrepancy of over $4,000,000 between the statements of these two eminent authorities—a difference, indeed, where none should exist, since the records ought to be available.

But the real issue here is not specifically whether Oregon lost a few dollars, or a million dollars, or four millions, but it is the fact that through the indifference or incompetence or neglect or oversight or consent of Oregon's Senators—let the reason be what it may—the established reclamation policy of the Government in the apportionment and expenditure of its funds was permitted to be changed. The voice of a single vigilant and aggressive Senator would have defeated the whole scheme, for it was nothing more nor less than a "joker" in the $20,000,000 loan bill fathered by Senator Borah and pushed through Congress only under tremendous pressure from him and others interested with him. Here is the vital section of the bill which Senator Bourne permitted to be repealed:

"That it is hereby declared to be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of this act, so far as the same may be practicable, and subject to the existence of feasible irrigation projects, to expend the major portion of the funds arising from the sale of public lands within each state and territory hereinbefore named for the benefit of arid and semi-arid lands within the limits of such state or territory."

The Federal Government may now take Oregon's money and apportion it at the option of the Secretary of the Interior, Oregon has no recourse. It must contribute indefinitely to the construction of great irrigation works in other states. Our money may and probably will—unless the law is changed, which is not now likely—forever go elsewhere.

Thus the result of the premeditated repeal of a single section of the reclamation law is that Oregon gives millions to Idaho, Arizona, Montana, Texas and other states, and keeps not a cent for its own meritorious enterprises, beyond the allotment already made.

JOHN MINTO, 90 YEARS OLD.

On the evening of October 10 a party of friends gathered at the Hotel Marion, in Salem, to pay homage to John Minto, and to assist him in celebrating his 90th birthday. Sixty-seven years ago Mr. Minto came across the plains to the Oregon country, and for those sixty-seven years he has been a beloved, useful and honored citizen of Oregon. Today he stands in the esteem and reverence of the people of this state side by side with that other great man, F. X. Matthieu. These two are surely Oregon's first citizens.

John Minto is loved, not simply because he is one of our oldest residents or because he has lived to an age a decade beyond the allotted life of man; he is loved for his sterling qualities, qualities which he has so often displayed in behalf of his state, his country and his friends; for his intelligence, his probity; and perhaps—yes, assuredly—this love is made the stronger because he himself "loves every man and bird and beast."

Gathered around the festive board at the Marion last Thursday night was a party of eminent citizens. Many speeches were made telling Mr. Minto of their esteem and assuring him that every man, woman and child in Oregon is glad that the Lord has brought him through another year in health and strength, and that every one hopes that he may live many years to celebrate in fitting fashion many more birthdays. And if the speakers made it plain to our venerable friend that the whole people were really back of those statements, then they spake truthfully.

May he never know pain or sorrow again. May each succeeding day and each succeeding year be sweeter than the yesteryears and the yesterdays. If in time the good Lord perchance should wish his presence in the great commonwealth of the blessed, may he go to sleep peacefully, happily, even joyously; not as one who dies but as one entering into the rewards of the just.

PORTLAND'S SHORTAGE OF WOMEN.

Portland, when the good word is spread about, should become the old maid's paradise. Now that the figures are out in an official Census Bureau bulletin, it appears that Portland suffers from a dire shortage of women. The market is hopelessly overstocked with men. Quoting cold figures in the matter, there are only 100 women for every 134.5 men. Hence, so far as the supply is concerned, Portland maids and spinsters can afford to be unusually fastidious. Every woman has one and three hundred forty-five thousandths men to pick from. No doubt there are a large number who will lay claim to having already drawn the fraction.

Considered matrimonially, the census figures are much of an innovation. The world's supply of males is known to be short. In most big centers of population women greatly outnumber the men. This is so especially in the cities and towns of England, France, Belgium and Norway. Old maids the world over attribute their dire predicament to shortage in the man market. The superfluous woman has become a problem of world-wide importance.

