LETTERS FROM VOTERS GIVE VIEWS ON PENDING ISSUES

Proposed Amendments and Various Initiative Measures to Be Decided at Polls in November Are Discussed From Different Angles by Oregonian Readers.

Recent Fatal Auto Crash Used as "Dry" Appeal.

Harry P. Coffin Says Accident Which Cost Three Lives Should Be Incentive to Vote for Prohibition.

PORTLAND, Oct. 6.—(To the Editor.)—Nothing in the past two years, since the organization of the automobile traffic squad, has been so forcefully and tragically portrayed to our community, than the preventable automobile accident recently on the East Side, in which three men lost their lives and one, at this writing, is hovering between life and death in the hospital.

Whisky did it—that's all.

But what a sad consummation. Three, possibly four homes are forever saddened, and the heart of a mother is throbbing this night, because her boy has been jailed, all on account of a curse that has sent many a good man down into the deeps of despair.

Liquor has no place in an automobile. It is prima facie evidence of incompetency to operate the same. It eclipses the "safety first" principle in the mind of the driver, it creates a temptation, which if indulged in, is sure to bring on disastrous results. In the words of our beloved jurist, Henry McGinn: "Any man who drinks booze and drives an automobile, is driving a murderous weapon and cannot expect any mercy at my hands."

Why place this temptation before the motorist or the man in a like position which requires a clear and level head? It is so necessary for a man running an auto, an engineer guiding the train or the pilot steering the boat, to have his faculties unimpaired—keen as nature endowed him, rather than dimmed by the use of alcoholic stimulants.

From time to time, we hear a voice raised in defense of personal liberty. How far should personal liberty go? Should we extend personal liberty to this class of men who are unable to exercise this privilege lawfully? If the whisky-user, himself, was the only one to suffer, that in itself would be an army of slaves of the liquor evil, but when you consider the numbers involved who are deprived of their rights of personal liberty by drunken husbands and fathers who spend their lives in hovels with less comfort than the inmates of our penitentiaries, whose wives and children crouch with fear when they hear the footsteps of the one to whom they should be able to look for protection, what about the personal liberty of this large class?

Elimination of this evil is in the hands of our citizens. It should be an appeal to all to do everything within their power to remove this blot from the fair name of our state, by exercising the right given them through the medium of the polls, in wiping out for all time this traffic in liquor, thus giving us true personal liberty and assisting materially in making our pathways and roadways safe.

HARRY P. COFFIN.

Change of Legislature Plan Suggested.

W. L. Jackson, of Eugene, Would Have One House Elected at Large and the Other by Districts as Economic Procedure.

EUGENE, Or., Oct. 15.—(To the Editor.)—I can see little present use of abolishing the State Senate except as such abolition would lead the way to some other improvement or substitution in the framework of the state government as regards legislative matters.

The main trouble with the Legislature is a lack of responsibility or what seems to be the same to the people who name the Legislature. This was getting so bad as to cause the partial substitution of the referendum and initiative for the Legislature. There are some evidences of good results, but the new system shows signs of going to seed, and may do so after a lapse of time due to causes not necessary to mention here.

Many processes have to run a certain course before their effects, benefits or uses can be seen or appreciated. I believe the people, however, or a certain portion of them, are seeking enlightenment and are willing to adopt or discard measures and methods as they find them useful or otherwise.

While the State Senate seems to many a redundant institution, it has possibly a few qualifying effects. The trouble with it, as with the House, is that its members while legislating for the state as a whole are elected from districts in the state, and so are subjected to the temptation to make personal benefit the desideratum by working for the interests of the districts they represent, instead of the state as a whole, for which they are supposed to act. If they were elected on a general ticket or by the state as a whole this temptation would be largely, if not entirely, done away with. There is no reason why it would not be as democratic a system as the present one. The people would have the say as regards the men they send there, whether on a general state or local vote, especially with modern methods of communicating intelligence and information. At least one House, and that perhaps the Senate, should be elected that way. And the Senate being the smaller, would be the body for it. This would cut out or shut off a large part of the log-rolling or trading off on bills, especially where money is expended, and a large part, if not all, the state's business involves the expenditure of money to conduct it or put it into effect. It would be better possibly to have both Houses elected the way indicated, but as a trial perhaps the one House would do for a while (one elected by general vote and the other by districts). As time went on perhaps it would be found as well or better to apply it to both Houses, and possibly it might be found to work so well that one House could be dispensed with to the consequent saving of state funds and reducing of complications attending the present system and resultant simplifying of state affairs and purging of undesirable elements from them.

