VARIED THOUGHT OF POPULACE IS VOICED IN OPEN LETTERS

WAR EFFECT ON LUMBER TOPIC

Discussion of Scarcity of Vessels and Rise in Rates Conducted.

PORTLAND, June 12.—(To the Editor.)—Commercial movements in the lumber industry would seem to indicate an expectation that the war, or the effects of the war, would continue well along into the Summer of 1916. Within the past month several charters have been made for next Spring loading at freight rates averaging from 100 to 130 per cent higher than was customary prior to the commencement of hostilities.

Fully 90 per cent of over-seas business is done on credit. Therefore, it naturally follows that exporters who are making freight engagements a year ahead must be closely allied with and advised by large financial interests as to the future outlook. Monetary interests, without doubt, are better versed about war conditions and the probable length of the conflict than any ruler or prime minister.

If there is any doubt in the minds of world financiers, it is extremely doubtful if their patrons would take such a hazardous gamble on the freight market one year hence. Capital is timid and conservative.

The number of steam vessels in the world available for over-seas commerce is about 6500. Great Britain has requisitioned 2500. Fully another thousand steamers can be accounted for by the German and Austrian craft interned in the ports of the enemies and neutral countries and vessels commandeered by France, Russia, Italy and Japan.

Deep-sea tonnage is governed by the law of supply and demand. Under normal conditions, previous to the war, there were just about enough vessels to handle the world's commerce, with varying conditions of slight importance. Consequently, by taking more than half of the vessels out of the world's commerce, it must follow that freight rates would advance to an unreasonable figure and create a stagnation in ports where it is necessary to dispatch cargoes.

Previous to the war the usual and customary rate on time charters, government form, was from 3 to 4 shillings per dead-weight ton capacity. In a conference with leading shipowners in Great Britain the Admiralty agreed upon a flat rate of 12 shillings and sixpence per dead-weight ton, an advance of more than 300 per cent. In other words, for illustration, previous to the war charterers were paying owners $1 per cargo ton rental per month for the use of their vessels. The English government advanced the rate to $3 per ton.

Consequently the reason is apparent for freight rates on trip charters of sailing vessels engaged in the trans-Pacific trade to advance more than 100 per cent on voyages a year from now. The charterers reason that if hostilities should cease today it would take a year before the effects of an armistice and the conclusions of a peace congress would be felt in the Pacific Ocean commerce.

With these conditions ahead of the lumber interests the next question for consideration is whether the foreign consumers of lumber in South America, Australia, Africa and the Orient can afford to pay the increased cost, and, if not, if they will resort to other means to supply the demands for our timber.

To understand better this point, it is only necessary to say that in previous years the transportation cost of lumber to Australia and the west coast of South America was approximately $10 per thousand feet, making the cost of our lumber to the consumers about $25 or $30 per thousand feet. Under present freight conditions another $10 to $13 must be added to the price, with a strong likelihood of a further advance.

The same conditions, generally speaking, apply to markets of China and Japan. The question then arises whether those countries, feeling the monetary stringency as they do, can afford to buy our lumber at the prevailing rates. The manufacturers of lumber have been told time and again in prosperous times that these markets could not stand an advance of $1 or $2, when such advance was actually necessary to avoid losses in the cost of manufacture.

This situation is of more importance to the Pacific Northwest in general and Portland in particular than any other economic question. Our principal industry is lumber. About the only attraction we have to reach out and bring in new money is lumber. One cargo of lumber shipped from this port is of more value to Portland than a dozen cargoes of wheat.

The amount of money left in Portland for a cargo of lumber, say, 4,000,000 feet, is about $60,000. Every cent of that is distributed among the loggers, the tow boat men, the sawmill employes, longshoremen and among merchants, and it all remains in and around Portland. A vessel carrying a wheat cargo valued at $300,000 leaves only $5000 in Portland for port disbursements. The remainder goes east of the mountains to the farmers, who, in making their purchases, buy direct from the Eastern markets, leaving little of the money to reach Portland or any of the Pacific Coast cities.

Of course, it must not be understood that we do not appreciate the grain shipments, but this comparison is made to show the value and importance of the lumber industry.

There are hundreds of orders floating around among the lumber mills, which are only too eager for the business, but the scarcity of deep-sea tonnage precludes their acceptance. There is no possible chance for conditions to change within a year, or until the warring nations release the commandeered vessels and permit them to return to the avenues of commercial trades.

W. J. JONES.

NEW YORK SCHOOLS DEFENDED

Former Teacher in Gotham Says Tammany Influence Is Past.