Yet Portland is short of women, hopelessly so. Unless the city's alarming condition in this regard is made known and a response develops from spinsterdom, 34.5 men out of every hundred must continue to exist in single blessedness, as many insist upon describing the state. Nor is this hapless condition confined to Portland. It is noted throughout the great State of Oregon. In the whole state every 100 females have 133.2 male population to draw upon.

While the Census Bureau bulletin doesn't go into details, it is safe to assume that every kind and condition of male creature is to be had out of Oregon's overwhelming supply. Now that the secret is out we shall expect Portland and Oregon to become a veritable spinster's mecca. Spinsters from other sections might do well to come early while the supply is strong, thus getting first choice and avoiding the rush.

ACCOUNTING FOR DICKENS.

In his October number the editor of the Yale Review finds an opportunity to enlarge upon "The Return to Dickens." By this he means that revival of respect for the style and genius of Dickens which is everywhere manifest among literary men. There is no occasion for a return to the prince of novelists as far as the people are concerned, for they have never forsaken him. The editor of the Yale Review, Wilbur L. Cross, undertakes the fascinating task of accounting both for the trend of Dickens' social doctrines and for the man himself with his intense class feeling and his passion for reform. The article is an essay in economic determinism. It belongs to that school of thought which holds that we can account for all human phenomena by considering economic conditions.

Applied to Dickens and his work this theory becomes deeply interesting. He was born in a time of class struggle between the old landed aristocracy of England and the rising industrial magnates. Industrial victory remained with the magnates. For a time they were politically dominant also. The long contention between Gladstone and Disraeli was nothing less than this class war embodied in the fortunes of two leaders, Gladstone spoke for industrialism, Disraeli for feudalism. The rising money kings invented a political economy to suit their interests. Its norm was the principle of laissez-faire, which may be freely translated, "let 'er buck" or "let 'er slide." As applied to the poor it taught that their miseries were the fruits of their vicious incompetence and that they deserved no pity. Accordingly poor laws were passed of unparalleled inhumanity. Feudalism, on the other hand, always acknowledged an obligation to the weak and humble, so that the transition to cold-hearted industrial domination decidedly increased the wretchedness of the English lowest class.

The lower middle class it ruined outright. Here were included the small clerks and persons of similar rank in life. Dickens' father was a small clerk. So severe was the economic pressure upon him that he failed to support his large family and finally landed in a debtor's prison. The boy Charles, just emerging from infancy, was obliged to fend for himself at starvation wages. His associates were the vilest of the vile. From the dreadful life he then lived he gained his understanding of the proletariat. He learned what the laws made by the rich do to the poor. He found out to what kind of schools the sons of the perishing middle-class fathers were sent to be educated. By suffering the miseries of the poor he acquired their point of view and never lost it through all his life. His novels may be called militant documents in the English class war of that day.

As Dickens saw society it was sharply divided into two hostile factions, the rich who made the laws for their own benefit, and the poor who were their helpless victims. In his imagination the typical rich man was a brutal, passionate, cruel robber of the widows and fatherless. There were exceptions, like the Cheeryble brothers, but they only proved the rule. The poorhouse was a place where the children of poverty were worked and starved to death. The courts were an institution governed by selfish chicanery, where law was perverted to private gain and justice smothered under precedent.

From this point of view, according to the editor of the Yale Review, Dickens conceived the plots and tendencies of his novels. They embody a relentless attack upon the institutions of his day because to his mind those institutions were destroying the manhood of England. Disraeli was a whole universe away from Dickens in origin and education, but it is significant to remember that he fought with the same weapons as his fellow novelist. Against Gladstone and utilitarian humanity he led the forces of the feudal aristocracy, and his war cry was that industrialism was killing the peasantry upon whom England must depend for her greatness. The old political economy which justified Yorkshire schools and Beadle Bumble has all but vanished from the world. Disraeli, Carlyle, Ruskin and William Morris had each a hand in its merited destruction, but none of them fought against it more potently than Charles Dickens and he himself with all his incomparable genius may have been a product of the very conditions which he helped to counteract.

FLOATING FOREIGNERS.

