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—Verree & 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, DEC. 1, 1912.

THE CARNEGIE PENSION SCHEME.

Andew Carnegie's offer of a pension to ex-Presidents is taken by the leading newspapers, almost without exception, as a hint to Congress to make such provision. A majority regard the hint as intended, some pointing to the proviso that the pension continue only until Congress makes suitable provision, but almost all take the hint, whether intended or not. The New York Sun makes severe animadversion on Carnegie for making the offer and others take occasion to comment adversely on the existence of such large fortunes as his and on the negligence of the Nation in allowing rich men to perform service which should be performed by the Government. The offer, by its very unwelcomeness to the people, has awakened them to consciousness of a neglected duty and has made the subject of pensions to and future public service from ex-Presidents a live issue, which has already borne fruit in the drafting of a bill covering the subject.

The New York World says Carnegie's offer "has forced the issue upon the consideration of Congress," but adds that, however excellent Carnegie's motives, "it is impossible for a man who has held the highest elective office in the world to accept a pension from an individual," for the reason that "popular sentiment would be so strongly against it that no ex-President would take the money." It calls the failure of the Nation to pension ex-Presidents a National disgrace and says that the country "should feel ashamed of itself for tolerating a situation" which makes the proposal possible.

Taking Taft's case as an illustration, the World says he could not be a counsel for corporations without subjecting himself to severe criticism, nor argue a case before the Supreme Court, for he appointed a majority of the Justices; nor "take a retainer without throwing the prestige of the office on the side of his client." It declares pensions a duty which "the country owes not to its ex-Presidents but to itself—to a great office which should never be commercialized."

Carnegie is credited by the New York Tribune with a purpose only to draw attention to "the possible desirability of Government provision" and says his offer will thus have served a useful purpose. It joins in the general disapproval of pensions from any private individual to ex-Presidents.

It does not admit, but does not deny, the need of pensions, saying:

> No ex-President since the Civil War has been forced to any undignified activities or any pecuniary embarassment, with the exception of General Grant.

Any pension which implies an obligation "that an ex-Pesident should refrain from normal activities as a citizen" is held by the Tribune to be unfortunate, with the remark:

> We want no endowed National figureheads, set apart like Princes of the blood. At the same time we want our Presidents to serve without worry about the future.

Suggesting that Carnegie had no other purpose than to stir up the Nation to action, the New York American says:

> Certainly it is unlikely that public sentiment will acquiesce in the idea that a private person—or foreign birth—should become the continuing benefactor and sustainer of our foremost citizens.

That journal attributes our reluctance to pension ex-Presidents to "a doubt as to the fitness of such a proceeding," but gives as reasons for the removal of this doubt the facts that "a man who has held the Presidential office is uniquely qualified to serve the Nation in some advisory capacity" and "that a man who has arrived at the White House and has lived there for a term or two, as the people's spokesman and representative to all the nations, has by that fact so linked his name with the National honor and dignity that he afterward loses the right possessed by every private citizen to lend his name to money-making enterprises." It suggests as a third consideration "that the absorption of a generous mind in large public and in personal affairs tends to unfit a man for the successful prosecution of private business under the conditions that now exist." It appears the suggestion that ex-Presidents be made life Senators, but prefaces a recommendation that Carnegie's offer be withdrawn as unacceptable with this opinion:

> But the idea of making ex-Presidents the beneficiaries of the bounty of any private philanthropist is inconsistent with the dignity of the office and of the intended recipient.

Describing Carnegie's proposal as "now defunct," the New York Globe calls the whole pension agitation a plan for "mummifying ex-Presidents." The Globe scoffs at the idea that it is scandalous and indecent for an ex-President to do more than breathe and says:

> The ex-Presidents have done pretty well, thank you, and there is no need to worry over them. So far as there is record there is no instance of an ex-President or his family going to the poorhouse or of living in abject and soul-destroying poverty.
>
> Reasonable pensions for public servants who have spent themselves in the public service are, of course, desirable, and ex-Presidents, like others, should have the benefits. But according to the same principles applied to all.

The New York Herald says Carnegie "might better have a big bonfire and burn it up Fourth of July style than seek to create a private pension fund for men who have held the office of President."

It approves of the idea of a Government pension and believes Carnegie made his offer "in order to shame Congress" into voting pensions.