W. L. JACKSON.

Woman Fights Prohibition as Drunk Breeder.

May Griffiths Declares Repeal of Law by Other States Should Suffice to Warn Oregon Against Its Adoption.

PORTLAND, Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—A writer in The Oregonian last Sunday speaking of his son, says:

"If prohibition prevails in Oregon, the chances for him to become a drunkard is decreased a thousand times."

If the gentleman who made the assertion knew anything about the results of prohibition he would hardly have ventured on such dangerous ground.

"Decreased the chances of a boy's becoming a drunkard a thousand times!"

Think of it! Then that is why Vermont repealed prohibition after 53 years' trial.

They wanted their boys to get drunk. New Hampshire, and other highly moral state, also repealed prohibition after 48 years' trial because they wanted a thousand boys to get drunk where one had gotten drunk before.

That is why in Massachusetts after that state had tried prohibition for 22 years that the successful fight to repeal the law was led by such men as Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, President Eliot, of Harvard, and ex-Governor Andrews, Massachusetts' great war Governor.

Such men as these would, of course, be against a law that kept boys from becoming drunkards. These men had seen the workings of prohibition; with them it was not a theory that they wanted to get rid of or adopt, but a condition that was breeding drunkards, hypocrites and lawbreakers.

It certainly does seem strange that in spite of prohibition's ugly history, men can still be found who will make such wild assertions about the good that it would accomplish. If it had ever accomplished any good, it never would have been repealed in a single state; yet we have before us the spectacle of a law being advocated for Oregon that has been repealed in other states because the test of experience has proved it a fraud and a farce.

How many men can expect good results from a law of this kind is incomprehensible; many reasons must lead to this conclusion if considered without prejudice; but Abraham Lincoln gave the real reason in his speech before the Springfield Washingtonian Temperance Society when he said:

"It is not much in the nature of man to be driven to anything; still less to be driven about that which is exclusively his own business."

Prohibition is an attempt to drive, and to be driven is contrary to human nature.

Is it any wonder that this law has proved a failure?

Does Oregon want to experiment with a law that has been repudiated as often as this one?

Men and women of Oregon, you, each and everyone of you, know that you cannot be driven about that which you consider "exclusively your own business," therefore it would seem that common sense would lead everyone to conclude that the other fellow felt the same. In which case there would be mighty few Prohibition votes.

MAY GRIFFITHS.

Mrs. Duniway Makes Plea for Common Schools.

Necessity for Carefully-Trained Teachers and Need of Southern Oregon Normal Cited to Help Children.

PORTLAND, Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—There is no line of endeavor to which one has or can lend his influence, however small, with a greater sense of satisfaction than that of aiding in the educational uplift of our people. As Horace Mann has said, "In this country and in our times, no man is worthy of the honored name of statesman who does not include the highest practical education for the people in all his plans of administration."

Each of our educational institutions has its circle of devoted friends, but we can all join on the mutual ground of devotion to our common school system. It is the foundation upon which all schools of higher education must rest. Look over the states of our Union, yes, the nations of the world, and where you find a devotion to higher ideals and a general ambition for the opportunities of higher education, you find a well-developed common school system.

And especially should our common schools interest all of us, because of the unfortunate fact that many of our children find it impossible to take advantage of educational opportunities beyond this school. All of the training they receive for citizenship and usefulness to their fellow beings must be obtained there.

How important it is, then, that these schools should have the best to give the children attending them. This state spends over $5,000,000 annually on its common schools. Do our taxpayers get a fair return for this money? Assuredly not.

The secret of the efficient school lies in the teacher. As is the teacher, so is the school. Putting the children under teachers untrained, incompetent and inefficient is to deprive them of an unquestionable right during the time when their entire futures will be determined.

These thoughts result from a consideration of the effort to reopen the Southern Oregon State Normal School at Ashland. The people of Southern Oregon need this school that their children may be under trainers who know how to train. From a single standpoint of economy, then, our common schools should be in the hands of trained teachers.

I hope that the good people of Oregon, and especially of our section of the state, where educational advantages are bountifully offered, will help to give our fellow citizens of Southern Oregon this school—so richly deserved.

ABIGAIL SCOTT DUNIWAY.

Aid Western Teachers to Normal School Asked.

Former Resident of "Cow Country" Tells Oregon Need Likely to Be Overlooked Among Many Measures.