It is a little disturbing to reflect how many people of foreign antecedents there are in the United States who never expect to become citizens. To the Oriental aliens we have become at least partially reconciled because their numbers must steadily diminish with time. Moreover, their lack of citizenship is not their own fault, since the law forbids naturalization, but there are other nationalities which stand in a different case.

We have thousands of Italians and Greeks, for example, who never intend to become citizens. They are here only because they can earn more money than at home. To American ideals they are completely alien. Often they do not even learn the English language. When a European war breaks out they acknowledge no obligation to this country, but take sides as if they were at home in Greece or Italy.

Patriotism is a most desirable emotion, but some ways of displaying it are more seemly than others. The only immigrants whom this country ought to attract are those who intend to live here and become citizens. The flock of transients, which increases every year, is not of the best omen for our future. There is no particular satisfaction in knowing that some thousands of our laboring men are ready at a moment's notice to become recruits for European armies. Suppose the United States should have trouble with Italy. The situation might present embarrassments all round the circle.

The maxim "America for Americans" is, of course, a piece of shallow fanaticism, but why should we not hold up the ideal of an America for those who wish to become Americans?

EVOLUTION AND DE VRIES.

Dr. Hugo De Vries' visit to the United States is exceptionally interesting in these days of agricultural investigation and reform. This famous man is the head of the department of botany in the Amsterdam University and he won his renown by discovering the great principle of "evolution by mutation." He comes to this country to lecture at two or three educational centers. Incidentally he will visit the Florida Everglades with a scientific expedition and look up the home of the evening primrose in Alabama. The modest primrose is a singular favorite of his on account of the part it has played in his scientific work. It was in this flower that he first observed the process of mutation going on. From seeds of one variety new varieties were produced, which thenceforward remained true to their own type.

This amounts to saying that DeVries saw new plant species come into existence in his garden without miraculous intervention and without that "accumulation of small variations" which Darwin had supposed essential. The older theories of evolution held that the only transmissable singularities in any individual must be very minute. An infinitesimal change from the type of the species might be preserved by inheritance, but a large one could not. Hence Darwin and his earlier disciples looked upon the evolution of new animal and vegetable forms as a process requiring ages. No doubt it does in some cases, but not in all. De Vries is a Darwinian, but he has found that the master's observation was at fault in some particulars. He has seen new species spring into life in a single generation. When this happens a "mutation" is said to have occurred.

Obviously this discovery opens up an inviting field for the horticulturist who wishes to introduce better varieties of fruit and grain. He need not wait to accumulate desirable qualities by a slow process of selection year after year. The selection may be made once for all and the improved variety established in a single season.

De Vries' doctrine is that mutations are likely to occur in every grain field. To take advantage of them, all one need do is to go through the field and select the most promising ears. These may be merely exceptionally fortunate individuals of the old species. If that is the case they will show it by deteriorating at the next planting. But, on the other hand, they may be actual "mutations," genuine new varieties, and if they are they will come true to type forever. This makes the process of developing improved food plants a very simple and rapid one and throws an encouraging light on the problem of the world's food supply.

It is well known that the productiveness of any plant depends more or less on the nourishment supplied to it. Starve a tree or a stalk of wheat and it cannot bear a heavy fruitage. Still every observer knows that of two trees situated exactly alike with regard to soil, climate and fertilization one will bear abundantly, while the other is barren year after year. Some other factor besides food supply comes in and plays a dominant part. For lack of a better name scientific men call this factor "hereditary tendency." Naturally, therefore, a highly important process in the improvement of agriculture will be to watch for "mutants," which show rich bearing tendencies and propagate from them. This has already been done to some extent by orchardists who now and then graft a whole orchard with clons from a specially desirable tree. Corngrowers have also availed themselves largely of De Vries' discovery and by collecting the best mutants in their fields have largely increased the yield per acre.

But the practical applications of his theory have hardly begun as yet. It is destined to revolutionze food production by tapping the fathomless supplies inherent in new species of plants. This possibility was not known to Malthus when he laid down his celebrated law of population and the chances are that it renders his dismal conclusions nugatory.