PORTLAND, June 12.—(To the Editor.)—I read with interest your editorial in The Oregonian, June 8, regarding the inefficiency of the public school system of New York City—the self-satisfied air of those directly responsible for the schools, and of Tammany's apparent control of all that concerns public education in Gotham. My reason for desiring to refute your statements is due to the fact that I was born and reared in New York City, and taught in its public schools for several years. I was a teacher in a school in one of the poorer districts. The school enrolled 2400 children, from kindergarten to eighth year. These pupils came from overcrowded tenements. 90 per cent of the parents of these children were immigrants, Russian, Greek, Sicilian, such as are commonly called the scum of Southern Europe. The remaining 10 per cent of parents were Americans, descended doubtless from the Mayflower folk, and that type of American who is still descending. This school was only one of dozens of like nature to be found in the city. Thanks to the efforts of the school system as shown by the work of principal, teachers, school doctor and school nurse, these children were being speedily changed into splendid little citizens, physically and mentally efficient. In spite of the Tammany influence cited by your paper, each principal and teacher owes his or her appointment to a rigid civil service examination. Each year, more is demanded of the teacher in regard to efficiency. Nowhere in the world will you find a corps of teachers better educated, broader minded, bigger hearted, or better equipped in every way to deal with the educational, social or physical problem represented by the average school. The problems presented by the schools of New York City cannot be compared with the problems to be considered in the schools of Gary, Ind. New Yorkers interested in educational affairs have the greatest admiration for the Gary schools and for the splendid mind which made those model schools possible. In New York City the Gary system would be practical only in a very limited number of suburban schools. Like the schools of Gary, the schools of New York City are in use all the time. After the regular session, the schools are open to the children as vocational and play centers, under the supervision of a specially trained corps of teachers. At night, lectures, evening classes, recreation centers, social or neighborhood clubs, gymnastic classes and vocational classes keep the school buildings open for the use and betterment of the public.

I, personally, am not an ardent admirer of Mr. Maxwell, nor of Tammany, (which, by the way, has had its day in the long ago, and exists now in name only). However, if Superintendent Maxwell were really self-satisfied, or if the schools were really controlled by Tammany, it would have been impossible for the schools to have accomplished their present degree of excellence.

After three years' residence here, I would not dream of criticising the Portland schools. So, I feel that no one has a right to discuss public education in Gotham unless that person has had an opportunity of studying conditions at first hand. I should not like New Yorkers to have a misconception of conditions existing in Portland, my adopted home, and I do not wish Portlandites to have a misconception of conditions in New York City. Really, Mr. Editor, some of our New York children are rather efficient, despite our inefficient school system.

L. BEE.

NO BACK TRACKING IN KANSAS

If Prohibition Is Failure There, Why Is It Not Repealed?

CORVALLIS, Or., June 11.—(To the Editor.)—Once or twice in a while some person "bobs up" with the ancient argument that prohibition in Kansas is a failure. If true, why does Kansas not repudiate it and go back to the license system? The people of Kansas, not being befuddled with booze, are above the average in intelligence and know that they are more prosperous under prohibition law.

The last Kansas Legislature is a failure in other respects beside neglecting to brace the Webb-Kenyon Federal law, as it also failed to pass needed appropriations to give initiative and referendum and various other measures that were urgently asked by the people.

If the old system of regulation which failed to regulate were satisfactory the commonwealth would not now be reaching out for prohibition.

But why seek either regulation or prohibition if liquor drinking be conducive to health, wealth and good morals? If it builds up industry, renders the drinker more efficient, elevates him intellectually and socially, goes with him to an honored grave, filled with bright hopes of blessed immortality, then by all means let us make it free, free as the fragrant dews of early morn on the sun-kissed hills of Oregon the blest. It is wrong to put a restraint on a good thing—pass it along!

But if, on the other hand, alcoholic drink is an evil which wrecks manhood, destroys homes, breaks hearts, brings disgrace upon little children, fills prisons and pauper houses and sends its victims scourged to their doom, cast into outer darkness of the wailing place, of the eternally lost, then let us join our forces to down the traffic, smash it to atoms, pulverize and cast it to the four winds.

Don't plead the excuse "It can't be done"; it must be done!

ISA WINANS JAMISON.

DEPORT AGITATORS, ADVISED

Writer Doesn't Think Native Birth Proof of Good Citizenship.

SAN FRANCISCO, June 9.—(To the Editor.)—In looking through The Oregonian I observed an article signed "Native American." The person who signed himself this laid great stress on the fact that members of his family have been native Americans for 200 years and said that "they cast their future with these colonies and the country of their adoption was their country," etc.

He fails to mention, though, that if many who belonged to the colonies had their own way this United States of North America would today be an English colony and under the rulership of King George, and the fact that our country is a free United States today was by no means due to the willingness of England, but solely because the people who in the early days of this country were here fought with their lives and blood for the freedom that England tried to wrest from them or rather deprive them of. The party who wrote the article seems to try to impress the reader that because he is of native birth he is a better American.

He overlooks the fact that, after all, he only happened to be born here by the grace of the Almighty, while millions of other people from all parts of the globe (including his antecedents), who came here 200 years ago, chose this country, and I dare say that most of them have made and are splendid American citizens, and that without first placarding themselves with the fact that their forefathers came here 200 years ago or on the Mayflower, in order to impress the public what good Americans they are.