Carnegie is credited by the Chicago Tribune with "doing one public service of which he is unconscious" and thus explains its meaning:

> He is reducing to the absurd the theory that any single man should be permitted to exercise unlimited dominion over hundreds of millions of dollars. If immense wealth is a trust, society owes it to itself to devise a better way than it now takes in the selection of trustee.

The New York Sun is merciless in its condemnation of the offer, saying:

> Who will be he first ex-President of the United States to step up, hat in hand, to the Thane of Skibo and let that modest and unostentatious son of Plutus drop $25,000 a year therein?
>
> There is certainly no reason why a former President of the United States should be a parasite on a dropsical private fortune made out of outgrown commercial vices like rebates, out of any outgrown system like protection for protection's sake, fines levied on the majority to give one little strutting plutocrat immortal opportunity for advertising.
>
> It would be intolerable and dishonorable.

The Baltimore Sun does not think "any President or former President now living, or any individual now living who becomes President, will be likely to accept the offer," adding: "There is something in the capable man that resents such charity." It strongly suspects Carnegie chose this method "of calling attention to the inexcusable failure of the Government to make some provision for its former Presidents" and predicts that, as such, it will doubtless prove successful. It deprecates the disposition to depreciate Carnegie's gifts and to condemn the manner in which he acquired his fortune, saying that he "made his money without utilizing any of the illegal practices that marked the growth of the oil and sugar and other trusts." It says that when such men "look upon their great wealth as a trust to be expended for the benefit of their brotherman they should neither be laughed at nor patronized as silly old gentlemen nor scorned as hypocrites."

Defending Carnegie against those critics who call him "merely a vainglorious person," the Washington Post says his object was to bring about "the enactment of a law that will make his private bounty unnecessary" and that no better method could have been devised. It calls Carnegie's offer "in effect a severe arraignment of the Government for its neglect of duty toward all its servants from President to janitors," contrasts our neglect in this particular with the practice of other nations and says he "has done a great public service in directing sharp attention to this great injustice."

Commenting on Representative Burleson's bill to pension ex-Presidents at $17,500 a year and to make them delegates-at-large for life in the House, but without vote, the Washington Star recommends that the subject go over to next Congress. It questions the wisdom of making ex-Presidents members of the House, asking how influential or how comfortable Cleveland would have been if he had passed into the House in March, 1897, or how Taft would care to pass to the House next March. It suggests that "during the extra session he might enjoy himself pointing out to Mr. Underwood the difference between a tariff for politics and a tariff for revenue only," but that after that his "interest in proceedings would be likely to wane."

The Springfield Republican holds that Carnegie's offer was meant "as merely a jolt to Congress regarding its plain duty to provide the pensions."

The effect of Carnegie's action, says the Springfield Union, "must be to force immediate action from Congress" and that journal adds that there is no reason whatever why our ex-Presidents should be dependent on private bounties," and that the people "would prefer to have the Nation fulfill an obligation that is peculiarly its own." It remarks that "private funds are being devoted to many objects that by right should be supported directly by the public, but which would be sorely neglected, but for the initiative of men like Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller." It says that, when the public has learned to do its duty in these respects, "it will be in a position to dispense with the luxury of near-billionaires, and the gaps between social classes will be less formidable than at present."

WHAT REGULATES PRICES.

That professedly progressive weekly, the Saturday Evening Post, which often scoffs at recognized economic laws, ridicules the law of supply and demand, saying it has relatively little to do with fixing the price of anything and that the first factor in fixing price is the cost of production.

It is as true now as it always has been that price is regulated solely by supply and demand, though price usually fluctuates close to cost of production. There are other factors, however. The world's crop of hops is at the mercy of the weather. Good weather in all hop countries has in some years produced so large a crop that the price has fallen far below cost of production, but farmers still pick and sell their hops for what they can get. The following year many farmers, disgusted at their losses, raise no crop. Bad weather may then ruin the crops in all except one or two districts, and the price rises to several times the cost of production, in fact has no relation thereto. The demand is usually constant, but the supply fluctuates without regard to cost of production.

The Post says that billions of tons of coal under the ground have no influence on price. Of course they have not, any more than unimproved agricultural land influences the price of wheat. If a mine has been opened in a body of coal, the owner will regulate the amount produced according to price, or will close the mine if price falls below cost of production. In like manner, a farmer will sow a field to wheat or some other crop according to his judgment of which will be most profitable, and thereby will influence supply and demand.