MARSHFIELD, Or., Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—I am glad to be able to testify that the effort to reopen the Southern Oregon Normal School is not local to Ashland nor Jackson County—it appeals to every section of the state where schools are suffering for the lack of trained teachers.

The art of teaching correctly is, by nature, only conferred on a few; the great majority must learn from the experience of others. In teaching, as in other trades and professions, the best work is performed by those especially trained for the performance of that duty. The shameful fact is that Oregon parents pay less attention to the qualifications of those persons into whose hands they place the moulding of their futures than do their gardeners, dressmakers or barbers.

The taxpayers watch the expenditure of their public funds in road building and salary accounts with keen interest, but do they insist that the $5,000,000, and more, that is spent annually in Oregon on our common schools shall be economically handled though teachers who know their business? If not, is not a large part of that money wasted?

I appeal for the Southern Oregon Normal School to put trained, competent teachers into our common schools on the stand of economy. Anything less is rank extravagance.

Today it is necessary to send to other states for a sufficient number of trained teachers. Why do this and allow the children of other states take the place which rightfully belongs to our own? The raw material in Oregon, for this business, is as good as any in the world. What we need is more training schools to keep pace with the wonderful development that is taking place in this rapidly growing State of Oregon.

H. M. SHAW, M. D.

Criticism Made of Consolidation Amendment.

Arrangement for Forming New County Out of Remnant or Ceding Area to Others Thought Impracticable.

PORTLAND, Oct. 17.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian last Sunday was a list of the measures appearing on the ballot to be voted on at the forthcoming election, in which you made recommendations to the voters. I observe you advised that No. 304 be approved. Surely your conclusion must have been reached hastily, occasioned, no doubt, by the pressing demands on your time.

The amendment is intended to promote efficiency and reduce expense of government by permitting consolidation of city and county government under certain conditions, the real purpose being to consolidate the governments of Multnomah County and the City of Portland. This is deemed by many to be a very wise move, as it is thought it would reduce our expense of management probably one-fourth to one-third.

In the proposed amendment the present constitutional provision is quoted, to which is added the following proviso:

Provided, however, that in any county containing an incorporated city having more than 100,000 inhabitants, the legislative assembly, or the people by the initiative, may provide for the establishment of a new county with its boundaries coterminus and coextensive with the boundaries of such city and for a consolidation of the county and city governments in such county and city, and also for the creation of a new county out of that portion of the old county lying outside of the boundaries of such incorporated city or for the annexation of such outside territory to adjoining counties.

The limitation placed in the act authorizing the creation of the new county, that its boundaries shall be "coterminus and coextensive with the boundaries of such city," surely restricts the new county's limits forever to the present limits of the City of Portland, except by further special legislative enactment they be enlarged. This is certainly contrary to common sense. Then, too, the provision for the "creation of a new county out of that portion of the old county lying outside of the boundaries of such city" (the present City of Portland), would result in the new county and City of Portland being wholly surrounded by and contained in the other new county (the present Multnomah County, less the territory of the present City of Portland), unless the other provisions of the law were availed of and the remaining portion of what is now Multnomah County, instead of being made into a new county, should be attached to either Hood River, Clackamas, Washington or Columbia County, or that it be divided up among them. What a preposterous condition. When the city increased in size (as it surely must) it would present the spectacle of one county's residents actually living in another county; one county overlapping the territory of another county; the county seat of one county being partially located in another county.

This measure won't do as it is presented. I believe, upon further reflection, you will change your recommendation and urge that it be defeated, so that the next Legislature may offer an amendment which will really permit the desired change being made and yet allow the city to grow without having to go to the Legislature or resort to the initiative every time it is thought desirable to attach a new addition to the city.

C. W. HODSON.

This communication seems to call for a reply. The Oregonian directs attention to the amendment No. 314-315, on which it also advised an affirmative vote. This amendment authorizes enactment of a method, now lacking, for merging adjoining cities. Existing law provides a plan for extending city limits into unincorporated territory. If the amendment Mr. Hodson criticises is passed, No. 314-315 should also pass. Consolidation of county and city governments must be approached carefully and, of course, a preliminary extension of the city boundaries would be essential. That preliminary seemes to us entirely feasible if merging of other towns is possible. If the two amendments carry the consolidation of city and county governments will be practicable.

Bill Aimed at Desert Land Board Called Sly.