Claims against the Ocean Steam Navigation Company for loss due to the wreck of the Titanic are limited to $91,805, the value of lifeboats and net freight and passage money prepaid. This is an average of $40 each for the 2296 claimants, for whom more than $2,000,000 has been subscribed by charity. The law limiting claims for loss by shipwreck to the value of the salvage from the wreck is an anachronism, surviving from the days when ships were owned by individuals and the owner who lost his ship lost his all. In these days, when a single corporation owns many ships and keeps them all well insured, this law should be repealed, or at least the insurance money should be divided among the claimants.

HADLEY'S DECISION.

Governor Hadley's announcement of his purpose to support Taft and to remain in the Republican party is the more significant because of his long silence and seeming hesitation. That bespeaks deliberation before he declared himself.

No man can seriously question Hadley's progressivenesss, for it has been abundantly proved by his course, first as Attorney-General, then as Governor, of Missouri. No man who bears Hadley's record in mind can doubt that he was guided to his present decision by consideration of what was best for the cause of progress, in serving which he has been a leader. His motive was doubtless the same as La Follette's, who is unwilling to confess that the Republican party, which he used as the means of regenerating Wisconsin, has become worthless as an implement in the great work he has in hand.

When Hadley surveys what has already been accomplished in making the Republican party the great instrument of progressive government—government in the interest of all distinguished from government in the interest of a few—he may well take courage. Wisconsin, Missouri, Oregon, Washington, Kansas, Michigan are in the hands of the progressives, Pennsylvania has been wrested from the grip of Penrose and will be redeemed unless it falls into the hands of the equally corrupt Flinn, and other states are tending in the same direction. Direct election of Senators is sure of adoption and the direct primary is destined to become general throughout the states. In one state after another the bosses have been unhorsed and the progresssives placed in the saddle, holding the party reins. The bosses have been and are being driven from power in the party councils. The day of the progressive has come and, when the discord and turmoil of the present campaign are ended, he will be found at the head of the organization and dictating party policy in state and Nation.

Following Army rules, a sentry at Vancouver Barracks endeavored to fire upon a military prisoner who was seeking to escape. Either his clip jammed or the striking pin failed to explode the cartridge. Being thus prevented from hurtling a Hudson-Thomas bullet into the anatomy of the fugitive, the sentry cast aside his new model Springfield and felled the prisoner with a stone, after a brief chase. Had the rifle operated the prisoner would now be in the town morgue or post hospital, for American military marksmanship is certain and deadly. Obviously it was unnecessary to shoot the offender. Yet experience has developed the fact that tender mercy has no place in the stern curriculum of military science. The man who enters the service necessarily must not prize life too highly and is expected to forfeit it when necessary, either in the line of duty or through his failure to abide by the rules of the game.

The celebration of the semi centennial of the war Governors' conference at Altoona, Pa., has been made the occasion of a comparison between the Pennsylvania Railroad of 1862 and the same road in 1912, which that road itself invited by making exhibits at the celebration. In 1862 the road had 882 miles of single track, 255 locomotives, 158 passenger cars and 4016 freight cars. The Pennsylvania Railroad proper, not the entire system, now has 3810 miles of single track, 3621 locomotives, 2502 passenger cars and 146,989 freight cars. One modern engine alone can haul fifty-nine loaded cars weighing 3224 tons, or a little over one-fifteenth of the entire freight equipment of 1862.

Capital punishment hasn't any place in the order of things today, says Arizona's Governor. Neither has cold-blooded murder. Unfortunately, as heretofore noted, we continue to be confronted by facts rather than theories.

Every additional electric train means more traffic. Frequent service educates people to the standard of the Texas cowboy of long ago, who would not walk across the road if a "hawss" was handy.

Threats of Mexican rebels that they will commence killing American trainmen October 15 causes no alarm. We have learned that the Mexicans traffic mainly in conversational gymnastics.

Theodore now charges that Wilson is not a progressive. Which leaves but one progressive on earth, according to the Roosevelt process of elimination.