A notable illustration of the working of this law has grown out of the automobile industry. Though independent refiners testify that the dissolution of the Standard Oil Company has restored competition, the great demand for petroleum products growing out of their use by automobiles has caused the price to rise without regard to cost of production. To the same industry is due the increased use of rubber. Cost of production has not changed materially, but price has risen enormously in consequence of greater demand, and has stimulated rubber planting to increase supply. If this supply should be so excessive as to send the price below cost, the growers would rather sell it below cost than suffer a total loss.

If the growers should combine to hold the supply for higher prices, that supply would still be a bear influence on the market. Interest on its cost would be eating into the investment and meanwhile outsiders would seize the opportunity to produce rubber and reap the profits of the combination's control, at the same time preventing the combination from raising the price to compensate for its interest expenses.

The law of supply and demand can only be set aside by an absolute monopoly of both the existing supply and of the means of increasing that supply. So long as our laws forbid such a monopoly and are enforced, it is impossible.

IT MIGHT HAPPEN.

By the occupation of Durazzo the Servians make it clear that they are inexorably determined to have a port on the Adriatic. The protest of Austria does not deter them, and they are willing to plunge Europe into a general war rather than forego their project. The professional peacemakers have been telling the world that the Servians would yield to Austria's desire for the possession of the Albanian port and find an outlet for their trade by way of the Aegean. The plan was to send the Servians down to the coast of the Gulf of Salonica and give Austria clear sway along the Adriatic. But the peacemakers propose and the Balkan allies dispose. Servia will not do as she is bid any more than the Bulgarians or Montenegrins will.

The fact of the matter is that the world is facing in the Balkan country one of those human upheavals which now and then get beyond the control of ordinary restraints and ignore all the teachings of prudence and policy. It is by movements of this kind that the enduring trends of history are caused.

We do not believe that Europe will be able to dictate to the Balkan allies what sort of a peace they shall make with the Turk or how they shall dispose of their conquests. The people of the mountain states have come to the pass where they choose death rather than longer submission to the oppression which has harried them for 500 years. They have taken their lives in their hands and are as ready to die fighting Austrians as Turks.

The situation reminds one of that in France at the outbreak of the Revolution. Allied Europe tried its best to undo the work of the French people. The consequence was a military outburst which overthrew half the thrones of the world and sent democracy ahead a thousand years at one leap. It is likely enough that Europe by interfering with the Balkan allies would bring down on itself an avalanche of resentful warriors who have already proved themselves to be formidable fighters and who might not stop until they had camped in the streets of Berlin. Such things have happened.

DISASTROUS LAWMAKING.

Repeated statements by the chief sponsors for the railroad rate law adopted in the last election, that the measure is "safe and sane" and that it is written in simple English, would be comforting if borne out by the tariffs now in attempted course of construction. As a matter of fact, the law is dangerous and crazy, and the person who drew it does not seem to have understood the ordinary rudiments of the English language.

As an example of the framer's strange conception of word meanings the second section may be cited. This section declares that "where no minimum carload weight is provided for each"—(mark the word "each")—"article by a railroad or fixed by an order of the Railroad Commission of Oregon, the minimum carload weight shall be 30,000 pounds.

The word "each" is inclusive in its application. Literally construed, this section means that if one article out of all these listed in the tariff sheets has not been given a minimum carload weight, every article carried by the railroads shall take the 30-000-pound minimum. As a matter of fact, no minimum carload weight is now fixed for either wool or hops. Therefore, if the act were to be construed literally, wool, wheat, rock, gravel, brick, canned goods and everything else should take the minimum weight of 30,000 pounds. Is is hardly to be feared, however, that this meaning will be given the section. It is so preposterous that the real intent must be sought outside the plain reading of the act. The wording is quoted merely as an example of the "simple English" with which the law is constructed.

As to its safety and sanity, it may be stated that to the ordinary voter, who is unfamiliar with the intricacies of rate-making, the law would seem to fix minimum rates. On its face the act apparently would not increase any rate because of the supposition that it would not be necessary for the railroad to increase any rate that was below the maximum provided, while, on the other hand, any rate above the maximum would come down.