The correspondent overlooks the fact entirely that the Indian of this country was here long before our friend's relatives came here, even if that was 200 years ago, so after all there are other native Americans.

I fully agree with "Native American," though, in the fact that if some of the gentlemen who express themselves in public as well as in the daily papers in the same way in the country of their birth, whether such country is England, Russia, France or Germany or any other country, as they do in this country, they would be looked upon as "agitators" pure and simple, and dealt with accordingly, and, in my opinion, people who continually seek to agitate the public in this mannner should be deported to the country from whence they came, for we Americans have no use for agitators and whoever can't see it that way should return to the land from whence he came.

I credit the citizens of our free country with enough intelligence to judge for themselves which is right or wrong without having a third party continually hammering away at them by practically trying to force a dictatorshop upon them; and if one or the other should not agree with such tactics or one expresses an unbiased opinion, a shower of all sorts of epigrams and abuse is heaped upon him, which I think is most disgraceful. It is true this is the land of free thought and speech, but this privilege should not be abused by calling one's fellow men all sorts of names, simply because the opinion of the other differs.

M. SANDER.

MAJORITY RULE IS CRITICISED

S. B. Hill's Views Are Taken Up and Declared Wrong.

GEER, Wash., June 11.—(To the Editor.)—The letter of S. B. Hill, of Salem, June 6, peremptorily calls for a few words in reply, whether one has time to write or not, and I hope you will kindly find space for them.

Mr. Hill tells us of the "fact that the majority is supposed to rule in this country, and so those who do not like our laws had better move, if they do not happen to be in the majority."

I wish to inform Mr. Hill that most emphatically the majority is not "supposed to rule." That was precisely the doctrine and practice of our venerated and worshiped "Pilgrim Fathers." In passing I will say that I admit the "grim" to be a superlative degree, and they may have been a "pill," from which our National vision is still suffering, but their claims to "fatherhood" are repudiated as an insult by all true Americans.

By juggling the well-known historical facts a portion of the population has been trying for generations to spread abroad the notion that these Pilgrim fathers came here to establish religious liberty, when any school girl or boy knows that the opposite is the case. They wanted liberty for themselves, to be sure, but they were less willing to grant it to their fellow-citizens than their oppressors at home from whom they fled.

Their characteristic enactment reads: "No man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of the churches within the limits of the same." The churches were the Independent and Puritan, the forerunners of modern Congregationalism, on the whole quite an advanced and enlightened institution, though occasionally showing sad individual lapses. Residence in the Puritan colony was permitted to others, but the right to vote and worship was denied them. These people believed in the divine right of majority rule, beside which the common mortals of the minority had no rights. They themselves were the majority. The legitimate fruit of this spirit was manifested in the executions after farcical trials of the witches at Salem and the hanging of the Quakers in Boston.

Mr. Hill suggests to those whose conscience puts them in the minority or who fail to see things from the viewpoint of the majority from other convictions, to emigrate "and let our laws alone"; that is, not dare to vote or argue against a law as it now stands. The spirit is the same. If the minority emigrates and finds itself again in the minority in the new country on the same or some other topic, it will have to migrate again, I suppose, until it finally gets off the face of the earth.

It will not do for Mr. Hill to avoid the issue by referring to his saving clause, asking the Advent elder if he has anything better than one day's rest in seven, because just before, he says, the elder has advanced what he thinks better, namely, that "there should be no Sunday laws," which course would permit the majority to rest the seventh day of the week, the first day of the week, or any other day, or none at all, just as they, the majority, choose, without compelling the minority fines and imprisonment to do the same. This, of course, would subject the minority to some inconveniences, which they as believers in liberty would be willing to bear.

This, it will be seen, is the opposite of majority rule. It is not rule at all, and is in harmony with the doctrine that stood godmother when this great republic of ours assumed its individuality, when it was held that "that government is best which governs least." "But," I hear Mr. Hill say, "without majority rule we would go back to lawlessness and barbarism." Not at all. The only proper and lasting government is the rule of right, which is quite different from majority rule, which has become too much of a fetish with us since the Civil War. Instead of the voter asking himself, "Will this measure benefit me, my county or state; will it bring the greatest good to the greatest number?" he must ask himself, "Is it just to all; will it benefit the United States as a whole; will it benefit humanity at large without detriment to our country?" The opinion of the majority, of course, decides, but this is different from majority rule, which is too prone to be unfair to one or more minority groups. When the ancient spirit of intolerance allies itself with the fetish of majority rule, there are breakers ahead for the ship of state, especially if the majority is swayed by a clique with ulterior motives as is now the case in Japan and has been for some time in other countries, not venturing to speak of our own.

When in 1618, two years before the Mayflower landed at Plymouth, intolerance and secular power combined to revoke "liberty to preach" in Germany, which had been a demand for 200 years, the 30 years' war was started that reduced its population from 20,000,000 to 6,000,000 and turned the land into a wilderness of ruins, the haunts of wolves and robbers. Let us take care that we are not drifting into a 30 years' war and French revolution combined.