A. W. Trow Declares Measure Is Spiteful and Abolition of Body Now Would Create Chaos.

ONTARIO, Or., Oct. 15.—(To the Editor.)—When great numbers of men are out of employment and without the necessary money or credit to establish themselves upon a farm, it appears astounding that anyone should advocate the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy announced in the bill to abolish the Desert Land Board.

This bill wrecks the entire system of water laws, which are now doing great service for the development of the arid lands of Eastern Oregon, and which system, if continued, will afford employment to thousands of men in Western Oregon through industries to utilize the wasting water powers of that section. This bill should be overwhelmingly defeated. Vote 347 X No.

This bill is clearly directed against the State Engineer, who has been doing valiant service for the development of Oregon. He is to be legislated out of office and another engineer in, at an increased salary. It looked to me like a partisan measure, as I am informed the man to be legislated into office is a Democrat, having switched recently from the Republican party. If this is not a partisan measure in disguise, then why was not the new engineer left, as at present, to the selection of the people? It designates the project engineer of the Tumalo project. Who is he? What are his qualifications for leadership in framing comprehensive laws for the development of our streams? Until such laws are placed upon our statute book, this Tumalo project is the last that will ever be undertaken by the people of Oregon. The plan is wrong. We need constructive statesmanship of the highest order at the present time. We cannot undertake vast internal improvements to make happy homes for others through burdensome taxation of our present population.

Our present State Engineer, who is also a lawyer, has led Oregon to an enviable reputation among the states of the Union, and this insidious attempt to legislate him out of office should not be tolerated. He was overwhelmingly nominated at the Republican primaries. He also was indorsed by the Democratic party. Are not the people to be trusted? Is it necessary that some guardian angel protect us by initiating a sly measure where the will of the people is to be defeated by a false cry of economy?

Many of us believe that this is purely a spite measure, back of which we see the skilful hand of the great corporations, and enemies of the public welfare.

That the present State Engineer has made enemies is admitted. We read in the public press where he persistently refuses to accept canal systems until the defects are cured and settlers protected. I know of cases where he has turned down promoters who were trying to deceive settlers with their wildcat schemes. The water code has been attacked in the courts by enemies of the system of water titles for which he stands. I have indirect information in which I have confidence, that one of the great speculative land corporations of Eastern Oregon is backing this bill in the hope that through the change in administration it may obtain an administrative officer opposed to the present system, which is giving entire satisfaction.

In Malheur Valley we are in the midst of an adjudication of water rights which will revive development in the entire district. Through topographic maps and river surveys of the State Engineer, a new and most ingenious plan for irrigating the valley has been devised. To disrupt this work at this time will result in unending delay and chaos. This work is in the interest of the small man. The proposed measure is in the interest of great corporations, who oppose the present system and desire a return to the old order where the small man is left to face single-handed an unequal fight in the courts against such corporations.

If this measure carries, the most severe blow to water power and irrigation development in the interest of the people will have been struck. If Western Oregon fastens this curse upon us by the vote of those who, because of its complexity, do not understand the situation, it will afford good grounds for the diversion of the state. We do not oppose water power development in Western Oregon, but we must have irrigation over the mountains. Vote 347 X No.

A. W. TROW.

Proposed Tax Levy for Projects Is Fought.

J. H. Moores Warns Voters to Scan Carefully Before Measure Is Approved, Recalling Past Failures of Enterprises.

NEWBERG, Or., Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—I am glad an opportunity has been given the voters of Oregon to discuss certain proposed measures and amendments through the columns of The Oregonian which they will be called upon to decide on November 3.

Taking advantage of your invitation, I desire to call the attention of the voters to amendment No. 306 and 307 on the official ballot.

It appears to me by a study of this proposed amendment funds are sought to enable the state to build roads; to carry forward irrigation projects and the development of untilled lands. It is proposed to raise this money by a direct levy upon all assessable property in the state to the tune of 4 per cent.

In view of past efforts by private concerns, the state and Federal governments (whose methods I will not take the time to discuss) for the reclamation by irrigation of vast tracts of arid and semi-arid lands within the state, I fail to discover wherein any large amount of success has attended their efforts, but, in the main, an unfavorable state of affairs obtains by following out a system of guesswork which has caused the people of Oregon to look upon any proposed measures for the carrying forward of these projects with a large amount of distrust. It is yet to be demonstrated satisfactorily to the people of Oregon that any of the methods adopted and put into operation by private concerns or other sources will work out successfully.

Why, then, burden the taxpayers, when their burden is already top-heavy, to create a fund for the furtherance of these plans which in the main have failed?