This would be true were it not for the facts that the law expressly provides for uniformity of classification ratings between one class and another and imposes a fine on any railroad that fixes a carload rate above a certain percentage of the less-than-carload rate.

For an illustration of the effect of the law, the present rate on shipments of green fruit from Medford to Portland may be taken. Such shipments now take a special commodity rate. The less-than-carload rate from Medford to Portland is 45 cents; the carload rate is 28 per cent. The minimum carload weight on green fruit is 28,000 pounds. The new law provides that under such a weighting the carload rate shall not exceed 59 per cent of the less-than-carload rate. But the rate now in force is 62 per cent of the carload rate. Plainly, the present rate must be changed, as the relationship is illegal.

If the railroad continues to move green fruit under the present commodity rate it commits a crime. For each carload thus hauled it may be fined $100 and costs of prosecution. It must make its green fruit rates conform to the act. As the rate must be changed, the only guidance offered is in the act itself. The act recognizes classifications and presumably it refers to the Western classification or the one now recognized by all Western roads and the Commissions. This classification places green fruit in the first class, and the Railroad Commission has given it a rate of 97 cents from Medford to Portland in less carload quantities. If this rate is reduced on the specific article, the article is out of its recognized class, and uniformity of percentages is destroyed. If all first-class rates are changed, the entire fabric of rates is upset, for the first-class rate is the basis for all rates. No other conclusion seems possible but that the Medford green fruit rate on less-carload quantities must be raised from 45 cents to 97 cents.

The carload rate on green fruit, according to the terms of the act, must not exceed 59 per cent of 97 cents, or 57 cents. Attorneys who have been endeavoring to construe the act hold that the percentage that may be selected within this maximum must prevail as to all first-class freight. Green fruit cannot take one carload rate and some other article moved as first-class take another carload rate. Moreover, there is a limit below which the railroad cannot be compelled to go in fixing freight rates. The rate must not be confiscatory. The almost certain result will be that the railroads in abandoning commodity rates where so compelled by the act will apply the maximum class rate fixed by law.

Thus has Medford, while acquiring favorable jobbing rates, probably ruined a part of its fruit industry. Portland this year took Medford's entire output of peaches, shipped locally from the district. The carload rates, it is probable, will next year be double what they were this year, if the act is upheld.

Nor is Medford the only community that will suffer. It is apparent that the Salem brick and tile factory, which markets a large output in Portland, will discover it is discriminated against in favor of Washington plants, whose rates cannot be affected by the Oregon law. Under this construction of the act the interior sawmill, which relies wholly on railroads for transporting its logs, will be unable to compete with the water mills. Baker has secured favorable jobbing rates at the expense of the wheatgrowers and livestock-producers. The potato-grower is hit. The builder, cement shipper, the haygrower, the livestock man, the lumber shipper and a dozen others, whose industries must prosper in order that the jobber may exist, are to suffer, and perhaps be put out of business through a foolish attempt by the interior jobber to widen his territory.

There are also numerous uncertainties in the act. One section may be construed to mean that a separate minimum carload weight shall be fixed according to the capacity of the car used. Under such construction a rank discrimination is made in favor of the large shipper against the smaller one, with the further prospect in view that the smaller equipment of the railroads will be largely tied up because large cars, which will provide low rates, will be demanded by shippers.

Not only is the intent of the bill not expressed in plain words, but no man could gain an idea of its effect without first acquiring a knowledge of railroad rate making and then applying the provisions of the act directly to all freight that moves in Oregon through tedious reference to the Western classification and the existing freight tariffs. That not one man in a thousand who voted for the bill did this is not open to question.

A LESSON TO TAKE TO HEART.

The success of the Balkan states over Turkey holds a warning for the United States not to rely upon our millions of men capable of military service to defend the country in time of emergency. The Turks were much readier for war than we are, but they were not as ready as their foes, who give military training to every man capable of bearing arms and pass them from the regular army into the reserves, subject to call. They maintain unusually large standing armies in proportion to population, and keep them in a high state of efficiency. The Turks have been neglecting their army since the deposition of Abdul Hamid, and had their forces scattered over their wide territory. The total war strength of the allies nearly equals that of the Turks, but it so nearly equals the number of men capable of bearing arms that the number of available men who remain unorganized is less than half their war strength, while Turkey has 2,000,000 unorganized men as compared with a total war strength of 725,000 men.