Lorimer is going to spend the next ten years on the lecture platform vindicating himself. His only hope is to keep quiet and allow us to forget him.

County Clerks are stumped by the extensive and complicated ballot this year. Most every one is due to experience the same dilemma.

Clatsop County's juvenile fair establishes the fact that culling prize produce from Oregon soil is mere child's play.

When we read of the wounded in battle, realization comes that civilization's veneer isn't so very thick, after all.

The farmer boy who illegally kills a pheasant provides for thousands of pests to prey on next year's crops.

Johnson has signed for another "fight" with Flynn. This savors of obtaining money by false pretenses.

At last we are discovered. Christo Colombo, the discoverer, arrived from Spain yesterday, 420 years ago.

Interest in Portland will be divided between Pitcher Wood and General Wood for the next day or two.

The players' share is not easy money, by any means. The struggle has been great all the season.

Mary Garden insists that she will marry a Western man. Forewarned should be forearmed.

Statistics show that Portland has a shortage of women. No further excuse for old maids.

Another day or two and eleven will replace nine as the most interesting figures.

LODGE UPHOLDS CONSTITUTION.

Dangers of Roosevelt Policies Pointed Out at Enthusiastic Republican Convention.

Those Democrats who indulged hopes of carrying Massachusetts, who regard the Republican party as divided, disheartened, demoralized and in the throes of dissolution, should read the account of the convention of the old Bay State and dispel their illusions. There was a unity and enthusiasm unsurpassed. A keynote speech was made by Senator Lodge, which rose to the highest rank in oratory. He carried conviction because he obviously expressed conviction. He defined the principles of constitutional government, for which the Republican party stands. Hotly resenting the assumption that adherence to the constitutional guarantees of individual liberty marks opposition to progress, he pointed to the record of progressive legislation reaching back for 50 years, all of which was passed through the instrumentality of the Republican party.

Most forceful was Lodge's exposure of the dangerous effects on liberty of the new Roosevelt policies, the more forceful because he did not once mention the name of his erring friend, whose spokesman and champion in the Senate he formerly was. He upheld the direct primary, but opposed the omission of party designation as a means by which "organized minorities, belonging to any party or to none, could go into the primaries and control the nominations of all parties." He opposed the compulsory initiative and referendum as "a scheme to enable minorities to rule," saying that, wherever they have been tried, "this power has been conferred upon a small percentage of the people." Asserting with Taft that the voters constitute only one-sixth of the people, and that one-twelfth of the people determine the result of an election, he said:

> The voters are not the people. They are merely the necessary instrument selected for the expression of the popular will. But they are not the people; they are representatives and trustees. Now it is proposed to give to a small fraction of the voters—not of the people—this great power to compel the submission of laws to a popular vote and when those laws are submitted to the popular vote experience shows that they are almost invariably carried by a minority of the voters. Those who are interested in the passage of the law, of course, take pains to vote; a small number who are interested in the other direction vote against it, and the great mass remain indifferent.

He condemned the compulsory initiative and referendum as "a device to permit interested and organized minorities to rule." He maintained that the Legislature represents all the people, while "the minorities of voters to which we are asked to give this power to compel the submission and the adoption of laws, in the exercise of that power represent nobody but themselves." He extolled representative government as "the one great advance in the methods of government in modern times," to break down which has been "the first care of every autocrat, of every dictator, of every man who has seized on power for himself alone."

Against recall of the judiciary and of judicial decisions he upheld the independent court as the great bulwark of freedom, while a court "subservient to anybody outside the courtroom, whether that influence comes from the King, from money or from a body of voters, is a servile court." He declared the independent court to be "the most potent defense and protection of the liberty of the individual man and of the rights of minorities against the oppression of majorities." He called attention to the fact that agitators for direct legislation make no attempt to limit the executive and would substitute for constitutional government "a government which consists simply of the voters and the executive."

Lodge emphasized the fact that Lincoln drew a distinction between government by the people and government by a majority of the voters when he said:

> A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people.