It puts into the hands of a commissioner or board (call it by what name you may) the right to use the money obtained by the adoption of this amendment to further indulge their propensity for experimenting. It occurs to me that bringing this matter before the people of Oregon at this time is premature and unwise and should by all means be defeated. Let it first be demonstrated that there is a practical method by which undoubted success may be secured and I am certain the people of Oregon would be willing and ready to respond.

It also would put into the hands of some unscrupulous politicians the means to further their schemes. Farmers would have dreams of marvelous crops and a canal would be dug about his potato patch, and the would-be politician, ever solicitous for the welfare of the poor, abused farmer, would assure him of the means to carry out his desire if he be elected.

Neither let the voters be misled by the nicely arranged and seemingly plausible argument of supporters of this measure to further the success of this proposed amendment. Others before them have had their "pipe dreams" and visions of indescribable loveliness. But, first and last, let the voters insist upon a practical demonstration of the ability of those intrusted with the business of carrying forward these projects before voting to give them the money to spend on some so-called enterprise or experiments.

J. H. MOORES.

Too Many Nominees for Judiciary Feared.

"Non-Partisan" Plan Would Mean Selection by Small Per Cent of Votes, It Is Argued.

PORTLAND, Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—I feel impelled to warn the voters to beat the "non-partisan judiciary bill" No. 324-325. By title and theory this bill looks rather attractive, but will not work out in practice. to give the office to a deserving candidate, because under such a system of nomination, every Tom, Dick and Harry will have petition chasers running around to the disgust of the people, and it is safe to say the votes would be divided up among about 30 or 40 candidates for each place to be filled. As only a plurality of votes is necessary to elect, we can see by how small a per cent of votes a judge would be elected. In this day, officers should be elected by "majority" and not mere plurality of votes. Non-partisan elections would be highly satisfactory if the three-choice preferential ballot be used and in no case more than four or five candidates run for one office.

Then there is a good chance for a majority vote for one.

Here is one great fault with the provision of our city charter, where the great waste of votes has been already demonstrated. Then this petition circulating is absolutely bewildering. All petitions and also the registration books should be open at each city water pay-station for the accommodation of voters. And the number of self-nominated candidates limited by some means to, say five. Not before, dare we venture the self-nominating system.

C. A. REICHEN.

Old Settler Sees Plot in Desert Land Board Act.

A. O. Walker, of Alfalfa, Or., Declares Enemies Would Abolish Present Model Water-Control System for Former Plan, Which Failed.

ALFALFA, Or., Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—Failure to profit by past experiences is apparent on the part of the framers of the bill to abolish the Desert Land Board. This bill should be defeated on the ground that it proposes to return to the old system, which has been tried and which failed. Furthermore, no economy is apparent, and efficiency will be sacrificed.

As one of the oldest settlers under the state Carey act project in the Deschutes Valley, I wish most emphatically to protest against the adoption of this measure. It is clearly reactionary, and embodies no new principle to insure success. It disrupts many branches of work essential to the development of the irrigated sections of the state.

The State Land Board in its 1907 report admits that mistakes were made. it assumed that the United States was looking after the details of reclamation and accordingly executed many contracts prepared by promoters without adequate safeguards as to settlers' rights.

It says further:

Mr. John H. Lewis, of Portland, was recommended and appointed State Engineer, and his knowledge of irrigation matters has made him a valuable adviser of the board, and it is to be regretted that the law accepting the Carey grant did not provide for the appointment of a State Engineer, as it would have saved a vast amount of trouble and some mistakes.

This report further urges that the State Engineer and Attorney-General be added to the Board, as their problems are mostly engineering and legal in nature. The Legislature acted upon these recommendations, calling the new Commission the Desert Land Board.

The 1913 report of this Board, signed by Governor West as chairman, says that "the Board has been very successful in its efforts to readjust the early mistakes."

Now we are asked to remove the Attorney-General and State Engineer from this Board on the ground of economy. This can only be a blind for some other motive, as neither officer removed receives additional salary for serving on such Board. The State Engineer has persistently fought for the protection of settlers' rights. He has incurred bitter enmity by calling attention to the great seepage losses and inadequacies in the canal systems. His protests are on record for the guidance of settlers. Governor West frequently comes rushing into print with the statement that "We want something practical from the State Engineer, and not so many reports and investigations."

If investigations which show the physical condition and seepage losses of an irrigation system are not "practical," as a settler who is up against the conditions, I would like Governor West to suggest something that is practical.