The spirit of intolerance and of despotic majority rule was supposed to have expired with the allegiance to Great Britain, and the successful establishment of this republic, because its founders had avowed allegiance to freedom and justice. Intolerance and despotism, whether of one, of a class or classes, or of a majority, are un-American. Their advocates hark back to a past that should be dead. They may be Colonial British-Americans, hyphenated citizens, linked both to the dead and to a foreign country, but not Americans.

R. STUEHCK.

"CHIP" CARRYING IS ABHORRED

Calmness and Not Resentment Advised Among Nations.

PORTLAND, June 12.—(To the Editor.)—Not many years ago it was the custom for a certain class of men to walk through life with an offensive chip on their shoulder, which they called their honor. Anyone who accidentally or intentionally disturbed this piece of wood was promptly challenged to mortal combat; if the first party succeeded in murdering him, his honor was thereby vindicated. This spirit seems still to animate certain nations as a whole; they must sacrifice the best of their own country and butcher as many as possible of another land in order to uphold their "honor." Is it not time for all civilized races to cast aside this folly. The only factors that can give a nation honor and dignity are humanity, justice and righteousness.

The glory of war is a figment of the imagination. War is anarchy, lawlessness, wholesale murder legalized by parties that have thrown aside the laws of God and man. It is settlement of disputes by barbaric destruction rather than by the juster and more civilized power of cool reason. The only justifiable war is one in self-defense or in the aid of a weak and outraged nation. Even then it should be the last resort. The name of warrior is one to be abhorred. The men who were willing to give their lives that our country might live during the Revolution and Civil War deserve our highest honor and regard; but men who fight for adventure or conquest, who make a profession of warfare are worthy of nothing but contempt.

Only men who construct and conserve have my esteem; the warrior is a destroyer. In boyhood days hero worship was given Napoleon; now he is looked on, along with Alexander and Caesar, as simply a genius at murder and destruction. Men like Pasteur, Sir Isaac Newton, Robert Fulton, Thomas A. Edison, Christopher Wren, Mendelssohn, Michael Angelo, Shakespeare and Abraham Lincoln are considered incomparably above any great military man. We want men who serve humanity in a constructive manner, materially, intellectually and spiritually.

Hence our fixed purpose as a Nation should be to not plunge into hasty and thoughtless strife when we feel that our rights may not have been properly recognized, but to be cool and self-controlled, to suspend judgment until we have all the information necessary for righteous judgment, and then to act not from any selfish ambition or desire for vengeance, but that we may aid and serve humanity. Let us remember that the only real possession that makes a nation strong is an industrious, righteous and intelligent people. Such a body of citizens will, if there be a just cause, fight bravely and strongly.

AN AMERICAN.

MAYO METHOT'S CAREER TOLD

Portland Child Traces Histrionic Ability to Grandmother and Aunt.

PORTLAND, June 12.—(To the Editor.)—Will you kindly tell me through your paper the history of little Mayo Methot's theatrical career? Were her parents or her ancestors ever on the stage? A child with such unusual talent certainly inherited it. Is she kept in seclusion? I never see her on the street. Thanking you for any information.

INTERESTED READER.

Mayo Methot is the only child of Mr. and Mrs. John Dillon Methot. She is 11 years old. Neither of her parents is theatrical folk, although her mother, who was Beryl Evelyn Wood, of Chicago, and a graduate of Kemper Hall, Kenosha, Wis., is a pianist and studied for concert work before her marriage. Mayo's paternal grandmother is Minnie Methot, of comic opera fame, for whom Kirke La Shelle wrote "The Princess Chic." She was a pupil of Marchesi, and lives in New York now. Mayo's aunt, Mayo Methot, was with Richard Mansfield and is now the wife of Judge Samuel Parker McConnell, of Oscawana-on-the-Hudson. Mayo is not kept in seclusion, but she lives in the country out from Portland, and only comes into the city whenever she is appearing at the theater, or to take her dancing lesson. She is studying French, German and esthetic dancing and music. She is in the sixth grade at school, and is a normal, healthy little girl, who lives outdoors, plays with her cat and dog, works in her garden, reads a great deal, goes to bed early and has no artificial amusements. She is a communicant at Trinity Episcopal Church, and she never misses Sunday school. Her stage debut was made when she was 6, with Izetta Jewel at the old Baker Theater, on Third street. She is a member of the Baker Stock Company, and appears whenever there is an important child role. She has appeared with Cathrine Countiss and in vaudeville at the local Empress. Mayo has never had any training or coaching of any sort from dramatic teachers, and her work is natural and unstudied.

SECOND THOUGHTS FLAY FIRST

Many Practices Are Good, but Opportunities Offer Better.

LENTS, Or., June 12.—(To the Editor.)—Thoughts being real things, they naturally occupy some space in the world. The spoken word is a thought sounded; the printed word is a thought photographed. While I do not care to say that it is a fixed habit with me, yet, sometimes, I do catch myself acactually thinking. A few fleeting thoughts tarried with me for a short while this morning, and I am asking that you photograph the same in your paper's columns.