He declared that a great gulf was fixed between these two things, and said:

> The proposition which now confronts us will, if carried out, break down government by the people, which is secured by the limitations of the Constitution, and give us over, bound and helpless, to the action of a majority of the voters appearing at any given moment—voters who are a minority of the people and whose majority may be fleeting, temporary or accidental. It was against this precise situation that the special checks and limitations, which Lincoln approved, were devised by the convention over which Washington presided.

Lodge cited the bill of rights embodied in the Constitution as being endangered by proposed direct legislation, and added:

> The Constitution is not a law. It is a declaration of principles. The effort now is to turn it into a statute, to be altered by the whim or the passion of the moment. The Constitution guards the rights of each one of us, no matter how humble or how poor.

Praising the Constitution as "the admiration of the world," as having "created a self-limited democracy," Lodge said:

> Do not let it be torn down, for if you do, all the great advance in freedom which it represents will perish and we shall return to those primitive forms of government which in ancient times and in modern times as well have oscillated between anarchy and despotism, with at best only brief intermissions of true and ordered liberty.

Lodge declared the Republican party to be the one party "which stands for the Constitution and for the principles upon which the Constitution rests." He continued:

> To say that this attitude is incompatible with progress is to utter a childish absurdity. Every great piece of legislation, all the progress which has been made in the last 50 years has been achieved under the guidance of the Republican party. We are today as we always have been a party of sane and rational progress under the Constitution. We do not believe that breaking down the Constitution is in progress. We regard it as revolution and retrogression, and upon that firm ground we take our stand.

He closed with a stirring appeal to Republicans to stand by their party and the Constitution, in the course of which he said:

> What if the odds be great and the enemies come from all sides? A brave man fights all the harder when he finds great odds in front of him, and he wins in the end if his cause is right and his courage high. So must it be with a brave party when, as with us, their cause is righteous and their principles are just. Parties come and go, but principles survive. If a party is true to its principles it will profit by victory, and like Anteus from the earth rise stronger from defeat. It will survive defeat and live on to win more victories and achieve a future which shall be as brilliant and as useful as its past. But if it abandons its principles, if it shrinks from the test, if it stops to count the odds, then defeat indeed is terrible and it will never look on victory again.
>
> There are worse things than defeat. To sacrifice principles and cast aside convictions is much worse. "Not failure, but low aim is crime." Those who battle for the right will snatch victory from the jaws of defeat and from the nettle danger pluck the flower safety. Once more we are called upon to defend the Constitution. That duty is our greatest heritage and our noblest hope. The cause of ordered liberty, of government by the people and of human rights is ours and we shall be victorious under the standard of the Constitution which passed triumphant through the ordeal of Civil War. We will fight the good fight once more, even as our fathers did, and once more we shall win.

Such speeches as this will have the effect of so inspiring loyal Republicans and so stiffening the spines of the waverers, that they will stand by the party and uphold its faithful chief, undismayed by the confident predictions of victory which come from the Democrats or by the slanders and boastings of those who avow their purpose to destroy the party which has once saved the Constitution in war.

Scraps and Jingles

Leone Cass Baer.

A scene-shifter sees many moving scenes.

* * *

It costs more to get married than to stay married.

* * *

The height of most girls' ambition is about five feet six.

* * *

Correspondent writes to ask, What is "Rotten Row?" I refer correspondent to the Portland vice commission for list of addresses.

* * *

Women aren't interested in hats in the ring—it's fingers in rings that is her burning question of the hour.

* * *

Love may be — and probably is — blind, but marriage certainly is some occulist.

* * *

It's a long political life that has no turning.

* * *

Little Do-drop writes to say that "My gentleman friend thinks I'm the nicest girl in the world. Shall I let him call often?" No, Do-drop, I'd just keep on letting him think so.

* * *

The three personal pronouns are wife, husband and baby.

* * *

"Temperature dropped to zero," says an article. That's nothing.

* * *

"Reception of suffragists at Ostend is dull," says an English review. Not Ostend—tatious enough I reckon.