Through being ready, while the Turks were unready, the allies have carried the war to the gates of the Turkish capital and have almost wiped out Turkish power in Europe. This has been accomplished in less than two months, and only now, when they are beaten and suing for peace, are the Turks assembling and organizing their reserves. In short, the battle is lost before the Turks have had time to prepare for its beginning.

The moral is that the nation which delays preparation until war begins is already beaten. Modern wars are short and decisive. The Austro-Prussian war of 1866 is known as the six weeks' war. The gigantic struggle between France and Germany was practically decided in three months, for within that time Paris was besieged. Our reliance on our inherent strength is blind folly. The greatest nation, if untrained and unorganized for war, is powerless in the hands of a small nation with a large, well-trained army. We should do well to take to heart the lesson of the Balkan war.

BRYAN, THE GREAT PROBLEM.

The whole country is becoming stirred up over the twin questions: "What will Wilson do with Bryan?" and "What will Bryan do with Wilson?" The Democratic party is particularly stirred up, not to say violently agitated, and some of its members are becoming vociferously indignant at the very suggestion that Bryan should have any part in the Wilson Administration. A report, afterwards denied, that Wilson had invited Bryan to join him in Bermuda for consultation made the Nebraskan the one topic of discussion.

That Bryan intends to have much to say about the policy of the new Administration and the new Congress is obvious from his own acts. The election was no sooner over than Bryan went to Washington and spent a week in discussing prospective legislation with his friends and with some who were not his friends and to whom he appeared decidedly "bossy." That caused Clark, who attributes his defeat at Baltimore to the peerless one; Underwood, whom Bryan accused of delaying action on the steel tariff and who gave his accuser the lie before the whole House; Martin, whose election as Democratic leader in the Senate and whose renomination for Senator Bryan opposed, and Senator Simmons, whom he also fought—it caused all these men to bristle up like angry porcupines. The New York and Virginia members of Congress were not overjoyed to see him, for he attacked the integrity of the delegations from those states at Baltimore.

When such is the effect of the appearance of Bryan at the capital merely as a leading member of the party who desires to discuss legislation, we can barely imagine the tremors of fright and rage which follow serious discussion of Bryan as Secretary of State, as the chief adviser of Wilson in the selection of the other members of his Cabinet and in shaping his policy. One exasperated Democrat calls Bryan "the Jonah of the Democratic party," another asks why he does not follow the historic example of Cincinnatus, go back to his "farm and stay with his goats and alfalfa." The leaders in Congress are wrought up and the mere mention of Bryan provokes language which would not sound well in a lady's reception room.

Yet Wilson knows that, if he does not do something with Bryan, Bryan may do something with him. He knows that he owes the nomination to the Nebraskan and that the latter believes he has substantial claims on the gratitude of the President-elect. With the memory of what Roosevelt did to Taft fresh in his mind, Wilson may consider it unsafe to leave Bryan unfettered by office. He knows that Bryan is looked upon by the progressive Democracy as its leader and that a slight to Bryan would be taken as a symptom of reaction. Having won the nomination as a progressive, he may well hesitate to incur the wrath of the militant progressives of his party.

But if he should protect himself against such dire consequences by inviting Bryan to sit at his right hand in the Cabinet, the latter might decline, unless the occupants of the other chairs suited him. Or some of the men Wilson selected to fill those other chairs might object to sitting in council with Bryan. Were Wilson to smooth over these difficulties and to form a Cabinet in which both wings of the party were fairly represented, the Nebraskan's "bossy" propensities would be in constant danger of causing an eruption of discord. The success of the Administration would depend on its working in harmony with the leaders in Congress, yet recommendations from the White House would not be the more welcome in that quarter because Bryan had a voice in their making. In fact, Clark and Underwood are reported to have expressed an intention of "sitting on Bryan" hard at the first show of interference and to have conveyed hints indirectly to Wilson that, if he wanted harmony with Congress, he would better deal with its leaders, unfettered by Bryan's advice.

A HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

It must be difficult for a man who has reached the age of 100 years to believe that he is living in the same world he knew when he was a boy. In many essentials it is not the same world. The progress of the last century in science and invention has transformed man's relation to nature and, by its reaction upon man himself, it has transformed society.