Were it not for the investigations of the State Engineer, who would know that half of the water diverted from the river under some of these irrigation systems never reaches the land for which it is intended?

If the State Engineer is removed from this Board and made an appointee of the remaining members, his independence of action would be completely removed.

Companies could then probably succeed in forcing the state to accept an inadequate canal system, greatly to the detriment if not the financial ruin of hundreds of settlers.

The enemies of our model system of water control are apparently back of this bill, which should be overwhelmingly defeated. Vote 347 X No!

A. O. WALKER.

Eight-Hour Measure Called Freak by Writer.

Carpenter Wonders Why Officers Would Be Allowed to Stop Him in Doing Good Turn if His Day Had Expired.

CORVALLIS, Or., Oct. 16. — (To the Editor.)—I have seen a good deal of argument "pro and con" lately about the proposed eight-hour law we are to vote on this coming election and have concluded to add my opinion through your paper, which I take regularly. I am a working man—a carpenter—and will say that so far as certain trades and occupations are concerned an eight-hour schedule might work to good advantage under certain conditions, but the framers of this bill evidently did not stop to think what a complicated state of affairs their law would bring about if enforced, even with carpenters.

For instance, if I were putting a new roof on a house and it were threatening rain and an extra hour's work would make the job complete, and so protect the family and their goods from a drenching, whose business is it if I work nine or even ten hours and finish my job and save the family a great deal of discomfort? According to the way the freak bill reads I would lay myself liable to a fine and the man hiring me would also come in for a fine for letting me work overtime, willing as I might be to accommodate him and protect him from the elements.

As to the farmer's viewpoint, there has already been quite a great deal said of the hardships he would suffer, and I, having farmed some in the past, readily can see where he would land with his work. Why can't we let well enough alone and let people make such agreements as are suitable to the work in hand without letting the officers of the law butt in where they are not wanted?

If the measure should pass I think I'll search the map for a free state and go there (if I can get in time enough to earn the money to move with). A working man has a hard enough lot now to live, without scheming some way of fining him if he does get a job and shows a willingness to work overtime if conditions demand it. Yours truly,

A CARPENTER.

Woman Defends Death Sentence for Criminal.

Negro's Atrocities Blamed to Masquerading Whites, Who Are Anxious to Rid Themselves of Foes.

PORTLAND, Oct. 18.—(To the Editor.)—In The Oregonian last Sunday I read an article written by A. W. Miller, 6877 Fifty-ninth avenue Southeast, wherein he set forth his argument why the proposed amendment for the abolishment of capital punishment should not be repealed. On this point we agree, for I believe that in no other way can the people be safe from the atrocities of the criminal.

But the argument set forth by Mr. Miller wherein he uses the negro and his crimes as a reason for not abolishing capital punishment shows that he knows little, if anything, about what he is trying to write. Admitting that the negro was accused of many crimes, and also that a number of them were lynched and burned at the stake, but in most cases after the accused had been lynched or burned investigation disclosed the fact that the guilty one was a white man who had masked to resemble a negro.

Still other cases where some prejudiced white man, desiring to rid the community of a certain negro, would have some of his women folk to accuse the negro of an attempted assault upon them to furnish pretext on which to punish the negro. This in itself is a strong argument why capital punishment should not be abolished, but should be more impartially enforced, for if those white men had believed that they would have received the same punishment that they gave the negroes they never would have resorted to their unlawful act.

Further, during the Civil War and the reconstruction period, when the white women and children were at the mercy of the "black brute," as Mr. Miller wishes to term them, when the white father and brother were at the front fighting to retain slavery, history fails to record a single instance where the black man was guilty of committing a criminal assault upon a white woman or child.

If lynching and burning had been equally meted out to the lustful and immoral man before and during that period, I'd like to ask, how many white men of the South would be left to tell the tale? For proof I refer you to the numerous mulattoes and mixed people throughout the country.

By all means, I say, do not abolish capital punishment, but extend it so that it will reach out and get the fellow who dares to take advantage of innocent girls 12 and 14 years old and with promises of money and fineries ruin their lives forever.

Just here I wish to say to Mr. Miller that his argument is far-fetched and places him in the class with Ben Tillman, Vardaman and Blease.

MRS. EDWARD D. CANNADY,
520 East Twenty-sixth street North.

Defense Raised on Behalf of the Liquor Dealers.

They Should Not Be Held Responsible for Acts of Lawless Minority.