First—A thought suggested that it is pleasant to know that we have fellow citizens so philanthropically inclined as to hand out a roll, a $50 roll of bills to a real gentlemanly streetcar official. He is right. I would walk a mile to see both the giver and the receiver. Such men are not to be seen in too large numbers these days. It is feared they may become wholly extinct. Yes, I'd walk a mile to see them, but I would walk much further to see the gentleman, had he given the amount to help the really needy, the man who has a family dependent on his labor and who has no labor to do.

Second—Another thought expressed delight that Portland, through its splendid commercial organization, should seem in appropriate cordially to entertain its traveling guests, such as Eastern Governors, Japanese and Chinese delegations and other personages of like distinction, but this thought was somewhat disfigured by another which claimed that it would be more appropriate, more humane, to expend the same expense money, or a like amount, in the assistance of some of our poor widows who are daily struggling to feed and clothe the little helpless and innocent children who so tenaciously cling to her skirts. Yes, it is appropriate and good to entertain our Eastern and Oriental friends, but it would be more appropriate and better to assist our unfortunate townspeople.

Third—Another big thought came and settled on me. It was a fine, handsome chap and carried much weight with its argument. Its mission was to explain the sound judgment expressed and displayed by our publicity clubs in gathering within our midst vast multitudes of Easterners who become our neighbors and our friends. Naturally, I was readily convinced that such is first-class judgment and would have continued under that conviction had not a thought of finer proportions intruded itself, quietly asserting that it would be better judgment to provide labor and thereby a means of sustenance for those who are already among us. I was most sorry to entertain this last fellow, for he queered the argument of the booster and made it a little embarrassing for both of us.

Fourth—This was a well-groomed and smiling thought. It pictured in forceful phraseology the pleasure, the gaiety, the recreation, the health and culture to be found in our playhouses, our racetracks, our social drinks and cigars; it spoke of the real benefits of the pool and billiard halls, the joy rides, the beach and mountain trips; it pictured the auto with a poodle dog occupying half of one of the seats and the late feast to follow. Such logic could not be lightly brushed aside; it was too true. I decided to join the throng at once. Why not? We have but once to live here. Is it not so? I decided to become a member, and accompany this last fellow and become his constant companion. But, alas! A little thought hidden under my desk, squeaked out: "It isn't so; it isn't so. If you want real happiness, the kind that will serve you throughout your whole life, share your pleasure money with those who have no pleasure; your luxury money with those who have no luxuries, and your idle time with those who are enforcedly idle, rather than by choice." Just my luck! Baffled, ignominiously defeated. This little unwelcome guest, hidden away in a dark recess, without leave or license, dares to come and undo, overturn and disrupt my fondest dreams.

OREGONIAN READER.

PROHIBITION IS CALLED FARCE

Writer Declares Oregon Law Only Will Send Trade Out of State.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., June 9.—(To the Editor.)—In his letter to The Oregonian May 30, E. T. Johnson, of Yreka, Cal., returns to a discussion with me of prohibition in Oregon. Mr. Johnson will have it that "the people of Oregon are striving to escape from the 'curse' of liquor."

What is this "curse" of which Mr. Johnson speaks? Is it the manufacture of liquor? I hardly think he means that. Is it the wholesale handling of liquor? I think that even Mr. Johnson would concede that, of itself, a rather innocuous thing. Is it the retailing of liquor or the use of liquor? Mr. Johnson would have us believe it the former (for it is far easier to stir up prejudice by such a procedure) but in reality is it not the use of liquor at which he is hitting?

Can the sale of liquor be a heinous thing if the use be a perfectly proper thing? Yet the Oregon law and the laws of other prohibition states not only do not forbid the use but generally take care to safeguard it so it may not be interfered with. Oregon simply provides that liquor may be secured from the dealer outside, who, incidentally, pays no taxes, instead of from the dealer at home, who is a citizen and pays taxes to Oregon. Neighboring Washington not only protects the use of liquor in a similar manner but the amendment there undertakes to protect the social use of liquor by specifying that nothing in this amendment shall prevent a man giving a drink to a friend in his home.

I don't know anything of the habits of Mr. Johnson, but I suspect that if he does not keep liquor in his home, three out of four of his friends do, and I think he will find many of the staunchest Prohibitionists in all sections have bottles in their homes. I say this with no desire to give offense. By the same queer twist in mental processes these men see the "curse" to be the sale of an article and justify its use by themselves.

One odd feature of the recent war hysteria in England that resulted in an attempt to make liquor the scapegoat, as usual, was the revelation of the widespread use of liquor by men of all conditions, the clergy included. This was no news to the liquor trade but to the general public, deceived by the absurd representation of Prohibition agitators, it was a surprise.