Our environment is fundamentally different from that of 100 years ago and in scores of particulars it has made us different creatures. If our centenarian could be carried backward to the days of his youth by some magic power he would feel like a castaway on a desert island, so rude and scanty would he find the implements of the household, the means of travel and the agencies of communication with his fellow men.

One hundred years ago people still cooked over open fires. Kettles were swung from cranes, meat was roasted on a spit and was kept at an even heat, sometimes by the labor of a little dog, called a turnspit, which turned a little wheelwork and contributed to the savors of a feast he was not allowed to eat. Bread was baked in huge cavities called Dutch ovens, hollowed out in the chimney walls and the only heat for ordinary dwellings came from the fire on the hearth. Stoves had been invented, of course, but outside of the cities they were not in common use. They were expensive, for one thing, but they were not satisfactory, either, in spite of their cost. It took as much ingenuity to perfect the kitchen range and the parlor heater as it did to devise the mold board of a modern plow.

The sleeping-rooms of those far-off days were icebound caverns. The sleeper's breath often covered his blanket with frost and if it snowed in the night it was no rarity to find a drift on the bed which had sifted down through the shingles. There is a superstition that those frightful old sleeping-rooms were more healthful than their modern successors, but it is baseless. Unless the roof or walls were broken there was no ventilation. The occupant breathed the same germ-laden air night after night for months, gradually poisoning his system. Pneumonia reaped a rich harvest every Winter. Consumption and smallpox, to say nothing of diphtheria, went the rounds of the neighborhood as regularly as the Assessor. The world has learned nothing of more value in the last century than the wholesomeness of fresh air. Many children were born in the houses of that day, but they died almost as fast. Only the most hardy survived. The salvation of the poor lay in their inability to afford tight dwellings.

Knowledge of current events percolated very slowly through the community. It was transmitted to a certain extent by the mails and newspapers but, in the absence of the railroad and telegraph, these were extremely primitive. The "news" was always old even to New Yorkers. Traveling peddlers were valuable social agencies. With their tinware and ribbons they usually carried a fair load of intelligence which they seldom failed to share with their customers. Now-a-days they are dreaded as hobos, but a century ago they were as welcome as the morning mail. In those days there were no hobos.

Another great distributor of intelligence was the stump speaker, who was a far more important character than he is now. What he had to say was the freshest of news to his auditors, and they heard him with an eager attention which moderns accord only to Presidential candidates. It was this dependence upon political orators for the news of the campaign which, in part, caused the rural American to lose all his interest in politics except just before election. How could he be interested in what he knew nothing about? The bad habit has continued to our time, though the cause of it vanished long ago.

People attended church 100 years ago more faithfully than we do. No doubt their anxiety about their souls was more lively, but the minister and his sermon agreeably interrupted the drear monotony of existence and that, too, helped win him a congregation. Even in town life was rather drab a century ago. In the country it was as miserable as isolation, superstition, ignorance, bad roads and darkness could make it. People read little because they had no decent light to read by. It is a marvelous fact that the art of lighting dwelling-houses scarcely advanced at all from the time of the Pharaohs to the discovery of kerosene. The ancients used lamps with the wick floating in oil. Our immediate ancestors used candles, which were hardly better. The perfection of a cheap and hygienic domestic illuminant has done as much as anything else to make us all readers and develop that cast of mind which is called "the scientific spirit." Naturally, as soon as people began to read they began to think and criticize. Even novels produce that effect unless the reader's mind is hopelessly mushy to begin with.

Isolation was no doubt a worse evil than darkness to country people a century ago. Those who lived on river banks were enviable, because they could get about in boats. Those who depended on roads were prisoners the greater part of the year. The nearest neighbor was hundreds of miles distant by our standards. The sick often died merely because it was impossible to go for the doctor. Social life was out of the question except in the pleasant months or when there was sleighing. The rural telephone has done a great deal to better conditions in this respect. Good country roads are doing more. There were no railroads 100 years ago. When they came and with them the great urban industries which depend on steam power, it was as if the gates of Tophet had swung wide and the rural population hastened to flee from their torments to the kindly city. To them, contrasted with the life they had been leading, the city was like heaven. Now that its infernal aspects have made themselves visible, the population begins to look longingly back to the land and, under modern conditions, country life has infinitely less gloom and immeasurably more possibilities of happiness than it had a hundred years ago.