PORTLAND, Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—"The prohibition constitution amendment presents a question which each person can decide for himself."

That statement, copied from the issue of The Oregonian of recent date, is the clearest and most convincing declaration that I have read during the present campaign to make Oregon a dry state.

Each person can not only decide the prohibition constitutional amendment for himself, but also the entire liquor problem for himself. What a marvelous power each individual possesses. If one elects to be a total abstainer he becomes practically immune from any of the real or fancied evils resulting from the liquor traffic; if one prefers his glass of beer, his soothing pipe and the companionship of congenial souls, why should he be forced to resist an amendment of the organic law of the state in order to retain the privilege.

Life is dynamic; the prohibitionist is static. Life is not only one emphatic thing after another, but it is also a series of striking contrasts. The total abstainer contrasts himself with the sot. The difference is great and the abstainer swells with conscious pride as he contemplates the wide gulf between them. Every sot is an object lesson to a thousand abstainers and the sot affords them the keenest mental pleasure by the contrast. Eliminate the sot and there will no longer be any virtue in the abstainer's self denial.

The prohi. charges the liquor dealer with being a persistent law breaker. If there is a larger percentage of law breakers among liquor dealers than among those following other pursuits, it is because the liquor dealers are the victims of the law makers. The laws regulating the liquor traffic are so numerous and, most of them, so unreasonable, that it is not surprising that infractions are frequent. Decent liquor dealers do not invite clashes with the authorities. They should not be held responsible for the acts of a lawless minority. There is a law-defying minority in every trade and in every profession.

In conclusion permit me to say that in my humble opinion the continued undermining of the business structure of this great country during recent years by a horde of muckrakers, uplifters, single-taxers and prohibitionists, actively assisted by a National Democratic misrule has brought this great Nation to the brink of destruction. The prohibitionist is the most active in his efforts to administer the final kick that will hurl the Nation down to industrial and financial chaos.

W. P. ADAMS.

Chaos Predicted if Minority Is Let Rule.

Compromises Would Result With No One Satisfied, Says Brownsville Resident.

BROWNSVILLE, Or., Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—The minority representation plan introduces a theory somewhat novel or what would have been so considered a few years ago in American form of government customary here. Under a representative government the majority is supposed to dominate or rule any particular question or person voted for. This seems absolutely essential to come to a decision of any kind, on any particular matter at issue. If a majority vote were not taken it stands to reason there would be no decision or outcome one way or the other, since if the minority, for instance, or any small number less than the majority, were allowed to decide the issue, the majority not represented or ignored would not be satisfied on account of force of numbers alone and the ensuing influence of said numbers, but would put in a decided kick at said minority decision at every turn and sometimes troublesome and even bloody kicks at that, as has sometimes come to pass in history or the records to those of long or handsome memory. Hence "Let the majority rule" is the only safe or practicable policy. If a Legislature, for instance, were chosen on the plan proposed with opinion as expressed by the representatives chosen completely at sea as far as any programme was concerned on many important questions, there could be no consistent action, or said action would be interrupted at frequent intervals by compromises which really represented nobody's opinion. It looks, by the way, as if the scheme mentioned is either a trick or plan of some of the opposition or discontented parties to confuse the dominant party by making it impossible, or practically so, to take effective action on many subjects, especially those connected with the political misfits or agitators now afflicting the country in some numbers. We are not referring to the Socialists or any one particular element, for there are many, but it is plain, in fact well known, who said agitators are, and that their scheme would fail in time if thoroughly understood.

DAVID HICKSON.

Prohi Leader's Own Words Used as "Wet" Argument.

H. Viereck Quotes Eugene W. Chafin as Saying "Attempt to Destroy Liquor Traffic by Law Is All Wrong."

PORTLAND, Oct. 16.—(To the Editor.)—On all public questions and movements some Moses or acknowledged leader always appears on the scene. This leader's words have been always quoted, and his or her advice and example followed in the prosecution of the cause. This is true of all the great efforts at reforms. In the religious world, as example, may be mentioned Luther, Calvin, John Wesley and Mary Baker Eddy. Politically confining ourselves to this country, our George Washington and Abraham Lincoln stand forth as valiant champions of the two great epochs in our history. So in the present day the prohibition movement has its recognized champion and leader, twice nominated as Presidential candidate by the Prohibition party. Presuming that our Prohibition friends will be glad to be guided by his advice, and so, in the belief that few of the rank and file know what he has said and advised on the subject, I desire to draw their attention briefly to a few sentences uttered by Eugene W. Chapin (twice nominated for President by the Prohibition party) at Madison, Wis., in 1912. The address was delivered at the state convention.