Thus we read of the attitude of the English clergy, as follows, in a London cable:

> The clergy comprising the lower house of the Convocation of Canterbury, are willing to set the nation an example in the matter of temperance, but they are not willing to abstain entirely from alcohol . . . Several members voted only after being assured that total abstinence was not expected of them. The Dean of Canterbury said flatly he refused to swear off altogether. He had tried it before, he said, and found it a failure in that it impaired his health.

The readers of The Oregonian know as well as I do that liquor is used by a large majority of the people of their state, by those who voted for statewide prohibition as well as by the so-called liberal element. The "curse" against which Mr. Johnson should fight is the use of liquor, not the sale.

Unless there were use, there would be no sale. The prohibitionist seeks to befuddle the public into the idea that sale makes the use. He is busy on all sides trying to create the impression that liquor men force their product upon the public. Let any of your readers look about him and he will see the illmeness of such a contention. The people of Oregon are not weaklings, more than are the people of any other state, and to argue that liquor is forced upon them is tantamount to making the charge that they are. The man who drinks because liquor is forced upon him by the seller should be in an asylum, and generally he is there.

The fact that in Oregon, as in other states that have voted for so-called prohibition, a large part of the prohibition vote has been made up of men who not only use liquor but have no intention of giving up that use, has led some students of the liquor question to diagnose the dissatisfaction of these men as being with the local selling agency and not with liquor itself, nor its use, nor even yet with the misuse of liquor—its use to excess—terrible as examples of that frequently are.

If this be the situation, what is the solution? Must mere dissatisfaction with the way of marketing a product that the public uses and the use of which it intends to continue, result in prohibition that accomplishes nothing save to destroy private property, without compensation, and public revenues, without doing aught of good to the state?

There is another alternative, not yet put to a trial. Let the people at the polls indicate where their objection lies. If it be to one method of sale, let it be abolished. If it be to another, let it be barred. But if prohibition be indicated as the wish of the sovereign body, let it be real prohibition and no subterfuge.

The idea set forth here in brief has been embodied in a tentative ballot. The different propositions are stated as follows:

1. Do you want "hotel and cafe" licenses? It is explained that this plan contemplates permitting the sale of liquor by hotels, restaurants and cafes, without bars, screens or perpendicular drinking, all drinks to be served at tables.

2. Do you want "merchant licenses"? The ballot sets forth that this plan would permit the sale of liquor in original packages—goods not to be consumed on the premises—by grocers and druggists who have been in business in the county not less than two years.

3. Do you want saloon licenses?

The ballot should specify that in the event any of these three proposals fails to carry, absolute prohibition shall prevail, it being forbidden to ship liquor into the community, to order it brought in, to bring it in or to have it in one's possession.

If this ballot were put before the people of Oregon tomorrow, I hardly think they would repeat the decision of last Fall. A trial of so-called prohibition will, I believe, convince them that it will yet be necessary to turn a deaf ear to the Rev. Mr. Huttons, the Mr. Johnsons and their allies and to retrace the step taken then.

T. M. GILMORE,
President National Model License League.

"OLD WOMEN'S" AGE IS VIEWED

Thinking Has Much to Do With It, Thinks Hillsdale Correspondent.

HILLSDALE, Or., June 11.—(To the Editor.)—I read with interest your editorial on "Old Women," and while the thoughts expressed therein are generally accepted as true, yet I believe it is this very mental attitude toward old age and death that makes them "inevitable."

Not so many years ago it was generally believed that sickness was a form of punishment sent by God and must be borne with patience and pious fortitude, though at the same time every rule of hygiene may have been defied, including eating, drinking and sanitation—I almost said sanity. No doubt people in those days said in their blindness, "It is better, on the whole, bravely to face the truth that we must all be sick," just as most people say with you today, "We must all grow old and die." It was the rule in those times to put aside a certain sum "against a time of sickness." In fact, it is not uncommon in these days. But there are few in this age who believe that because there has always been sickness all must expect it and none can escape it. People know today that it is possible so to regulate living and thinking as to be absolutely free from bodily ailments of any kind. While there are still those who accept the age suggestions of their environment and wither in the very mid-summer of life, the great majority have set the age limit higher than that fixed by past generations and absolutely refuse to consider themselves old while they are still young, as a consequence greatly prolonging the period of youth. Does not this show conclusively that old age is a product of thought? And if old age is in the mind, may not death be also?

Unfortunately, few can see the connection between prolonged youth and eternal youth. They still believe that nothing can insure immunity from death, that no amount of "plain living and high thinking" will avail them anything when once the grim reaper has marked them for his sheaves. They can defer death, but cannot escape it. Life is a mortgage on which interest can be paid, but when the time limit has expired and the owner, death, is ready to foreclose, the mortgagor has to pay. It has never occurred to them to get rid of the mortgagee and all his kin.

But though no mortal has yet succeeded in demonstrating eternal youth, there are many people today who are thinking youth and life, instead of old age and death, and it is a foregone conclusion that such people will look young and feel young when their contemporary friends with the "servant consciousness," as a young writer expresses it, are ready for the grave. They are freeing their minds from the race fear of sickness, old age and death, realizing that in truth it is the "things they fear that come upon them." What we fear we hold in consciousness, and whatever is held in consciousness must manifest outwardly. Was the name of the serpent Fear, I wonder, that entered the hearts of Adam and Eve and caused them to be driven from the presence of God on their long evolutionary journey?