In anticipation that the required number of states will have ratified the income tax amendment to the Constitution before the end of January, the Democrats are said to contemplate the passage, at the session of Congress which opens in December, of an income tax bill. This tax is designed to take the place of both the present corporation tax and of the excise tax which passed the House at the last session, and to raise enough revenue to compensate for any tariff reductions which may be made. As the details of the bill are likely to cause prolonged controversy, it is not easy to see how it can be passed at a session limited to three months with the Senate so nearly tied.

Oregon may or may not have one of its citizens a member of Wilson's Cabinet, but if that honor comes to her it will probably be W. R. King rather than Joseph N. Teal. The horse editor does not pretend to great political foresight, but for once will back his guess that if either King or Teal gets the place it will not be the latter. The Oregonian to the contrary notwithstanding.—Salem Capital Journal.

This paper has been so busy trying to fix things with the new Salem administration to the satisfaction of the Salem saloons that it has no time to look into the facts about any political matter, even if it had the inclination to state them. The Oregonian has nowhere said that Mr. Teal will be appointed Secretary of the Interior. It has said that he should be appointed.

A syndicate of Chicago crooks cleaned up $500,000 in two years. There are syndicates of Chicago crooks that clean up more than that, but they masquerade in a cloak of respectability and are not molested by the police.

American troops, with blank ammunition, are engaged in driving elk back into a Montana reserve. Under the American military policy that is precisely the sort of service our troops are best fitted for.

Effort to start a movement for a giftless Christmas after holiday stocks are on display is reprehensible. The proper time is following New Year's, when all are "broke."

Harvard pays her football coach $10,000 a year. Now, aren't those mere professors of philosophy and psychology and such sorry they studied so hard?

Treatment readily suggests itself for the humane Frenchman who killed his wife to end her sufferings. Hang him to end his grief at the bereavement.

England and Germany lay virtuous claim to being deeply interested in securing peace. Securing the pieces probably comes nearer the truth.

We are beginning to suspect that the authorities ought really to have confined their efforts to saving Johnson from the Cameron girl.

We shall be interested in noting the overwhelming number of "original suffragists" among the male politicians next campaign time.

With peace in prospect between Turkey and the Balkans, work for the war correspondents is promised by Austria and Servia.

Ten dollars a word having been fixed as the penalty for mashers, pantomime probably will become popular in mashing circles.

Success in life depends upon the choice of a wife, says a University of Illinois professor. Zantippe, for example.

Blanche Bates' husband says she need not quit the stage. Perhaps he has his eye on a job as advance man.

It was only to be expected that one of the world's biggest navies would beat the smallest army at football.

Fifty thousand a year is not enough, says a New York society matron. She must be an atrocious bridge player.

Just as Turkey was beginning to put a little confidence in her army, two whole divisions surrender.

Watches on dancing slippers are the latest wrinkle. Enables the dancers to keep time, no doubt.

"Bold Jack" Rose, out of jail, says he doesn't want police protection. Can't afford it, perhaps.

Turkey soup today, and Thanksgiving will sink into the realm of memories.

Los Angeles pugilists have formed a union. We can foresee many strikes ahead.

New York gangsters are headed this way. What have we done to deserve this?

Trouser skirts are now predicated as a certainty. For which sex?

Harry Lehr has gone to London, and says it is for good. Good.

To fine mashers is not enough. Let them mash rock.

Once again—shop early.

Scraps and Jingles

Leone Cass Baer.

See that Corbett is compiling an autobiography. Collecting data from his scrap-books, I reckon.

* * *

Headlinishly I read "Women Fit for Men." I think the word should be fought—fit isn't good English.

* * *

I put it to you sisters—do you think you'd care to be a "plain-clothes" officer?

* * *

The woman who smokes
No need invokes
Against any, or all, who attack her.
For it is plain
They'd help in vain.
She has one good friend to-back-'er.

* * *

Statistics prove that most centenarians die orphans.

* * *

Missprint in newspaper account of English Duke's engagement to American heiress refers to her as his financee. Which seems an excellent pocketbook word for a betrothed heiress.

* * *

Speaking of marriages, which they do occasionally in newspapers, even in the alleged funny column, I note the wedding of Mr. Bennie G. Marks and Miss Lena Dyke Down. The headline reads: Mark-Downe.

* * *

"Close-fitting skirts to be satin," yells a fashion headline. Well some of 'em can't be with comfort.