After saying that the liquor traffic is a great curse, which ought to be destroyed, he said, quoting his own words:

That after 70 years of the most heroic effort ever made, and at a sacrifice more costly in time, money and effort than any other cause in the world's history, we find ourselves with the liquor traffic stronger, and more thoroughly entrenched in the National Government, and more liquor consumed annually than in any previous year in our entire history. That being so, it ought to occur to good people that they may not have been using their time, money and effort in the right direction.

After giving a brief history of the great pledge movement, in which millions signed the pledge in this country and Great Britain, and which proved abortive, Mr. Chapin said that the Prohibitionists turned to the expedient of prohibiting the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages, finding expression in Prohibition laws in 24 states, of which 18 have already repealed them. Mr. Chapin then goes on to say (repeating his own words):

And that is where the people have been wrong for the past 60 years. We never can destroy the liquor traffic by law alone. Law never has destroyed and never will destroy the traffic. It is not law that destroys the liquor traffic. Law is not government; administration of the law is government, and all the people who for the past 60 years have stood for destroying the traffic by getting a prohibition law have been all wrong.

Mr. Chapin in his admirable address dwelt at great length to show that to make prohibition effective, the general Government in its executive, legislative and judicial branches must first be committed to the proposition that the liquor traffic is wrong, and not a legitimate business. To show his utter contempt for so-called prohibition laws, he said:

We don't propose to go at it wrong end to, any longer. We don't propose passing a local option or a prohibition law, or a Constitutional amendment, and getting a town dry, a county dry, or a state dry by law. There never was a more absurd plan carried on, and called a method of dealing with the liquor traffic. Had it been tried on any other great political issue except the liquor question, people would have said the men proposing it did not have sense enough to come in when they were cold. And this is why I want party Prohibitionists to cut out every such scheme.

Can it be possible that in the light of such frank and open advice by the recognized leader and standard-bearer of the Prohibition party that a majority of the electorate of this great and glorious commonwealth, this pioneer in the world of real reform, will so stultify themselves as to vote for such a vicious law as the "Anti-Saloon League" proposes? It would be too bad to place fair Oregon on the same plane and class her with unprogressive and corrupt Maine.

H. VIERECK.
1256 East Twelfth Street North.

BAD BLOOD.

Hatred of the Nations for One Another.

This European war was born of the hatred caused by earlier warfare—it will engender other wars between the same nations in the future. The sons yet unborn will carry this hatred in their blood to blaze into warfare when the spark is touched by Kings or Statesmen who are yet in infancy.

It's bad blood that makes your liver sluggish and the same bad blood causes your stomach muscles to lose their elasticity and become flabby and weak and that means indigestion.

Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery, purely vegetable and free from alcohol or narcotics, is not a secret remedy, for all its ingredients are printed on wrapper.

Take it as directed and it will search out impure and poisonous matter in the stomach, liver, bowels and kidneys and drive it from the system through the natural channels.

It will penetrate into the joints and muscles, and dissolve the poisonous accumulations. It will replace all the bad blood it drives out, with rich, pure blood full of vital force. It will furnish you with the kind of blood that increases energy and ambition, that puts the entire body in such perfect physical condition that brain or muscles know no fatigue.

It will clear the skin; eczema, pimples, rash, blotches will dry up and disappear; boils, carbuncles and other evidences of tainted blood will pass away, never to appear again.

Get Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery at any medicine dealer today, in either liquid or tablet form, as you prefer. It's the one great blood maker and purifier that all weak or run-down people ought to start to use at once. If you want good blood, good health and clear skin, get a supply today.—Adv.

A SKIN OF BEAUTY IS A JOY FOREVER

Dr. T. FELIX GOURAUD'S ORIENTAL CREAM OR MAGICAL BEAUTIFIER

Removes Tan, Pimples, Freckles, Moth Patches, Rash and Skin Diseases, and every blemish on beauty, and defies detection. It has stood the test of 66 years, and is so harmless we taste it to be sure it is properly made. Accept no counterfeit of similar name. Dr. L. A. Sayre said to a lady of the hauton (a patient): "As you ladies will use them, I recommend 'Gouraud's Cream' as the least harmful of all the skin preparations." At druggists and Department Stores.

Ferd. T. Hopkins & Son, Props., 37 Great Jones St., N.Y.C.