MARY H. FORCE.

FACTORY HEADS TESTED

Many Apply for Licenses to Manage Creameries.

MARSHFIELD, Or., June 12.—(Special.)—Complying with the new state law that requires that all persons managing cheese factories and creameries be licensed, 33 persons have taken the examination in Coos and Curry counties in the past week. Examinations were conducted at Bandon, Coquille, Marshfield and Myrtle Point, the Curry County applicants journeying to Bandon. The examinations were conducted by County Agriculturist Jay L. Smith, of this county, James E. West, of the Macleay cheese factory at Wedderburn, traveled 128 miles to qualify. Those who applied for licenses included:

H. E. Bessey and James K. Childers, Coos Bay Creamery; Clay E. Elliott, Coos Bay Ice & Cold Storage Company; A. J. Surbeck, North Bend Condensery; N. M. Young, Lakeside Creamery; L. D. Walker, Roberts Brothers' Cheese Factory at Tenmile; George A. McCulloch, Golden Leaf Creamery, Haynes Inlet; Nels P. Peterson, dairyman, North Inlet; C. T. Skeels and Henry Belloni, Coquille Valley Creamery; Fred Moser, Graveford Cheese Factory; T. J. Ballantyne, North Fork Cheese Factory; C. S. Anderson, Lee Cheese Factory; J. H. McCloskey, Clarence Barklow, George A. McDonald and C. C. Robinson, Norway Creamery; E. C. Ostrander, Mount Anderson Creamery; C. E. Broadbent, Myrtle Point, owner of three factories, the Sunrise Creamery, Sunrise Cheese Factory and Arago Cheese Factory, with his assistants, J. W. Broadbent, Norman McDonald and A. W. Britton; Andrew Christensen, Sugar Loaf Cheese Factory; J. H. Beach and H. J. Miller, Parkersburg Cheese & Butter Company; J. C. Baker, Bandon Creamery; L. M. Strong, Two-Mile Cheese Factory; M. H. Manwaring, Langlois Dairy Product Company; Hazel Manwaring, Euchre Creek Cheese Factory; Ernest Lutsey, Crystal Creamery; Howard Brunn, Denmark Cheese Company; M. G. Lutsey, Langlois dairyman; James E. West, Wedderburn Cheese Factory.

TWO TO STUDY AVIATION

Portland Amateurs to Practice on Military Field at Vancouver.

VANCOUVER BARRACKS, Wash., June 12.—(Special.)—L. T. Barin and W. T. Bailey, amateurs of Portland, are to attempt to learn to become aviators on the lower field of the military reservation. They have set up a Burkhart model biplane there and contemplate making trial flights within the next few weeks.

Frank Bryant, a brother of John Bryant, who was killed when flying at Spokane last year, is to be here July 20 with a Curtis biplane for trial flights and experiments. He has had five years' experience in flying and has taken part in meets with Beachey, Silas Christofferson, who learned to fly on this field, and several other well known aviators.

The Burkhart model now here weighs 800 pounds, has a spread of 35 feet and a four-cylinder, 50-horsepower motor.

3 CELEBRATIONS PLANNED

Onalaska, Winlock and Bolsfort Valley to Observe Fourth.

CENTRALIA, Wash., June 12.—(Special.)—July 4 will be well celebrated throughout Lewis County. Onalaska will stage festivities July 3 and 4, the celebration also marking the opening of the Newaukum Valley Railroad being built into Napavine by the Onalaska Lumber Company.

Winlock business men have subscribed sufficient funds to insure the best celebration in the history of the town.

The residents of the Bolsfort Valley will celebrate on July 2 with a big picnic, each farmer supplying a basket, as has been the custom in the past.

Centralia will not celebrate this year, the festivities attending seven state conventions of patriotic orders here June 22 to 26 taking the place of the annual programme.

GENESEE HAS HORSE SHOW

Great Crowd Gathers for Annual Affair at Idaho Town.

GENESEE, Idaho, June 12.—(Special.)—One of the largest crowds that has gathered here in many days thronged the city Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, the days of the annual horse show. The show was started with a parade of all stock entered to compete for prizes. Immediately after the parade the judging of the stock took place. Professor Iddings, of the University of Idaho, acted as judge of the stock.

The ball game between Genesee and Pullman was a one-sided affair, the Pullman team winning by a score of 13 to 7. An athletic meet and automobile contests also were held.

McCleary Youth Killed by Train.

ELMA, Wash., June 12.—(Special.)—Albert Gustafson, a popular young man of McCleary, was killed accidently by the logging train in that place a day or so ago. He was on the front of the engine ready to jump off and throw a switch, and in some manner lost his footing.

BETTER BABIES ARE NEED

Mother's Right to Place in Industrial World Is Upheld.