* * *

You can always tell a self-willed woman by her husband.

* * *

Also you can sometimes tell her by her lack of one.

* * *

Extract from a contemporary editorial says, "We must protest with all our power against the degrading and disgusting spectacle of the recent prize-fight, full and late details of which will be found in our sporting edition."

* * *

See where all the crowned heads are bobbing because Princess Louise of Saxony has written a book—her secret memoirs. They think its circulation will be liable to lower royalty in the eyes of the public. Not in the eyes of the American public. It can't be did.

* * *

Suggested New Version.

Dirty days has November,
April, March, May, December,
And all the rest are dirty too.

* * *

An advertised feature of a new motor car is its absolute noiselessness. People in the neighborhood of one won't know it until they wake up in the hospital.

* * *

Elinor Glyn has a new novel in process of making which she says is to be called "The Man Who Sowed." Of course he was married. The single ones have theirs sewed at the tailor's.

* * *

Also it suggests as titles for sequels: "The Woman Who Stitched" or "The Crowd That Gathered" or "The Egg That Shirred" or "The Lover Who Seemed," etc.

* * *

Miss Calamity Step-and-fetch-it the erudite and acutely literary lady of the Willamette Valley has put a pretty thought into poetry. It is on Germs and other dangers. She says she feels as if called upon to do it since she is of German descent and has it, in a way, in her blood. She calls this one

O Do Be Careful.

We little know the risks we run,
The danger is real frightful,
At home, abroad, or elsewhere—
Of germs all things are quite full.

They'd float about on every side,
All papers scream a warning.
They'd scare me stiff from 5 o'clock
When I get up each morning.

The brush, the comb, the wash tray too,
E'en soap holds fat bacillus.
The letters that the postman brings
Hold bacteria 'nough to kill us.

At meals, it seems, we overeat—
Ain't that a grand suggestion?
And heels too high or skirts too tight
Will give one indigestion.

Wear hats, and lose your hair, they say
The disease has germs contagious,
And when we eat we must not think
Or brain fag soon will age us.

Cucumbers, oysters, rats and veils
And collars high bring on a panic.
The coffee, too, and cigarettes
Give off poisons inorganic.

All day these warnings shriek at me,
And no doubt they're meant in kindness.
But now, some fool's discovered that
To read in bed will bring on blindness!!!

PATRONS COMPLAIN OF SERVICE

Commuters on Oregon Electric Charge Discrimination Against Them.

PORTLAND, Nov. 28.—(To the Editor.)—Residents of the outskirts of Portland along the line of the Oregon Electric, after many appeals to the State Railway Commission and the officials of the company, see no recourse but an appeal to the press to force a living condition of the service on that line.

This company holds right of way along some miles of streets, worth millions of dollars. A reasonable assumption is that it undertakes in return some of the obligations of a city traction service. On that assumption Portland wage-earners have built hundreds of homes along the line, inside the city limits and as far out as Garden Home.

Now the company has seen fit to transform its line into a trunk road, and for every bit of service beyond Salem, has deprived the suburban patrons of just that much. As an instance, the Eugene Limited goes out at 6:10, followed five minutes later by a local train carrying, on the average, 100 tired and hungry wage-earners. The limited goes straight through, and in doing so delays a Garden Home local coming toward the city with an average of less than a dozen passengers. To let this train in, the hungry hundred are held every night from 10 to 30 minutes. Last night this train left the city nearly 45 minutes behind time. This is not an occasional delay, but an invariable one.

Add to this the fact that this train, "in order to allow for delays," is given 22 minutes between North Bank and Jefferson street, where ten minutes used to be the rule, and you can see why residents inside the city limits who formrly left their offices and reached home in 30 minutes now are fortunate if they do it in an hour.

This letter is written at the instance of five business and professional men whose time has been wasted and property depreciated by these conditions and who feel that they have exhausted every other means before appealing to the press. The railroad company can have their names and 100 more, if it wants them. They are on a petition in its office now.

Linking Eugene and Portland is fine for both, but more important to Portland is the serving of the thousands who do their work and spend all their money within her limits.

COMMUTER.

Signs of the Football Season.

Chicago Tribune.

Football Athlete (in a towering rage)—What's become of my moleskin pants?

His Mother—Now, Everard, there's no use of your raising a fuss. We had to cut them up to make a jacket for your sister.