* * *

Definition of the "devouring elements"—the bread lines.

* * *

women." It can't be done. It's as much as you can do to get one out of 'em.

* * *

Fleeing henpeck wails that "marringe is a Gordian knot." So he cut i'—and run.

* * *

Why is it that a' beautiful blonde with dark lashes always excites suspicion among other women?

* * *

Flattery, like too much sugar, only spoils that which it was meant to sweeten.

* * *

"Man weds woman through advertisement," screams a headline. Union of corresponding minds, eh?

* * *

Ideas are like coin; those of the smallest value get into greatest circulation.

* * *

Evidently the loan of the loan sharks is best left a-lone.

* * *

Read lengthy account of a proposition to raise a sunken treasure ship. Oswald West tried a task almost as difficult when he tried to "elevate" Portland.

* * *

Miss Calamity Step-and-Fetch It, the charming and genteel lady writer of the Willamette Valley, has thrown together a pretty meringue which she calls

On Poker—Not Vile Gambling.

Here's to the sturdy fire poker,
By the woodbox it takes its place.
And whenever used it glistens
Right bright in a body's face.
It indeed is grand and noble,
Of it we shouldn't joke.
What would we do without it?
How could we the fire poke?

It isn't in the Summer when
The sun sufficient heat supplies
That the poker's merit's noticed—
In the attic, there it lies.
But when the Winter's rain sets in
And on the streets we cannot roam,
Then it is we 'preciate
The poker as a friend at home.

J. B.'s Appeal

By Dean Collins.

Thou whose bright star is a-shimmering
Paler than once was its way,
Ere it be quite gone a-glimmering,
List to the song that I play.
Johnathan B., thou official
Who erstwhile sent forth the stern cry,
(Assuming a power judicial),
"'Tis you are on trial and not I."

My head was 'mong those on whose pinnacle
Was emptied thy wrath from its vial;
By Fate, which is flighty and cynical,
I was one of the ones upon trial.

If memory serves me not poorly,
By primary records you'll note,
The verdict came back to you surely
"Not me, John, but thou art the goat."

What motive then, tell me, impelleth thee,
What impulse within dost thou feel
That proddeth thy soul till it yelleth;
"We
Will carry it on, and appeal?"

Ah Johnathan, once thou wast foremost
In praising the Oregon plan—
Wherefore, when it maketh thee sore most
Canst not take thy dose like a man?

The primary lost; simultaneous
Arises a protest from thee;
As Roosevelt, contemporaneous,
Whacks all things unfriendly to "me."

Rejected by primary voting,
Thy appeal is proclaimed with a roar—
But thy case cometh up, I am noting,
'Fore the same judge that judged thee before.

Portland, Oct. 11.

Old Rhythm and Ryme.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox in Lippincott's.

They tell me new methods now govern the Muses,
The modes of expression have changed with the times;
That low is the rank of the poet who uses
The old-fashioned verse with intentional rhymes.
And quite out of date, too, is rhythmical metre;
The critics declare it an insult to art.
But oh! the sweet swing of it, oh! the clear ring of it,
Oh! the great pulse of it, right from the heart.
Art or no art.

I sat by the side of that old poet, Ocean,
And counted the billows that broke on the rocks;
The tide lilted in with a rhythmical motion;
The seagulls dipped downward in time-keeping flocks.
I watched while a giant wave gathered its forces,
And then on the gray granite precipice burst;
And I knew as I counted, while other waves mounted,
I knew the tenth billow would rhyme with the first.

Below in the village a church-bell was chiming,
And back in the woodland a little bird sang;
And, doubt it who will, yet those two sounds were rhyming,
As out o'er the hilltops they echoed and rang.

The Winds and the Trees fell to talking together;
And nothing they said was didactic or terse;
But everything spoken was told in unbroken
And beautiful rhyming and rhythmical verse.

So rhythm I hail it, though critics assail it,
And hold melting rhymes as an insult to art,
For oh! the sweet swing of it! oh! the dear ring of it,
Oh! the strong pulse of it, right from the heart,
Art or no art.