PORTLAND, June 12.—(To the Editor.—There seems to be a great desire for consideration of the woman question, a question in which I am not only enthusiastic, but vitally interested. Mr. Barzee's utter misunderstanding of my former letter prompts me to a further discussion of this subject. He has absolutely failed to consider the development of the modern machine in our industrial life, apparently failing to understand that our social life is builded upon and shaped by the economic life. Economic determination seems to have no place in his trend of thought.

Woman's advent into the industrial field is a benefit not only to woman, but to society. We must have noble, intelligent, useful women to mother our race. Economic freedom ennobles woman and the education she gets through experience on the industrial field makes her an intelligent and useful woman. In the indestrial field woman learns to specialize and systematize. Soon she will want to specialize in her most precious occupation—that of raising children.

She will see the folly of each woman trying to care for two or three children. She will see that, instead of being kept constantly in a home made for grown-ups, where they are continually nagged at, they need an environment where their little minds and bodies may have a chance to develop—where the furniture is made for their use, where they are encouraged to do rather than don't.

She will feel the need of children being properly fed, of being trained into better habits of choosing their food. This can be done best by feeding them separately, instead of allowing them to sit at the ordinary table with the grown-ups, who (because of our food being manufactured for sale rather than for use) have formed bad habits.

She will see that society needs children that have been fed, clothed, housed and trained scientifically. She will understand that this is a study that needs many years of preparation. By being trained scientifically we mean that each child shall be carefully studied by experts who realize that one set of rules will not do for a dozen children.

This has been the mistake of too many of our public school teachers. Each child must be allowed to show his natural inclinations, in order that we may know better how to develop his individuality and how to guide him to a broader general conception of life. Perhaps the best example of such education is found in the Montessori system.

It is a fact (not a theory) that many mothers who were employes before marriage—mothers who do not want divorces from their husbands—are longing for their economic freedom and are returning to their old places. These women have been specialists in some line. They can see that they are not as well fitted to handle even their own children as someone who has specialized in that line. These mothers can be counted on to help solve these problems.

This new relation of woman to society will tend to take much of the selfishness out of motherhood. Instead of the mother feeling that she is raising her child to be merely her "pride and joy," and feeling a keen disappointment if he does not live up to her special ideals, she will feel a deeper interest in all children.

Another important benefit to woman and to society is that woman is seeing the necessity of taking better care of her health in order to have physical endurance for her new duties. Gymnasiums and swimming pools are becoming more popular all the time and the working girl is much in evidence at these places.

The "rural maid" sees her mother, aged before her time, still feeling responsible for father's cuff buttons, still feeling responsible for the handkerchiefs and bath water for the whole family; sees her always ready and willing to slave early and late that everyone in her household may be comfortable. She sees the boys and girls come home from college with their polished manners and hears them discuss topics of the day with father, for he reads his newspapers and keeps posted to some extent.

But poor, dear old mother, they love her, but, too often, there is only little intelligent companionship between them, for she always has been too busy with the farm drudgery and little details of the household duties to keep pested—to keep step with her children.

The "rural maid" sees this and her heart aches for dear old mother, but she instinctively shrinks from following in her footsteps. So she decides to make herself economically independent. If she acts wisely and has learned her lesson well she always will retain this economic independence and will say to the young man whom she may choose to become the father of her children: "I will become your partner, but I have no desire to become your 'queenly wife,' or your household slave, and no amount of flattery can make me such. I desire to retain my economic freedom. I have the desire to become the mother of healthy, intelligent children, but such children should be intelligently and scientifically reared at our mutual expense. Then we will stand on equal grounds."

In conclusion: It is not more babies, but better babies that society needs. We need better methods for rearing and training our children that they may grow into better men and women, physically and mentally, and thereby in turn be fitted to produce better children. When we breed better babies and have better methods for rearing and training them we need not fear a dearth in the production of children. The natural instinct of man and woman will attend to the perpetuation of the race—especially when they know that their children will have opportunity to develop into normal human beings.

LYLITH M. CANNON.

CORVALLIS MAN IS PICKED

F. R. Brown to Teach Agriculture in Payette High School.

OREGON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, Corvallis, June 12.—(Special.)—F. R. Brown, specialist in horticultural by-products at the Oregon Agricultural College, has been appointed supervisor of agriculture in the Payette High School and agricultural advisor in the community with farmers in an advisory capacity.

"Mr. Brown," says Professor C. I. Lewis, chief of the horticultural division, "is one of the leading authorities in horticultural by-products of the Pacific Northwest. His work in the development of loganberry by-products, especially evaporated berries and loganberry juices, has been one of the chief factors in preparing the berry to travel to wider markets in Eastern states and other parts of the world."

Twin Falls Merchants Elect.

TWIN FALLS, Idaho, June 12.—(Special.)—The merchants of Twin Falls, at a meeting in the Commercial Club rooms recently, perfected an organization for their mutual protection and benefit. Bylaws were adopted, and the following directors, who will later